

Hon. L. CRAIG: I shall be surprised if members refuse to allow the department an opportunity to deal with the difficulty.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	16
Noes	..	..	..	8

Majority for .. .. 8

#### AYES.

Hon. E. H. Angelo	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. J. A. Dimmitt	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Tuckey
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. G. B. Wood
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. L. Craig	Hon. W. H. Klitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. M. Heenan	Hon. G. Fraser
	(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—Repeal of Section 18:

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Section 18 is to be repealed, and a new section inserted in lieu setting out that margarine manufactured or sold within the State shall not contain any butter fat. The Act of 1936 contains an amendment dealing with margarine. Why was not advantage taken of the provision?

Hon. L. Craig: For the same reason that this clause will not be operative.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Mr. Craig seems to know all about the matter, but I would like to know from the Minister why the provision in the 1936 Act has not been put into operation. The object of that section was to control the sale of margarine.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I understand that an agreement was entered into between the several States whereby uniform legislation was to be introduced to deal with margarine. Western Australia was the only State to take action in accordance with the agreement. Because the other States have not fallen into line, that part of the 1936 Act was not proclaimed. The provision was that 5 per cent of butter fat might be used in the manufacture of margarine; hence the amendment in the Bill to prohibit that practice.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I do not know why margarine has been mentioned in the Bill, because the provision will not apply at all. I do not know why margarine should

be allowed in competition with butter. In other States that has been permissible for several years. Notwithstanding all the knowledge the Minister has of this industry and how well disposed he is towards it, he allows a quota of 200 cases of margarine per week for this State.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 8 and 9, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

*House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 15th November, 1939.*

	PAGE
Questions: Swan river reclamation .....	1959
Federal Wheat and Wool Board: salaries and allowances .....	1960
Railways, annual and long service leave .....	1960
Parliaments—Federal and State, Constitutional position .....	1960
Wheat Storage Select Committee, report presented .....	1960
Bills: Plant Diseases (Registration Fees) (No. 2), 1R. .....	1960
Main Roads Act Amendment, 3R. ....	1960
War Funds Regulation, report, Standing Orders Suspension, 3R. ....	1960
Sunday Observance, 2R. ....	1961
Reserves (No. 2), 2R., Com. report .....	1960
Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report .....	1975
Income Tax (Rates for Deduction), 2R., Com. report .....	1988
Administration Act Amendment, Council's amendment .....	1988

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

### QUESTION—SWAN RIVER RECLAMATION.

Mr. HILL asked the Premier: In return No. 11, submitted with the Revenue Estimates, the loan liability on the Swan River improvements is shown as £400,679. Can he state (a) how much of this amount is due on the cost of the reclamation work: and (b) what proportion of the last-mentioned amount was expended in the financial years ended the 30th June, 1937, 1938, and 1939?

The PREMIER replied: (a) £294,509; (b) Year ended the 30th June, 1937, £16,972; year ended the 30th June, 1938, £29,086; year ended the 30th June, 1939, £41,142.

### QUESTION—FEDERAL WHEAT AND WOOL BOARDS.

#### *Salaries and Allowances.*

Mr. BERRY asked the Minister for Agriculture: Will he ascertain and inform the House what salaries and allowances are paid to each member of the Federal Wheat and Wool Boards, appointed under the acquisitional and appraisal policies of the Federal Government?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: Endeavours are being made to obtain the information desired.

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

#### *Annual and Long Service Leave.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What accrued leave, i.e., annual and long service, is due to each of the following officers of the Railway Department:—

(a) J. W. R. Broadfoot, Chief Mechanical Engineer; (b) R. N. Johnston, Works Manager; (c) J. H. Railton, Chief Traffic Manager; (d) J. Yates, Superintendent of Loco Running? 2, Will these officers cut out all leave due prior to reaching the retiring age? 3, If not, why not?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, (a) Annual leave 57 days, long service leave, nine months; (b) annual leave 14 days, long service leave, nil; (c) annual leave, 92 days, long service leave, six months; (d) annual leave, 26 days, long service leave, three months. 2, Yes. 3, Answered by No. 2.

### QUESTION—PARLIAMENTS, FEDERAL AND STATE.

#### *Constitutional Position.*

Mr. NORTH asked the Premier: 1, Has the onset of war interfered with any previously conceived plan for an overhaul of the constitutional position between the Federal and State Parliaments? 2, Is it not highly desirable that State Budgets should almost invariably show a surplus, and that any deficit required to make (public) ends meet

be shown in the Federal accounts? Is not this condition called for, having regard to the Federal powers to create and control money? 3, Seeing that in practice it is the Federal Government which has shown the surpluses, of what avail has it been to this State that its productivity per head has been one of the highest in the world?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, (a) Balanced budgets are desirable. (b) There is no provision for State deficits to be included in Commonwealth accounts. (c) This is a discretion which may be exercised by the Commonwealth Government. (3) It has assisted in the material progress made by this State.

### WHEAT STORAGE SELECT COMMITTEE.

#### *Report Presented.*

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [4.34]: I desire to present the report of the Committee, and move—

That the report be received.

Question put and passed.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [4.35]: I move—

That the report be printed, and the consideration of the report be made an order of the day for the next sitting of the House.

Question put and passed.

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

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

### BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—WAR FUNDS REGULATION.

Report of Committee adopted.

#### *Standing Orders Suspension.*

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. A. H. Panton—Leederville) [4.37]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the third reading of the Bill to be passed at this sitting.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and assured myself that there is an absolute majority of members present.

I declare the question passed.

Question thus passed.

*Third Reading.*

Bill read a third time and returned to the Council with amendments.

**BILL—SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 9th November.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [4.38]: I must acknowledge that I am surprised at the presentation of this Bill, because I learn from the Acts of 1677 that already there is ample legislation dealing with Sunday work. In the Bill before us particular reasons are advanced whereby the door shall be closed to Sunday work in connection with different phases of building. The provision is a very dangerous one. It is axiomatic that when control is expressed in regard to some particular industry, the door must remain open with respect to other industries. The Bill makes it clear that control is sought to be exercised over one industry, but would be without effect, in the circumstances, with respect to other industries. We have had before us a multiplicity of Bills, and it would appear that the one under consideration now is without any special justification. If we agree to its passage, a dangerous situation may arise. The Bill savours of an Edgar Wallace effort compiled without full consideration. Just as Edgar Wallace would produce a midday novel on some subject of general interest, which he weaved into a story, the Bill bears evidence of hasty construction without adequate consideration. The measure has little justification indeed from the standpoint of the existing law and certainly none for the setting out of reasons why building operations of various types should not be permitted on Sundays. A statute relating to Sunday observance was passed in 1677, which is admittedly a very long time ago.

Mr. Marshall: You were only a small boy at that time.

Mr. SAMPSON: Our ancestors were living in those days. Judging by the attitude of the Minister for Lands, he seems to be desirous of denying that obvious fact.

The Minister for Lands: I do not think you were any younger even in those days.

Mr. SAMPSON: In 1677, laws were passed in England relating to the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday. Is it necessary that we should pass a further law to deal with that subject? The 1677 Statute sets out that—

All and every person and persons whatsoever shall on the Lord's Day apply themselves to the observation of the same by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion.

That specially relates to the action of the Minister in bringing forward this Bill.

The Minister for Mines: That would not allow people to play tennis on Sundays.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, but tennis is a modern game. The Act from which I am quoting does not relate to recreation in the form of any sport or athletics.

Mr. Watts: It certainly does.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Act also says—

No tradesman, artificer, workman, labourer or other person whatsoever shall do or exercise any worldly labour, business or work of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's Day or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted).

Surely that is sufficiently comprehensive for the purposes of the Minister. There is no need for further legislation on the subject. I draw the attention of the Minister to the danger associated with his action in bringing down legislation that relates to the illegality of building operations on the Lord's Day, or Sunday as we commonly call that day. The effect is to make it axiomatic that other works are perfectly legal and that such work undertaken on the Sabbath or Lord's Day will not be at variance with the law, because the Bill makes it clear that it is only illegal to carry on building construction work on Sundays. There is very grave danger in such a proposition. It is all very well to say it is wrong for any building work to be undertaken on the Sabbath, but if we agree to the Bill the effect will be that work done on the Sabbath in other directions will be legal.

Mr. Cross: The parent Act will still stand.

Mr. SAMPSON: No, because the Bill will supersede the 1677 Act as applied to building operations. If the Bill be agreed to, the 1677 Act will in effect be repealed.

Mr. Cross: No, it will not be repealed.

Mr. Patrick: There are Acts dealing with Sunday trading.

The Minister for Labour: The member for Swan has not read the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: The purpose of the Bill is to regulate work in certain trades on Sundays. It contains a schedule that relates to an Act for "the further reformation or sundry abuses committed on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday" and also to the Sunday Observance Act, 1677. I take it that the Bill, if agreed to, will supersede those earlier Acts, which otherwise would have been the law in relation to the matters dealt with in the measure before the House. There is certainly no need for legislation as that proposed by the Government. For some reason or other, the Minister is much concerned about anyone who desires to work on Sunday. Ample power already exists in the statutes to deal with that phase, so why should the Minister wish to go further? If we accept the Bill, grave injury will be worked in respect of those who desire Sunday to be maintained as the Lord's Day.

Mr. Watts: Where would you erect the stocks?

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not referring to that phase.

Mr. Watts: You will have to do so.

Mr. SAMPSON: Nor is there any need for me to do so. The Minister has persistently shown an unjustifiable objection to work in certain categories. He specially desired that no bread should be baked on the Sabbath. Now he goes further and says that no building operations shall be carried out on the Sabbath. It is a matter of restriction. Under the 1677 Act it is illegal for work to be done on the Lord's Day, and that legislation is just as effective today as it would be if the measure had been passed during the last decade or so.

The Minister for Labour: We will put you in the stocks next week!

Mr. SAMPSON: I would be prepared to suffer that indignity if I could persuade the Minister regarding the right course to adopt. This fanatical desire to introduce further legislation for which there is no possible justification prompts the question: Why is this course taken? To understand why it is done is exceedingly difficult. The introduction of such a Bill must do grave injury to the sacredness of

the Lord's Day. Surely there must be some virtue in a measure that has been in existence for such a long period.

The Minister for Labour: Can you tell me where I could secure a copy of that Act?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have one with me.

The Minister for Labour: You are about the only person who has a copy.

Mr. SAMPSON: Copies can easily be obtained from Eyre and Spottiswoode of Fleet-st., London. These laws, which are Imperial laws, have been adopted by this State and apply equally with any other law. For some reason or other, however, the Minister has decided that any law that indicates the right to work on the Lord's Day should vigorously and definitely be opposed. Why that should be I do not know. Apparently, if some housewife desires to arrange for a copper to be constructed, such work will be rendered illegal by the Bill. If the measure is passed, it will be impossible in some instances for bricklayers to be engaged to do what is required. The same difficulty might apply in respect to certain building construction work in the country. I know of an occasion when the erection of a brick chimney in a country district was impossible because there was no local builder and the building in question was too far removed from other builders to enable the work to be done by them. Consequently, an iron chimney had to be depended on.

Mr. Warner: Would they want to build that on a Sunday?

Mr. SAMPSON: Often the only time when such work can be carried out is on a Sunday.

Mr. Cross: It could be done during the week; there is plenty of time.

Mr. SAMPSON: Not by a man who has to go into the country to do the job. I am indicating the difficulty that arises through a scarcity of tradesmen. Often a desire to help people living at some distance from the metropolis is the reason for work being carried out by city builders in the country on a Sunday.

The Minister for Labour: You have had several buildings erected in the country in recent years.

Mr. SAMPSON: Not recently, but on occasion, and there has been some difficulty about bricklaying.

The Minister for Labour: I know.

Mr. SAMPSON: As a matter of fact, it has been sometimes impossible to have the work done.

The Minister for Labour: There has been difficulty in regard to many other things, too.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister will make it more difficult because he will brand a person who does something on a Sunday as one who violates the law. A person so doing, however, already breaks the law. The law is quite clear. When the Lord's Day or the Sabbath is violated, a breach occurs.

The Minister for Labour: You might explain why you have not been prosecuted.

Mr. SAMPSON: By specifying wrongdoing in connection with building, the Minister axiomatically decides that any other work done on the Sabbath is in order. Consequently, the Lord's Day will not be treated with the sacredness demanded by the Act of 1677.

Hon. P. Collier: You hold that book in the same way as a parson holds the bible.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am pleased the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) can sense the method by which such a book is held. I am very much encouraged and surprised. I shall continue to hold it in this way. The law states—

No person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry shew forth or expose to sale any wares, merchandizes, herbs, goods or chattells whatsoever upon the Lord's Day.

This old Act is a comprehensive measure designed to prevent traders and tradesmen from violating the Sabbath.

Mr. Warner: What did they do to them for law-breaking in those days?

Mr. SAMPSON: There is no doubt that the Sabbath was held in great respect in the old days. There is no object in bringing down another Bill. Why there should be such an epidemic of Bills for which there is no reason, I cannot understand. There is no virtue in introducing a measure to provide for something for which provision has already been made. The Minister would have a Bill brought down every session in order to do something that is quite unnecessary, something that is not called for by circumstances.

The Minister for Labour: I understand you pioneered a Bill to the first-reading stage on one occasion.

Mr. SAMPSON: Not in connection with Sunday work. Had I done so, I should

have received such criticism and the Bill would have had such a rough reception that I would never have been able to forget the incident. I do not understand how it has been possible for the Minister to proclaim himself ready to introduce legislation that is not required and that will do so much injury.

Mr. Cross: Are you sure that statute has not been amended since 1677?

Mr. SAMPSON: So far as my research has extended, there have been no amendments. I am pleased that the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) is so concerned about this. Not everyone believes in Sunday observance. There are some people who support seventh-day observance. Let me quote a few lines from this old Act—

Forasmuch as the Lords Day comonlie called Sunday is much broken and pfaied by carriers waggoners carters waynemen butchers and drovers of cattell to the great dishonour of God and the reproach of religion, be it therefore enacted by the Kings most excellent Majestic and the lords spirituall and temporall and by the commons in this psent Parliament assembled and by the authoritie of the same, that no carrier with any horse or horses nor waggonmen with any waggon or waggons nor carremen with any cart or carts nor waynemen with anie wayne or waynes nor drovers with any cattell shall after fortie daies next after the end of this psent session of Parliament by themslvs or any other travell uppon the said day

Other offences of which a person might be guilty are set out.

The Minister for Mines: What is set out?

Hon. P. Collier: What was the penalty, transportation?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing in this Bill about stock and other things mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. SAMPSON: But the Bill relates to Sunday observance, and I wish to point out that existing legislation is fully provided for. It not only relates to tradesmen and to those who cry their wares in the streets, but also deals with those guilty of abusing the Sabbath.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill deals with the building trade only.

Mr. SAMPSON: But the Bill contains power to deal with anything else. The Minister could not deal with baking because he has already done something to prevent Sunday work in that industry.

Hon. P. Collier: The year after that was passed was the year of the first fleet to Australia. Were any of those people members of the first fleet because they disobeyed that law?

Mr. SAMPSON: Those guilty of dishonouring the Sabbath were dealt with under the equivalent of the First Offenders' Act of the day.

Hon. P. Collier: And they were in the first fleet that came to Australia.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have no record of that, but I am prepared to accept the assurance of the hon. member that it was so. He in turn can accept my assurance that those who were guilty of any breach of the law in those days were given consideration as first offenders.

Hon. P. Collier: The consideration was transportation for seven years or life.

Mr. SAMPSON: If that was so, the authorities acted at variance with the law. I wish to make clear the penalty imposed in those days. Does the Minister desire to know?

Hon. P. Collier: The penalty was inflicted not by a judge but by a magistrate.

Mr. SAMPSON: It appears that a breach of the law relating to the Sabbath was a common offence, and there was no waiting to bring the offender before a judge; he was brought before a justice of the peace.

Mr. Cross: Do you think that after 300 years those conditions should not be amended?

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope the hon. member does not desire to open the door to all manner of Sunday trading. We cannot limit legislation in the way expressed in this Bill without opening the door to other breaches of the Act.

Hon. P. Collier: No wonder we had some good people that came here as convicts. Our ancestors were good people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: There is no doubt that some of our ancestors were quite good people.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member get back to the Bill and address the Chair.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am endeavouring to give the Minister information relating to the penalty paid in 1627 by those who violated the Act for the reformation of sundry abuses committed on the Lord's Day

commonly called Sunday. Here is another reference—

Every pson and psons so offending shall lose and forfeit twentic shillings for every such offence.

Then it proceeds to set forth that butchers and others were not allowed to kill or sell any victual on the said day. The Minister is attempting to do something that can be described as ultra vires. He has brought down a Bill for which there is no justification.

The Minister for Mines: That would not make it ultra vires.

Mr. SAMPSON: If it is ultra vires, there is no justification for it. I have said that the Bill goes beyond what is necessary, and if it is unjustified, to an extent it is ultra vires.

The Premier: Ultra vires what, the Constitution?

Mr. SAMPSON: Ultra vires the existing Act. During the temporary absence of the Premier at the Loan Council meeting, his Minister has brought down a Bill for which there is absolutely no justification.

Mr. Patrick: And the Premier is annoyed about it.

Mr. SAMPSON: Not annoyed, but rather amazed that the Minister has so little work that he can bring down a Bill for which there is no need and no justification.

Mr. Cross interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I direct the hon. member's attention to the fact that he cannot make a speech while the member for Swan is addressing the Chair. He will have an opportunity to speak later.

Mr. SAMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. P. Collier: Is this rambling talk relevant?

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to get back to a discussion of the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not know whether the member for Canning is able to make a speech.

Mr. Cross: I am just as able as you are.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am opposed to the Bill.

Hon. P. Collier: Are you?

Mr. SAMPSON: And I hope the Minister will not persist with it. There is no justification at all for it. I believe in observing the Lord's Day, and the Minister can take

action as desired under existing legislation. The member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers) referred to the carting of big logs by lorries on the Sabbath. I do not like to see that sort of thing, but that could be prevented under the Act. The Minister has brought down a Bill that makes no reference to log carrying by lorry. As I said earlier, the Bill makes it possible for that sort of thing to be done.

The Minister for Mines: Those logs are carted on motor lorries, and there is no mention of motor lorries in the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: That does not matter. As the Minister for Mines would know, if he were sufficiently interested, this Bill makes no distinction. The Act, however, relates to carters and others engaged in transport work. I would have liked to give the Minister for Mines further quotations from this old Act. There is a reference to waggons, carters and others.

Hon. P. Collier: What is the date of it?

Mr. SAMPSON: The date is 1627.

The Minister for Mines: A.D. or B.C.?

Mr. SAMPSON: A.D. I shall let the matter go at that. I shall certainly vote against the Bill, and shall be surprised if the House supports the measure. I hope the member for Canning will take a stand for righteousness.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for Canning is not mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. SAMPSON: And I hope members generally will not decide to do something that will have the effect of treating with lightness, with looseness and with lack of consideration the observance of the Lord's Day.

**THE MINISTER FOR LABOUR** (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—in reply) [5.11]: I desire to express regret that I was not able to be present in the Chamber last night when several speeches were delivered on the second reading of this Bill. I have had an opportunity to read the reports of those speeches, and in every instance it was a very good speech. The members who spoke were constructive; they started from a certain point and finished at another point. Only one speech have we had, the one delivered this afternoon—

Mr. Cross: That was not a speech.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR:—that started nowhere and finished nowhere.

Hon. P. Collier: And rambled nowhere.

Mr. Sampson: But was interrupted fairly often by the member for Boulder.

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: Although it started nowhere and finished nowhere, it travelled in many different and conflicting directions between the commencing point, if any, and the finishing point, if any.

Mr. Sampson: I was hoping the Minister would be enlightened.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The member for Swan could not produce a single reason, or even an apology for a reason, in his effort to build up opposition to the measure. He kept repeating the statement that there was no justification for the Bill. In my second reading speech, I put forward several reasons in justification of the Bill. Other members, who have spoken, with the exception of the member for Swan, advanced reasons in justification of the Bill. The member for Swan has read the Bill, but has failed to understand its contents. He told us in that insinuating style of his that this Bill, if passed into law, would control Sunday work in respect to the building trade, but would automatically wipe out the provisions of his beloved 1627 Act insofar as it applies to every other trade. If the member for Swan had read the Bill carefully, he would know that the Sunday Observance Act of 1677 will be affected only in respect to the building trade, which is set out as a prohibited trade in this measure, or to any other trade which might in future be brought under the provisions of this measure. The Sunday Observance Act of 1677 will continue to operate, if it does operate at present, in connection with all other trades except those which are declared to be prohibited trades under this legislation. I am quite satisfied that every member of this House except one favours the Bill and will vote for the second reading.

Mr. Sampson: Do you really believe that?

The MINISTER FOR LABOUR: The very fact that the Sunday Observance Act now in existence—if in fact it is in existence—is the best part of 300 years old constitutes in my opinion the most powerful argument that could be adduced in justification of the present Bill. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) may be in love with old statutes which have not been operated to any extent, if at all, in recent years. He may desire to preserve those old statutes

which are 300 years and more out of date; but I am sure all other members of the Chamber will be anxious to place on the statute-book legislation that is modern, legislation that takes into consideration the many and varied changes which have occurred in industry and in industrial and other practices during the period that has elapsed since 1677. In addition there is the important point that that legislation which the member for Swan regards so affectionately was not passed by any Parliament in Western Australia, was not passed by any person who had ever seen Western Australia, was not passed by any Parliament, nor by persons having the slightest knowledge of this State. So it seems to me that the Bill now before the Chamber is not only due but, as I said in my second-reading speech, long overdue. I feel highly regretful at the fact that the member for Swan is not able to bring himself beyond the point of 1677 so far as his ideas on this question are concerned.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

## **BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).**

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. MARSHALL** (Murchison) [5.18]: I would like the Minister, when he replies, to give some further information regarding what he proposes shall be done with the buildings at present housing most if not all of the States' departmental activities. I am inclined to support the second reading of the Bill, notwithstanding that the site factor has been thoroughly overhauled by various members, some for and most against. I would like to know from the Minister whether, should the Bill receive the sanction of the Legislature and become an Act, it is intended that the housing of the various departments shall be centralised in this one proposed building, or whether we are to find that in the course of time there will be a building partly erected, instead of a tightening-up or centralising of the activities of government additional buildings somewhere within the boundaries of the metropolitan area in which some of the departments will be housed. The Minister said that what the Bill proposed was a com-

mencement of centralising of departments. If we are going to wait for years for the complete centralising of all the departments, I do not think I could support the Bill at this juncture, because its creation would aggravate the position rather than bring about that which all members, I believe, are agreed upon—one central building for all departmental activities. If it is to be that all the departments shall be concentrated in the proposed building, and if that building is to be promptly proceeded with and constantly kept attended to, up to the point that all departments shall be centralised within it, the Bill in my opinion should pass.

It is true that much has been offered in opposition to the measure because of the site proposed. I respect the opinions of some members who oppose the Bill on that ground. However, I also have some regard for environment. In my opinion nothing looks nicer than a modern, well-constructed building with beautiful surroundings. Looking around the older cities, we find that invariably all important buildings are surrounded by gardens, lakes, waterways and all that which goes to lend some natural beauty to the artificial attractiveness appearing in the structure as well. I consider members should pay some regard to that factor.

Taking the central building of to-day which is known as the Treasury Building, I hold the view that the site it occupies is the most central position available. We must not, however, be unmindful of the fact that the traffic which passes around that building is intense and the resultant noise most objectionable. I consider that the State Government Insurance Office, a most important office, suffers most acutely from that cause. It is difficult for any member to carry on negotiations in that office because of the noise of trams continually passing to and fro, up and down Barrack-street. Again, we have to bear in mind that anyone desirous of approaching a Minister or officers of his department by motor transport has no facilities in that vicinity for parking. Therefore I suggest that if the building is to be proceeded with and completed, there will be sufficient parking area for vehicles while business is being done. I agree with probably the great majority of people whose access to the city, when having departmental business to do, is per medium of trolley buses, motor buses or trams: but I cannot

agree with those who argue that the distance intervening between the two sites in view is so great that immense inconvenience will be occasioned to those who travel on foot or by the means of transport I have just enumerated. Therefore, while wedded to the particular site I have indicated, I must admit that, taking all the factors into consideration, and provided something can be done with the present building in the way of leasing or renting, which would probably return most of the burden of interest and sinking fund that would have to be met to service the cost of the money needed to erect the new building now under discussion, this Bill should be enacted. If the Minister can give me an assurance that something of the kind will take place, I shall more readily support this measure. However, having weighed all the arguments for and against, I am prepared to endorse the proposal enunciated by the Bill. I can see no great injury resulting to the beauty of the city, or any spoiling of the effect of existing improvements established in and around the proposed site, if the Government's scheme is brought to fruition. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that a really modern, pleasant building erected in that centre would yield a more picturesque aspect than the present site affords without such a structure. Therefore I am ready to support the second reading, hoping the Minister will be able to give me assurances as to when the building will be started, when it will be completed, and what he proposes to do as regards the present Treasury building.

**MR. NORTH** (Claremont) [5.26]: It is highly curious that on most occasions in this House our trouble is to find money for projects. There are always ample projects and plenty of things to be done if only the money could be found. On this occasion, I understand, the money is banked for the job, if we could only agree upon a site for the proposed building. Unfortunately, in this Parliamentary life we seldom get our way, especially if we sit on the Opposition side. Last session I was most anxious to ensure, if possible, that buildings for the Government departments should be provided on the grounds adjoining these Houses of Parliament. But whatever I put up last session failed to impress either the Government or the experts who were consulted. Having heard the member for West Perth (Mr.

McDonald) and others, I do feel that this site is not the worst site that has been suggested. The member for West Perth said it might be the very best site. I do not know that but I am strongly in favour of centralising the public buildings. If my vote in support of the measure is taken as favouring the construction of a building capable of housing the whole of the departments, that is all it does mean. I am not wedded to this site. I think there might be a better site than that proposed, but I can imagine thirty years of discussion on the question of site as in the case of the Perth Town Hall.

The Minister states that his proposal does not concern the existing Government Gardens or Government House grounds where improved in any shape or form. As to the question of the purchase of the Christian Brothers' College, the possibility of having to purchase a building from a school does not concern me one iota, if the site itself is right. Nothing would be worse than if we were to be influenced by such a side-issue and accepted that side-issue as ruling our decision on a particular measure. However, there are a few things I should like to suggest in regard to the proposal. Firstly, could not the Minister in his desire to get the Bill through give some sort of promise with regard to Parliament House? Could not we be told that included in the proposal there is the germ of the idea of completing this building—not tomorrow, but could not it be included as part of the general plan ahead of us. Is it reasonable to say that this site should be left as it is now, with the ugly view facing the Terrace, and with the grounds waiting for something to happen, as it were, with jagged bits of bricks here and there and strips of galvanised iron hanging in the air for years and years? Or could we imagine that if the big site now idle in the Terrace were allocated to buildings, Parliament House too might be completed soon, wars and Hitler permitting, and the great Barracks themselves be removed as part of the general building scheme? When another measure was before this House on a previous occasion, I moved to insert a clause permitting the Barracks building and other similar buildings to be removed, if necessary brick by brick, and reconstructed in some park or garden. The law is that we can do that to-day. If it is decided to make an announcement on this Bill that the Government's intention is to

complete Parliament House and remove the Barracks, so that the beautiful Terrace vista may be obtained, that might possibly be some sugar to coat the pill that this Bill represents to some members.

As regards the proposed building, I shall not discuss its features, because that is work for an expert. I am still not convinced that the proposed site is the best of all possible sites for the erection of public buildings, even provided that Government House gardens, the lodge, and the old building itself are not interfered with in any way. Money is available and plans have been prepared; the only question now is whether we should postpone action until the war ends, or whether we should proceed with the work at once. All the other sites that have been mentioned by members have been objected to in some way or other. Therefore this is not the most important question for us. There are other questions that we could discuss for hours and days; but I am one who holds that while there is the opportunity and the money to proceed with a good work, it should be put in hand. So much obstruction in this case, when money is available, is extraordinary, because in other cases money is not available. I support the Bill.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascoyne—in reply) [5.33]: I thank the last two speakers for their very tolerant attitude and their desire to secure information, rather than to discuss the matter with preconceived ideas and with their minds made up deliberately to oppose the Bill. Before introducing the measure, I was careful to prepare personally the case in support of it. I gave consideration not only to immediately available reports, but to reports made to various Governments on the subject. Many aspects have to be considered in dealing with an important matter such as this before arriving at a decision. The Leader of the Opposition, at the outset of his speech last evening, suggested that the House had been denied certain information, and he advised the Minister to furnish complete information. I must confess that I gave all the information that was accessible to me. I can readily understand the objections which the Leader of the Opposition would have raised—and probably he would have been testy in raising them—if I had

not taken the House absolutely into my confidence, given members the whole story and indicated the whole desire of the Government in this matter. I emphasised the point that the Government had a greater responsibility to the people of the State than merely to erect buildings of brick and mortar. One of the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition last evening was that we were to have a barn-like building erected on a stately site. I desire to make it perfectly clear that the Government accepts full responsibility to the citizens of this State, present and future, with regard to the proposed building. The structure will be one of which the city shall be proud. With regard to the site, prior consideration should be given to a river frontage. That is most important. The Leader of the Opposition will admit that as regards the sites of Government buildings in cities overseas which he reviewed, the various Governments made full utilisation of water frontages. Another important matter to consider is the proximity of the proposed site to professional offices. Buildings are urgently required to house the Land Titles Office and the Department of Agriculture. The Land Titles Office should be easy of access to the professional heart and the mercantile heart of the city. Government buildings should also be adjacent to the shopping centre, but not too close. Of all the sites mentioned last evening, not one was suggested that could effectively house the Agricultural Department. Attached to that department are laboratories. Livestock must be kept on the premises; at the present moment, in spite of the unsatisfactory nature of the present site, we have two or three sheep and other animals there. Every consideration should be given to the requirements of the future for the development of agricultural science.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the University building?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** The University deals with the fundamentals of agriculture. It considers no developed project, nor does it make research into established diseases. It merely considers the fundamentals of agriculture, and it is right that that should be so. The desire of the Senate of the University is that the University shall in no way conflict with the Department of Agriculture. A very clear

line of demarcation exists between the beginning of the education of an agricultural student and the finished work and research in connection with animal and plant diseases carried on by the pathologists and other officers of the department. Therefore it is essential to have a building consisting of something more than mere bricks and mortar.

The Government carefully considered the recommendations of the various building committees. It has acted on the best advice, despite the allegations of the Leader of the Opposition to the contrary and despite his assertion that he would brush aside that advice and pay no heed to it, and that his opinion was paramount. He airily suggested that he would accept all blame attaching to his turning down these proposals. I suggest to him, however, that he would not welcome the advice of the Principal Architect, the Town Planning Commissioner, or the Lands Resumption Officer of the Public Works Department in connection with the control of his farming operations. I respectfully suggest to him that these accredited persons, free and unfettered, have reported on a particular site, and that they have acted reasonably and in all good faith. The report is such that the Leader of the Opposition has not been able effectively to criticise it. So it is not with any degree of irresponsibility that the Government approaches this matter. We have no desire to erect an eight-storey structure overlooking the towering site where the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) lives. We have no desire, such as that entertained by the Leader of the Opposition, to encroach upon King's Park. We have no desire that the people—and there is a considerable number of them—who must conduct business with the Land Titles Office should have to journey up Malcolm-street or Mount-street. Our one desire is that the building shall be such as to be in every way fitted for the beautiful City of Perth. The complaint made by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to boring is ill-founded. He said the suggested site had not been tested. That is an untruth.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The ground has been bored in order to test it for the foundations. Every inch has been

tested. The Leader of the Opposition said that the land was a partial swamp, that there were lakes on it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say lakes; I said ponds.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There are water-lily ponds in the gardens of Government House. It is well to examine this proposal before aimlessly criticising it and before suggesting that we should take a portion of King's Park.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are making a very bad case worse.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition referred to King's Park as the best possible site. He said it was a magnificent site.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say it was the best possible site.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I will tell the hon. member exactly what he did say.

Mr. Raphael: Let bygones be bygones.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: He said: "There is a nice site in King's Park. I would not refuse the Minister a portion of King's Park. It is a magnificent site."

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said it was a magnificent site—so it is.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I desire to refer to two points made by the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle). He read the first paragraph of the report of the Buildings Committee and alleged that the Government had instructed that committee to bring in a certain report. That is a grossly unfair statement to make, because it does not correctly interpret the actual words of the report. As I said, before this Bill was introduced the Government carefully considered all the reports of committees that had been appointed in past years to report upon this matter. A committee consisting of Mr. Berkley, Mr. Munt and Mr. Clare, investigated every possible site within reasonable access of the city proper. That committee recommended that the site for Government buildings be either the Esplanade or the Government Domain. The Government gave consideration to that report and for obvious reasons eliminated the Esplanade. It asked the Buildings Committee of last year to report specifically upon the area in the Government Domain. The Committee furnished the Government with a report which vindicates the reports of previous committees and which is certainly

a complete answer to any criticism upon the suitability of the ground. The Leader of the Opposition dares to suggest that the report is not worth much and that he would not take any notice of it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say that. Get back to facts.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The report is a most important one on an extremely important project. The second point raised by the member for Avon was that we should demolish the Treasury building and erect a structure upon that site. And then in almost the very next breath he said it would be a crime, even in the years to come, to demolish a building such as that of the Christian Brothers' College if it were needed to carry out the Government's scheme in its entirety. So that members opposite in airing their views were very inconsistent. The Leader of the Opposition made a typical opposition speech. He first of all objected to the Bill because he said it contained exactly the same wording as that of last year. The Leader of the Opposition is entirely incorrect. He did add that there was a small difference in the schedule; but the schedule is the Bill because it contains a description of the land the Government desires to excise from the Government Domain. There is nothing else in the Bill except the Title, and of course the schedule to which I have referred. So in describing this particular piece of land, the Leader of the Opposition suggests that it differs slightly from last year's Bill. Of course it does because it is a different part of the land that is referred to in this year's measure. The Leader of the Opposition said, "Let us remember that this piece of land was set aside for Imperial use." I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to prove that contention. There has never been any suggestion, nor are there any official documents, to show that this particular land was set aside either for the past or the future with regard to any purpose other than that of housing the Governor of the State. If the hon. member has a search made of every document that has any relation to this area, he will not be able to find any reference, or any obligation, implied or otherwise, with respect to this piece of land. He also said we had not taken legal advice on the matter. We took all the legal advice that was necessary long before the document

was sent to England in connection with the excision of the particular piece of land that will be required, and long before that we submitted the matter to His Excellency. The hon. member also said that very few people used the Government buildings. That will not bear examination. He suggested also that we should have the structure in an isolated area; he was sick of the centralisation of Government offices. If there is anything essential in the housing of public servants so that the best efficiency may be obtained, it is in respect of the aesthetics of the proposal and the importance of having the officers housed somewhere near each other, not only for the convenience of the public but for the convenience of the officers themselves who have to confer with each other.

I went to the trouble this morning to find out how many transactions take place daily and annually at the Titles Office. We cannot exclude the Titles Office because it is the most important in connection with the housing scheme. I found that there were no fewer than 60,000 ordinary and direct transactions with the public annually, and that the average number of people who called at the office daily exceeded 200. The hon. member knows the position of the Titles Office and I am sure he would not even suggest that it is a suitable place for 200 people to pass in and out of daily, nor even where 100,000 transactions take place, involving the return and the re-handling of documents as happens from one year's end to the other. The Leader of the Opposition definitely pitted his knowledge against the opinion of experts. I am reminded of what Sir Henry Parkes once said on that point. The Leader of the Opposition desires that we should take no notice of the advice of experts, but suggests that we should be guided by his advice. We have been guided by the advice of our experts, and as Sir Henry Parkes pointed out, it is not only unnecessary but perhaps unwise that administrators should be engineers, architects and the like. It is necessary, however, that an Administration should take the advice of experts, and if the Administration does not act on that advice, it is not the fault of the advisers, it is the fault of the Administration. The Government is prepared to act on the advice of responsible people, those who are qualified to speak and qualified to give an opinion on a matter such as this.

The Leader of the Opposition's heart bled because of the trees that ultimately would have to be destroyed at the bottom of the Domain. His heart, however, did not bleed very much for the magnificent trees immediately opposite Bellevue-terrace that would be destroyed if his suggestion were carried out. Probably he has never seen those trees. So it is hard for us to imagine just to what lengths the hon. member would go to oppose the Bill. I desire now to show in what way the first approach was made to the Governor with regard to this matter. I will read a letter that will explain just how it occurred. This letter was addressed to His Excellency, the Administrator—

I am forwarding herewith, for the information of Your Excellency, a plan of Government House grounds.

At the eastern end of this area, adjacent to the Christian Brothers' College, is a block of land which has not been seriously used by the Governor for a considerable period—possibly due to its being occasionally waterlogged at certain times of the year. This was originally intended as a horse paddock and has had some use as a vegetable garden, but, with the advent of the motor and the elimination of the horse, it had been permitted to become a patch of wilderness and a breeding ground for mosquitoes.

It is now desired to excise from Government House grounds the area indicated on the attached plan, amounting to 4 acres 0 roods 30 perches, leaving for Government House domain the whole of the present garden, representing 10 acres 0 roods 20 perches. The area deleted will include the old building, formerly used as a stable and portion for quarters for married servants. If the building is required for a similar purpose in future, it may be used until more suitable premises can be provided. The land deleted will be held by the Crown with a view to its use for other purposes, most probably the building of Government offices—possibly a Titles Office.

I should be grateful if Your Excellency would kindly forward a recommendation for the excision of this area from Government House domain to the Secretary of State for the Dominions for his concurrence.

The letter was sent by the Premier of the day to His Excellency the Administrator, and the date is the 21st June, 1932, when the present Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Lands. The communication was sent by the Premier of the day to the Administrator, and I repeat at that time the Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Lands. Because he was in the Government it suited the Leader of the Opposition

then to try to get a piece of land excised from the Government Domain, but now that he is in opposition it does not suit him at all. Although the Leader of the Opposition was associated with the original request to excise that area from the Domain, we heard last night the wonderful case he put up to show why, in his opinion, it was wholly unsuitable. As a matter of fact, he declared that there could not possibly be a place less suitable for Government buildings.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Does the letter say anything about Government buildings?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes, the words are "with a view to its use for other purposes, most probably the building of Government offices—possibly a Titles Office." I wonder how the Leader of the Opposition, as Minister for Lands at the time, came to agree to that. It is really difficult to understand the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition of yesterday and his attitude of yester year. So it would appear to be very obvious that the Leader of the Opposition opposed the Bill simply because he is Leader of the Opposition. Those crocodile tears of his!

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are not making your case any better by being offensive.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The hon. member suggested that I was a most irresponsible person, and that the only virtue he could see in my predecessor was that he was half-hearted about the matter. That, of course, would appeal to the Leader of the Opposition, but I say, in spite of all the insinuations and suggestions of the hon. member, my heart is in this State equally with that of my predecessor. We have heard a great deal year in and year out regarding the lack of accommodation for the Agricultural Department and members opposite had a good deal to say about it on the Estimates that were discussed a few nights ago. What the Government is doing now is really the first move towards solving the difficulty. Members opposite have offered no solution, though they are only too willing to say that the department is housed in a rabbit warren. They are not a bit helpful when the Government submits a proposal backed by experts, authorities supported by the Leader of the Opposition himself in other days. Let me ask, also, what is the attitude of members opposite with regard to reserves when those reserves are in country districts, and those districts in which they them-

selves are interested. Is there a reserve shown on the plan that they do not seek to acquire? It may be a water reserve or a reserve for travelling stock, or for Government purposes. Members opposite will then be found associated with the request that the reserve may be relinquished and handed over to somebody. Give it to a person rather than that the Crown should control it! That is their attitude when a reserve is in the country, and when there is something that is regarded as urgent associated with the transfer of that reserve. The matter that we are now submitting to Parliament is also urgent and the erection of Government offices on the suggested site would be a pleasing setting in those surroundings.

Mr. Cross: Ask the member for Swan what he did when he was a Minister of the Crown.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government is taking full responsibility in this bricks and mortar proposal, a proposal that is not only in conformity with our requirements and the essentials of the future of this State, but will be something that will conform to the beauty of the city and will provide for the present and the future. The Government's desire is that the structure should be a contribution to the beauty of the city, and therefore it whole-heartedly supports the suggestions, reports and recommendations made by the expert officers.

During the course of the debate an attitude has developed that is not uncommon in these days. It is to deride Parliament and Parliament House. The site on which this building stands is part of an area known as the parliamentary buildings reserve, and this reserve appeared to receive most favour from members who spoke against the Bill. The suggestion was made that the old Barracks be pulled down and that that site would be ideal for our purpose, one of the reasons being that a block of buildings there would be seen from St. George's-terrace. If there is anything in the suggestion that Parliament House is the most important building in the State, that it is a place to which we bring all our visitors, then I consider we should preserve the area on which it stands for the completion of the building as it was originally designed. If we constructed buildings either as wings following the contour of the present vacant land, or

constructed buildings wholly to face St. George's-terrace, we would be commencing to put Parliament House in the backyard of that block. If we look up St. George's-terrace to-day and see Parliament House, the only part of it visible over the three-storeyed structure of the Barracks, is the flag, should that be flying. What position would Parliament House be in if an eight-storeyed structure were built in place of the Barracks? It would absolutely dwarf this building and make it insignificant.

I had a conversation to-day with leading authorities on this matter. Whilst it is conceded that it would be possible to construct suitable buildings on that area, but not sufficient for all the departments required, and while it would be possible to build suitable offices there, does Parliament desire that that should be done? Does it desire we should ignore the importance of Parliament House and dwarf it by other buildings, either having it completely blotted out by a structure at least eight storeys in height, or flanked by other tall buildings? Surely that is not the desire of this House, and surely it is something every member should resist. The member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) questioned the possibility of the Treasurer being able to find the money for this project. That position, as was hinted at by the member for Claremont (Mr. North), is absolutely assured. There will be no interference with the loan programme in any way in regard to a stimulus being given to the building trade. It is absolutely necessary that a stimulus should be given to that trade, not only for the artisans but the labourers engaged in that section of industry, who would also be affected by such an activity and would also benefit from the expenditure of the money. The money in question is immediately available from the State Insurance reserve fund. Ample money is available to construct the first section of the building, and to commence it immediately. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) sought information in that connection. If it were possible to commence the building immediately, that building would be a complete unit, designed to house the first two departments that are essentially in need of housing, namely, the Titles Office and the Department of Agriculture. The building should be erected as soon as possible, firstly because of the necessity for obviating the payment of rentals, and secondly with the ultimate object of the project, illustrated on the plan,

being commenced and progressively dealt with until the whole design has been completed. The Government desires to follow up the suggestion of the member for Murchison, namely, that of centralising Government offices, because we consider it a very important one. We do not wish to perpetuate the existing system of having one department here and another a mile away. The housing of Government departments can be visualised by reference to the centralised plan that is designed to accommodate them all, with the exception of those whose functions and necessities confine them to their immediate surroundings, such as the Railway Department and one or two others.

The Premier: The Supreme Court, for instance.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is important that the Supreme Court should remain in close proximity to other Government departments with which it is actively engaged in some manner or other. The Government has had the advice and opinion of all who are in authority and are qualified to speak. When those authorities gave their opinion we asked for a special report on the site selected by them. We gave them the opportunity to go through the report in whatever manner they desired, and they supported this project. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) asked what was to be done with the present building. I have had a special report made in connection with that, taking into consideration its foundations, to what height it would have to go, and what accommodation would be available if the whole of the area were used. The answer is definite. If the building were constructed to the maximum height permitted, 120 feet, it would then be insufficient, and in some degree unsuitable for the requirements of departments, and insufficient to accommodate those departments it is intended to accommodate.

Mr. Lambert: It is not necessary to centralise every department.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: What happens when a railway is suggested? Do we not get a report from the authorities on the subject? Are not all the various routes that are suggested examined: and if we were to permit the conflict of opinion that is engendered to persist, would we ever have a railway constructed? The Government has by means of responsible committees ex-

hausted all the possibilities of public and Crown lands. It has received a very solid recommendation, one which the Leader of the Opposition, when a member of the previous Government, supported.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not be silly.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We do not desire to wander away from that recommendation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Be sensible.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I read a letter that was written when the Leader of the Opposition was Minister for Lands, and he cannot deny the statements contained therein. He supported the proposal then.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I say I did not. The Premier does not tell his Ministers everything he does.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: That is an astounding statement.

The Minister for the North-West: And that is the guy who termed me a "departmental puppet!"

Mr. Thorn: There is nothing astounding about it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have no wish to delay the House. I have endeavoured faithfully to present the case, to show what was in the mind of the Government concerning its responsibility to the citizens of the State, and as to perpetuating the beauty of the city, and the responsibility of the Government in that connection. No alternative has been suggested that has not previously been examined and discarded. I submit that we must, in consequence, take notice of those authorities who have advised the Government.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	26
Noes	..	..	..	..	17

Majority for	..	..	9
--------------	----	----	---

#### AYES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. North
Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Panton
Mr. Cross	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Fox	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Hill	Mr. Triat
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Withers
Mr. Needham	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

NOES	
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Patrick
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Hughes	Mr. Seward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Warner
Mr. Latham	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Willmott
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Doney
Mr. McLarty	
PAIR.	
AYE.	No.
Mr. Holman	Mr. Stubbs

(Teller.)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Marshall in the Chair; the Minister for Lands in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Reserve A1149:

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I propose to reply to the statement that has been made by the Minister for Lands. That portion of the reserve relating to A1149 is exactly similar to that which was contained in the Bill of last year, known as Clause 10 of that Bill. Perhaps the Minister for Lands will now agree that there is a certain similarity between this Bill and that one.

Clause put and passed.

*Schedule:*

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It is around the schedule that all the discussions have occurred. I agree that there are variations in it, but the schedule is of such a technical nature that I doubt if any member understands it. The Minister for Lands boasted that he had given all the information necessary. He probably gave all the information he thought advisable, but not all the information necessary. To find out what the schedule means, one would require a protractor and all the equipment of a draftsman. Why was not the exact acreage worked out by a surveyor? We should know what is comprised in the total area. Last year we considered a somewhat similar schedule.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I was dealing with the schedule and pointing out how difficult it is to determine what area is to be excised. I agree with the Minister that the schedule is probably the most important part of the Bill, for it defines the site on which it is proposed to erect public build-

ings. In order to justify his remarks regarding the comments by the member for Avon, the Minister dealt with the report of the departmental committee that has been submitted to every member. No other interpretation can be placed upon the report than that stressed by the member for Avon. In the first paragraph of the report, the committee states—

In accordance with your instructions, this committee has given consideration to a site for public buildings at the eastern end of Government House Domain on the basis that the western boundary of any excision from Government House Domain for this purpose would coincide with the rear fence of the lodge enclosure.

There is no other alternative. That is the only site that the committee inspected, and the report shows what it had to say about that site. The report proceeds—

The need for the maximum use of the area available has made it impossible to provide a proper setting for such an important building.

That is the view of the departmental officers, so that the member for Avon was not wrong when he drew the attention of the Committee to the fact. Then again, the report states—

Such a development is not possible on the small area which it is proposed to excise from Government House Domain, but if the block at present occupied by the Christian Brothers' College could be added, sufficient land would then be available to allow of the satisfactory planning of the Government Centre.

Members will see therefore, that the piece of land is useless for the purpose proposed by the Government, and the departmental committee told the Minister so in no uncertain language. I complained about two points, and the Minister took exception to my attitude. One was that he did not give members particulars of the area to be excised, and it is customary for that information to be embodied in unmistakable language in schedules attached to such Bills. The departmental officers have not attended to that phase, and I did not expect the Minister to do it, because he has not had the time. Secondly, he did not tell members whether an offer had been made to the Christian Brothers for the block of land on the eastern side of the site, or whether the Government really proposed to buy that block and at what price. Those are important factors, and it was useless for the Minister to waive my objections airily aside and talk about

my shedding crocodile tears. I did not shed tears, crocodile or otherwise; so the Minister did not assist his case by indulging in such language. The Minister did not refer to another ideal site available for his purpose. I have in mind Observatory Hill.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that we are dealing with the schedule, which refers to one block of land only.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But if the schedule is altered, as it may be, we can probably refer to other blocks of land.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has already agreed to Clause 2, which refers to the site, and therefore it will not be possible to alter the schedule. The only matters to be discussed are the area, the bearings, and—

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The site itself.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. The hon. member is limited to that.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then I shall take advantage of my opportunity at the third reading stage to say to the Minister what I desire. For his information, I shall read what his predecessor in his Ministerial position said regarding this particular block, when last session's Bill was under discussion. The then Minister, the Hon. M. F. Troy, said the block was swampy, and further stated—

Regarding the Government House Domain, we propose to take nearly two acres out of the 14 odd acres there. The member for Irwin-Moore said that the land on which we intend to build is low-lying. It is nothing of the kind. That portion which is close to St. George's-terrace, which we propose to utilise, is high land. The low-lying land is on the southern side. Even though the lands on which it is proposed to erect the new buildings is high land, the probability is that deep foundations will have to be provided. We know that there is water everywhere about those parts.

That was the information the then Minister for Lands had to present to members when dealing with the Reserves Bill last year. After all, I suppose the departmental officers could have inspected the block still further in the meantime, and probably did so, but the Minister did not inform us on that point. We must form our opinions on the information supplied to us, and if the Minister was cross with me because I disagreed with his views, he is to blame for that.

The Minister for Lands: You will find I gave you that information.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Minister must remember that particulars of his remarks were not available until we received our copies of "Hansard" yesterday, and there has been little opportunity in the meantime to study the exact terms of the Minister's utterance. I listened carefully to him, and I did not hear him deal with that phase, although he said bores were put down every few inches. I have some doubt about that.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say that. I said that the foundations had been tested and there was no doubt piling would not be necessary.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not know about that. We have had experience of the work of experts in years gone by, and it has not always been satisfactory. However, I realise that I would be out of order if I sought to reply to the Minister at this stage, so I shall defer my further remarks until the Bill is again before us for the adoption of the third reading.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

## BILL—INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

### *Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [7.40]: The Bill is identical with that introduced last year, after another measure had been withdrawn. As the Premier pointed out, the object is to collect the combined tax at the source. All members sitting on the Opposition side of the House have raised no objection to that course. I want to make that point perfectly clear. We do not raise any objection at all to the collection of the taxes at the source, both income and financial emergency, in the combined form. We cannot expect that the whole of the taxation will be collected in that manner, because some of the income is of a nature that will make it impossible for the tax to be collected at the source.

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: We can admit, too, that the Government's proposal will affect only a certain number of taxpayers. The

problem that confronts me in discussing the Bill is that I have yet to find out how it is possible for the Premier to raise the large sum that has been obtained from the financial emergency tax, which the Government cannot do without. Prior to leaving for the Eastern States, the Premier was good enough to arrange for members to be supplied with tables, and so we have had an opportunity to peruse the particulars. From my calculations, allowing that a tax of 9d. in the pound will be levied, I can only assume that the Premier will raise barely one-third of what he estimates to obtain.

The Premier: There will be the single men.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot follow that exactly, because we have not found out to what extent the present tax affects people in receipt of salaries from £100 to £200. The basis for the start of the new imposition is a taxable income of £200. As the Premier pointed out, there are many single persons who pay on incomes ranging from £101 to £200. We cannot estimate the number because neither in the report of the Commissioner of Taxation nor in the tables with which we have been supplied, is there any information on that point. To a certain extent, what I submit is in the nature of guesswork. The figures I have taken out indicate that the Premier will receive a return of £337,000. For my part, I think it would have been wiser if the Premier had left the taxing measure as it was. Obviously all taxes affect some individuals unfairly, irrespective of what the tax may be. Both the Customs duty and the sales tax operate unfairly. The man with a big family pays more, and those taxes are more unfair than the one under discussion. The more mouths a man has to feed, the more taxation he has to pay. In those circumstances, it is difficult to determine what is quite fair.

The Premier: Those phases are included in the calculation of the basic wage.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The basic wage itself is unfair, inasmuch as we provide only for a man, his wife and two children. Today we are advocating large families with the object of stopping the national drift. On the other hand, we make no provision for the man who has a wife and six children. In this particular instance, the Premier proposes to omit a large num-

ber of taxpayers who formerly paid small amounts to the Treasury. A man with a wife and two children who has a taxable income of £300 pays only £6 5s. under the existing Act, but he is to be relieved of responsibility for making that payment, and partial relief continues until we get to a salary of £500. People will pay nothing until their taxable income passes the £300 mark. There are many men earning £300 who could contribute something to the revenue of this State. They would not be asked to pay much and it would be collected at the source, being spread over the year. It amounts to £6 5s. per annum. That is not a large sum for the individual taxpayer to find, but the aggregate amount collected by the Treasurer would be large because of the number of people who would pay. I remember that when a previous government was attempting to increase the revenue of the State by means of this form of taxation many systems of raising money were tried. We found that the number of people earning small incomes greatly exceeded the number earning large incomes and in order to obtain the amount of money required at that time we had to tax the man on the lower rung.

The Premier: This proposal goes far beyond yours.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: It goes a very long way beyond our proposal.

The Premier: Single people will pay twice as much.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes, we imposed a tax of only 4½d. Now it is 1/.

The Premier: Ninepence.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am speaking of the present time. It has risen to 1s.—from 4d. to 1s. Under the new proposal we shall hit the man with the good income fairly substantially and in doing so we shall cause unemployment. I am not concerned about the men on the £5,000 level. We have a very small number of taxpayers earning £5,000 per annum. Nevertheless from such a taxpayer we shall take £1,125 in direct taxation. He has also Federal taxes to pay and ordinary rates and charges to meet, and in addition has his own family commitments, which are considerably greater than those of the average taxpayer. This measure will afford little encouragement for men with big incomes to

come to Western Australia and remain here; yet they are the people we need.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We want workers, not drones.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: They must be workers to secure that amount.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Premier works harder than I but he is paid for it and why should he not be?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: He is an exception.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. JOHNSON) is probably entitled to what he gets and no more. I have looked carefully through the figures and I am concerned as to the possibility of raising this money. True, in the following measure a tax of 6d. in the £ up to £400 is provided. I am sure the Speaker will pardon my mentioning the next Bill but the two measures must be considered together. Under the other measure a tax of 6d. in the £ up to £400 is provided for and thereafter a tax of 9d. in the £.

The Premier: Up to £8 a week.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Yes and then 9d. onwards. I am afraid that will not be the rate struck. I think it will be considerably more. I cannot perceive how an increase can be avoided.

The Premier: That is only for collection at the source.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Every year a new measure will be introduced. I should like the Premier in his reply to tell us what tax will be necessary to return the £1,250,000 he would have obtained if he had allowed the financial emergency tax to be imposed as it was imposed last year.

The Premier: You will see it set out on the front of that table you have before you.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No.

The Premier: Yes that is the proposal. Read it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I cannot see how the Premier will secure the money.

The Premier: I asked the taxation experts and they said "Yes, this will do it."

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Premier has referred me to the foremost part of the table containing a comparison between the taxation payable under the existing rates and under the proposed amalgamation of

the income and of the financial emergency taxes. Therein it is stated—

The accompanying tables show the amalgamated tax payable on various incomes if the rate commenced at 9d. in the £ and increased by .01d. for every £ of taxable income up to a maximum of 4s. 6d. in the £ and if:—

- (a) The statutory exemption for persons with dependants reduced at the rate of £3 for every £2 instead of £2 for every £1, as at present; and if
- (b) Deductions for children reduced by £1 for every £1 by which the net income exceeds £500.

From £500 upwards the exemption is greatly reduced. It is clearly shown in the tables.

The Premier: When a man gets £700 or £800 he is treated as a single man.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I suppose this is the Treasurer's pigeon and not ours, but I assure him he will be very unpopular if he asks for additional money during the recess. On page 8 of the Commissioner of Taxation's report for last year, appears an analysis of income tax assessments for the years 1933-34 to 1938-39. I am not concerned about 1938-39 because that year is not completed. Here, however, are the figures for 1937-38.

Grade of Net Income grouped according to Net Income.	No. of Taxpayers.
£101 to £200 .. ..	20,519
£201 to £300 .. ..	18,239
£301 to £500 .. ..	13,379
£501 to £700 .. ..	3,805
£701 to £1,000 .. ..	1,839
£1,001 to £1,500 .. ..	1,037
£1,501 to £5,000 .. ..	844
£5,001 and over .. ..	58

When we eliminate the very large number of smaller taxable incomes—

The Premier: There will be the same number under this proposal.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think there will be.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: By taxing at the source we will get more.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If the House is agreeable to take the Premier's word, it is all right; but I cannot agree with the facts submitted to the House. Exemptions are provided for men with children, but we do not know how many there are.

The Premier: They are all in this.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No.

The Premier: Yes. This deals with assessable income. They will be assessed in the same way as under the old Act.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: A married man with no children will pay £5 6s. 10d. in income and financial emergency tax. That is what he paid before. The man with one child paid £4 3s. 4d., but now he will pay nothing. A man with two children paid no income tax up to £300 but £4 3s. 4d. financial emergency tax on £250 and £6 5s. on £300.

The Premier: That is the combined tax.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No. That is the financial emergency tax.

The Premier: Oh, yes.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The persons with those incomes will be exempted completely and that is what I want the House to understand. The man with three children pays no income tax if he earns up to £350 and if he earns £400 he pays 5s. 7d. In financial emergency tax he pays £4 3s. 4d. on £250, £6 5s. on £300, £8 15s. on £350, and £10 on £400. But all those people are to be relieved.

The Premier: They will be relieved of a little of financial emergency tax.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Of all the financial emergency tax. The trouble is to find out how many taxpayers there are with one, two and three children respectively. We have not the figures. There has been a good deal of guess work as to the result of this taxation.

The Premier: Not by me; by the Taxation Department.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I know the Premier could not work it out, any more than I, unless he had the papers before him.

The Premier: That is not my job.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I agree. It is one of those jobs involving much guess work. I would like to see a select committee appointed so that we might ascertain where the information is obtained and how we are likely to be affected by these proposals. I know it will be a sorry day for the Treasurer and a sad day for the State if we find that our deficit is built up simply because we have not the revenue that was anticipated as a result of the amending Bill. We on this side of the House do not propose to object to the amalgamation of the taxes. We did so last year on principle. That principle, as I explained clearly

to the House, was that it was wrong for an out-going Government to lay down a method of taxation for an incoming Government. The Premier went to the people and asked for a mandate in respect to this taxation. I do not admit that he asked for a mandate to impose this tax in this way. He said he intended to abolish the financial emergency tax. He should have said, "We are not going to impose what is now called a financial emergency tax, but we are going to impose a tax that will return an equivalent amount of money. Instead of calling it a financial emergency tax, however, we shall call it an income tax." If he had told the electors that, he would not have been as popular as he was with the abolitionist party.

The Premier: I think I told them that in other words.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: While I knew what would take place I could not find it set out in the Premier's speech. However, we are not worried whether a mandate was or was not given. The Government's responsibility is to finance its operations for the next three years. Taxation can be too high, particularly in these days when we are looking for people to provide permanent employment for our workers. The Government is obviously getting short of money. A little while ago a Bill was introduced taking into Consolidated Revenue money that hitherto has been available to provide employment for workers. The Premier has told us definitely that he proposes to pay from that money interest and sinking fund on sums borrowed in years gone by. If we impose high taxes we will drive away from this State men with money, and they are the people we should encourage to come here. That is my main worry, and I hope it is also the worry of the Government. The fact that ours may be the highest taxed citizens in Australia will not be a credit to the State, and I am afraid that that will be our record if we pass this type of legislation. I have to look at the matter from the point of view of the primary producers. The worker has the advantage of the Arbitration Court which grants to him a rise or a decrease in wages according to the increase or decline in the cost of living. Manufacturers and other sections of the community can arrange their prices accordingly, but the primary producers cannot pass on the extra

costs and so are loaded with them. We must not forget the condition of our primary industries, with the exception of the mining industry, if we can call that a primary industry. Outside of that one, they are in a deplorable condition. The primary producers have no income and everything they buy is loaded.

Mr. J. Hegney: Then how can they pay taxation?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Because they pay the hon. member's taxation.

Mr. J. Hegney: The workers in the city produce as well as do the primary producers.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: And immediately there is an increase in prices, those workers go to the Arbitration Court and secure more pay. Some day an adjustment will have to be made in this respect because we cannot continue in that way. I do not know what stage we would have reached had not the depression occurred. That has had the effect of the clock being set back by legislative enactments. But we are building up the pyramid again, and unless we adopt some such system as is adopted in the dictator countries, I do not know where we shall end. In the dictator countries a price is fixed, and a man has to do a certain amount of work for that price. He knows that if he does not do the work, he will not get the price.

The Premier: And he does not get too many commodities for it.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: No, and he gets poor quality, too. We do not want to reach that stage. Therefore we should be careful what we do in the direction of increasing taxation. Taxes can be passed on by so many sections of the community until they finally reach those people who cannot pass them on but have to sell their goods at the world's dumping prices overseas. We ought to keep that fact well in mind. That is the mistake our Arbitration Court makes. It says that a man is entitled to a fair standard of living, but forgets that industry has to pay eventually, and does not consider whether industry is able to pay. That is the reason why the farmers are in such a deplorable state today. They have no income taxation to pay because they have no taxable income, but in the process they are paying the taxes of other people through the manner in which they are being loaded up with enhanced costs.

Take one of the big firms in the city whose name I shall not mention. We impose taxes and the cost of commodities rises. The workers go to the Arbitration Court and obtain an increase of wages, and up go the prices of commodities again. A man manufacturing an article in competition with the world—he can get an Australian price, just as we are getting an Australian price for wheat, eggs and butter—is also in difficulties. The people we represent have such a large export surplus which they have to ship overseas and for which they have to accept any old price they can get.

The Minister for Lands: The dairy industry is doing fairly well.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I agree that for butter there has been a fairly reasonable price overseas, but if we produced a very large surplus and exported much larger quantities overseas, I do not know how far distant the day might be when the dairying industry will not be in such a good position. When we spread the price received for produce consumed in the State over the total production, the producer does not get a payable price. That is the position the wheatgrowers find themselves in. A price of 4s. 8d. a bushel is a fair one to charge our own people for wheat. We use about 2½ million or 3 million bushel of wheat and export about 31 million or 32 million bushels. Last year I think the quantity actually exported was 28 million bushels. Spreading the advantage derived from the wheat consumed locally over the total production gives a very poor return indeed. This is the point that worries me. We know we are dependent entirely upon our industries, particularly our primary industries, and we have to be very careful how we adjust our taxation. I think that the best and easiest way to pay taxes is to have them deducted at the source.

The Premier: Undoubtedly that is so.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: But the Premier, in my opinion, is ill-advised to change the system at this stage. I assure the Premier that the man who is paying his tax at the source does not complain so much as does the man who has to borrow when his tax for the year falls due.

Hon. W. D. Johnson interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not propose to deal with side issues, but we provide a great deal of revenue for the Premier, which should be put to the best possible use. Con-

sider the large sum of money spent on amusements in this State, according to the returns supplied by the Commissioner of Taxation.

The Premier: Who spends the money?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Principally the young people, I should say.

The Premier: The people who will be hit by this taxation.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: That is, if the Premier can so arrange it.

The Premier: Their tax will go up from 6d. to 9d.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am not sure about that.

The Premier: Yes, 4d. financial emergency and 2d. income tax.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Premier is providing for an amount of 6d. in the pound on salaries up to £8 a week.

The Premier: that is only for the purpose of collecting a sum to be set against the amount due. There will be some deductions for medical expenses and other things.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I am afraid I have not all the information I should like, but I have tried to discuss the proposal as reasonably as possible.

The Premier: That is the proposal.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then, so long as we stick to it—

The Premier: There will be an opportunity next year to pass or not to pass the tax.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If we pass this measure, we shall be giving the Government an instruction to go ahead, and next year the Premier will probably say, "I have the necessary machinery to impose the tax and am going to increase the rate, because I cannot get sufficient revenue from other sources."

The Premier: Oh no!

The Minister for Mines interjected.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I could wish that I was as unsophisticated as is the Minister for Mines. That is what I am afraid of. The Premier will find that there are difficulties ahead. He is lucky in having been able to get the amount of loan funds that was promised, some of which will be available to him shortly. I fully expect money will soon become very scarce. We must not forget that apart from the additional taxation to be imposed by this measure, the Commonwealth Government intends to impose increased taxation and our people will

have to pay the increased Federal tax, just as people of the Eastern States will have to pay it.

The Premier: We are not increasing taxation, but are spreading it in a different way.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Let me examine that statement.

The Premier: That is what the Commissioner of Taxation tells me. He says we will not get any more in the aggregate.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I think the Premier will probably get less.

The Premier: We will get a little less.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: The Premier says he is not imposing any additional taxation.

The Premier: Not any increased taxation.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Then let me consider a man on an income of £3,000. There are not very many in receipt of such a large salary.

The Premier: I was not referring to a man on that salary.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition had better address the Chair. He is getting quite a lot of information by way of interjection.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Not too much information; I only wish I could get a little more. I know that people on the higher incomes will have a considerable increase of taxation to meet, while married people on the lower range of income will be relieved. Still it is not my responsibility to see that the Premier gets the revenue needed. That is his responsibility. At the same time I do not want it to be said that I supported a Bill which means that next year we shall have to increase the rate of taxation. If the rate is as set out on the front page of the tables that have been supplied, I shall be prepared to accept it, but I hope the Premier will be able to live somewhere near that figure. I do not like increased taxes for anybody. If we increase our taxation, we shall drive from the State people who are in receipt of reasonable incomes. Generally speaking, a man who has a substantial income spends a good deal of money and provides employment. That is a fact of which we should not lose sight. I do not propose to offer any objection to the Bill. I believe in the principle of collecting taxes at the source, and I believe that is the only feature to commend the present Bill.

**MR. McDONALD** (West Perth) [8.12]: I agree that the principle of taxation at the source is an innovation which the State is well justified in accepting. It will lighten the burden of many taxpayers and, in addition, and what appeals to me even more, it will, I hope, afford the Treasury an opportunity of securing its proper quota of tax from some people who have not hitherto been meeting their obligations. I do not propose to offer any opposition to the second reading of the Bill. I hope that in the interval between this and the measure becoming operative and being brought into force, the Government will take the opportunity of studying the incidence of taxation as it will be affected by the combination of the two measures that are intended to apply in future. I have advocated—and I took occasion the other evening to support the amendment of the financial emergency tax—that there should be some easement of the burden of financial emergency taxation on those who have family responsibilities and are in receipt of the lower incomes. This Bill will carry that principle into effect. For that reason, and to the extent it does so, the measure has my support.

I do not desire to plead the cause of a man on £5,000 a year because he has £5,000 a year. There are some people on £5,000 a year who perhaps do not deserve that much money. There are some people on £5,000 a year who give more value for that sum than do some people on £300 or £400 a year. The man on the larger income is often worth more to his employer than is the man on the smaller income. But I am somewhat concerned at the general condition of income taxation throughout Australia generally. Anyone who reads the amounts paid in income taxation, as set out in the tables that have been circulated by the Treasurer of the Commonwealth, Mr. Casey, must be struck with the startling variations between the amounts paid in the several States. Let me take as an example the man on £5,000 a year with a wife but no children. In respect of £5,000 a year, the amount being wholly earned by personal exertion and none from investments, the combined taxation he will pay in Western Australia for Federal income tax and for State income tax, as increased by this Bill, will be £1,770 a year—I speak in round figures. Of this £5,000 salary or income from personal exertion he will pay in this State by way of

Federal and State income taxes £1,770 a year. In Queensland he will pay more—£1,950 a year. In South Australia he will pay less than our amount—approximately £1,400 a year. In Victoria, according to the figures as I interpret them in the Federal Treasurer's booklet, that man will pay in combined State and Commonwealth taxation £1,077 a year. So of two men on the same income from personal exertion residing in Victoria and Western Australia, the man in our State will pay £1,770 and the man in Victoria £1,077.

The Premier: Of course Victoria has increased its income tax.

**MR. McDONALD**: I believe that is so. Some increase is being made in Victoria.

The Premier: In New South Wales taxation has gone up by £4,000,000.

**MR. McDONALD**: I believe that also to be true. Queensland is the one State which is not increasing taxation, the reason being that it cannot very greatly increase it. Queensland is bound to recognise that fact. But when we consider the question of taxation we are bound to bear in mind the report of the last figures of the Federal Grants Commission just recently circulated, which in paragraph 261 shows the index or taxable capacity in the various States. Now, the taxable capacity of Western Australia is the second lowest among the Australian States. Our taxable capacity is 89, whereas the taxable capacity of New South Wales is 123. The State with the lowest taxable capacity is Tasmania, which has the figure of 83 as against our figure of 89; but we are well down the scale in the taxable capacity of our people. Whereas at paragraph 270 of the same book, which was compiled before the increases of taxation proposals in this State and also in other States, the index of severity of taxation in States shows us to be the second highest, our figure being 113, and the highest figure Queensland's, 135, the lowest being Victoria, with 72. That is in the index of severity of taxation. By our proposals we are going to reduce the severity of taxation on the lower grades of income going up to £600 or £700 a year.

The Premier: That is a figure in the aggregate, a collective figure. We do not get more tax by our proposal.

**MR. McDONALD**: No. If we take the total tax collected from all our taxpayers and receive the same amount as in the past,

the index of severity as shown by the Grants Commission will not be affected. But what it will do is this: if we collect the same total figure as in the past but reduce the taxation on some incomes and increase it on others, then we greatly increase the severity of taxation on the higher incomes, on incomes that may range from £700 or £800 a year upward.

The Premier: And on the people with no dependants.

Mr. McDONALD: And on the people with no dependants. As far as increasing taxation on that class is concerned, it has been advocated by me in this Chamber before, and I am entirely in favour of it. But the severity of taxation by this proposed measure on all incomes which reach the higher levels, from £1,000 upwards, is going to be very substantially increased.

The Premier: Those incomes reach the maximum rates a little more quickly. That is all.

Mr. McDONALD: They pay more. We may use any formula we like, but when taxpayers draw the cheques to pay their income tax assessments they are going to pay more than they paid in the past. There are two ways of meeting the State's finances—substantially only two ways. One is to get increased taxation, and the other is to reduce expenditure. The second is highly unpopular, but I think it has to go hand in hand with any consideration as to meeting the Budget. I would like to see, as I have said before when speaking on the Budget, some inquiry made as to the extent to which the State is paying away money for which it does not receive full value, or the extent to which it pays away money which it need not pay away. For that is one way in which we may keep the severity of our taxation down to a reasonable figure. When I speak of severity of taxation, it is for the reason that I feel very strongly that a reputation for very heavy taxation in this State is going to rebound to our disadvantage. We all know that capital is extremely fluid; and if taxation gets too high here, we may find that people with incomes who feel it to be too severe will gradually emigrate to States like Victoria, where they get more advantageous treatment, as no doubt they will even with the increased taxation being introduced there.

Mr. Needham: We have heard that plea before.

Mr. McDONALD: We have heard that plea before; and while we may regret it, it is one which we cannot ignore. I can only remind the member for Perth (Mr. Needham) of the documented exodus of capital from New South Wales to Victoria which happened not very many years ago in immense sums, and also of the undeniable, the admitted exodus of capital which has taken place from New Zealand in recent years.

The Minister for Mines: If the owners can get it out.

Mr. McDONALD: They cannot now. The exodus had to be stopped by Government action because it reached such large dimensions.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Capital was not exported from New Zealand by individuals, but by banks and insurance offices.

Mr. McDONALD: Oh, by individuals! I can tell the hon. member that it was by individuals.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It was by institutions.

Mr. McDONALD: Institutions do not move capital about to any great extent.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They did in the case of New Zealand.

Mr. McDONALD: It is moved about on behalf of people who own it, and by people who are interested in that capital. In Australia the migration of capital from one State to another is something that no State can control at all. We do not want to be in this position, that of all the Australian States we are the least attractive from the point of view of capital and enterprise. When I speak of capital, I do not speak merely of pounds, shillings and pence, of money in the banks, and of goods, but of capital in the widest sense, as including a man's skill and his capacity to work, because when he has skill and capacity to work, whether it is labouring work or any other kind, he will be turned irresistibly to that area where he sees the best prospect of reward for his labour and the greatest chance of advancing his position in life and also increasing his earnings. We are going to advance towards, as I say, a very substantial rate of taxation on the higher amounts. When the Federal Government, as it must do, brings down

additional taxation to meet the obligations of defence, that will be a uniform figure spread over all the Australian States. The man on £1,000 a year or on £2,000 a year, or on £800 a year, will pay the same sum in Federal taxation in Victoria as he will in Western Australia; and people in Victoria will bear that taxation with comparative ease, but here, if we get our State taxation too high, it may be a very severe burden on many people as compared with those who live in States which are endeavouring to maintain their index of severity of taxation at a low figure. And the disparity between the heavily taxed State and the moderately taxed State will become all the more apparent and all the more urgent when we start to feel the added burden of the taxation necessary to the Federal Government in order to meet its defence expenditure.

I do not want to put forward these considerations with the idea of assisting people who have large incomes. I do not raise objection to their paying large taxation. There are now in our State some men who by these measures in every year will work four months for the State out of the 12 months. For four months of the year they will be servants of the State so far as their incomes are concerned, and for eight months of the year they will be working for themselves. There is nothing very wrong with that.

The Premier: It is not as much as that.

Mr. McDONALD: £1,770 a year on an income of £5,000 is rather more than a third of the total earnings. That means that for something between four and five months of the year a man works for the State and the Commonwealth combined.

The Premier: Where is the £1,770?

Mr. McDONALD: That is Commonwealth and State taxation combined. For, after all, whether the sovereigns are divided or not, the same amount is still paid in taxation. So, while I offer no opposition to the Bill, which has some principles that I support and gives some relief, to which I do not object, to certain classes of taxpayers, I would like the Treasurer, in the intervening period before the Bill comes into force, to survey this question of rates of taxation, not from the point of view of making it easy for people with large amounts of money by way of income, but from the point of view of ensuring that

there will not be a disparity between our State and any other State of the Commonwealth, that there will not be an urge towards or an advantage in choosing some other State as a place to live in, or a State for enterprise, or a State for the investment of capital as against Western Australia—an undeveloped State, and a State which is comparatively poor and low in the index of capacity to pay taxation.

Mr. Withers interjected.

Mr. McDONALD: In a State which desires to attract capital and attract people, and which has a low capacity grade in taxation, it is highly desirable that we should keep our taxation level as low as can be done consistently with the inescapable obligations resting on the State. As the member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers) says, when there is a disparity between the States, then the fluid people—if I may so term them—people who may have an income from property, tend irresistibly to go to the State where they can get better treatment from the point of view of taxation; just as on the island of Jersey, in the vicinity of England, there reside large numbers of people who wish to take advantage of the low income tax rates ruling there. Because of lower income tax rates on the Continent, thousands of English people have been living in Europe, the severity of taxation in England having made it exceedingly difficult for them to live in England on their incomes.

The Premier: The impost on property is, of course, greater than that on personal exertion.

Mr. McDONALD: That is quite true; but the fact remains that, even allowing for all variations in taxation principles, some States show a low degree of severity and consequently income-earners there are at an advantage compared with income-earners in other States. My wish is that, as far as we possibly can, our State should not show in a bad light when compared with other States. Admittedly, our difficulties are exceedingly great if we compare ourselves with Victoria; but, in view of the fact that we want population and capital, we should so frame our taxation system as to attract rather than repel people. I hope that in the intervening period the Treasurer will have an opportunity to review the incidence of taxation and

will consider how far the considerable increases in the rates in some cases may militate against our attracting and holding people in the way we desire.

**HON. W. D. JOHNSON** (Guildford-Midland) [8.33]: I support this tax because it will remove the burden that has been unfairly put on those least able to carry it. In other words, we shall relieve the worker from the unfair burden of the financial emergency tax, which will now be combined with the income tax. While that causes me to rejoice, I am not blind to the inequality and unfairness of the taxation we are now considering. Taxation to-day is being quietly but scientifically changed from a direct impost to an indirect gathering of revenue. One of the processes is taxation at the source. In past years the Labour movement did not agree to the principle of taxation at the source. Since it has been introduced, however, it seems to have penetrated to such an extent that no great resistance is offered to it; it is generally accepted. Some workers argue that it is easier for them to pay at the source; in other words, to give away that which they never got. It did not reach them. The employer got their labour and retained part of their wages, which he paid to the State. The workers did not see it, their wives did not get it, it did not go into the home, and so was not missed. I admit that in some respects that is an advantage, but we cannot lose sight of the fact that it is not just.

**Mr. Hughes**: It is very like the Customs tax.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON**: Yes. I am coming to that. Taxation at the source is unfair when it is not general. To be just, I can understand members on the Opposition side agreeing to this form of taxation, because they introduced it and it operated for some time under their administration. It has been continued and is now being expanded. If it is just to say to the workers, "You shall pay each week as you earn," it is reasonable to say that the man who holds the money so paid should pay interest on it. If the Labour movement were scientific, it would have taken this money from the workers through the trade unions, and so would have had the use of the money, paying it to the State at the end of each year. What a glorious interest revenue the Labour movement would in those circumstances have had for propaganda purposes! Instead,

however, the State gets the money, and reaps the advantage of the interest it earns. The State has the cash to use. If one analyses it, taxation at the source is unfair. It is an indirect impost; that is what I desire to emphasise to-night. It worries me. I cannot understand why workers do not realise the gradual process that has been taking place during the last few years, particularly the last seven or eight years, of increasing indirect taxation. It is remarkable what the workers are paying. How on earth they pay it, I do not know. Take the sales tax. This is another form of taxation at the source. I do not know the amount the Commonwealth collects by this means, but it must be enormous.

The Premier: It is £6,000,000 or £7,000,000.

**Hon. W. D. JOHNSON**: When the worker buys his necessities, he pays sales tax. He does not realise that he is paying it, because the amount is added to his purchase, and paid by the shopkeeper to the Commonwealth direct. As the Premier says, we pay £6,000,000 or £7,000,000 a year in sales tax. It is a new process, but part of the game. The reason it is possible to impose such taxation in Australia is because the Labour movement has succeeded in raising the standard of living. The Labour movement and industrial organisations have gradually, but surely, by industrial and political action, elevated the standard of living by obtaining increased wages for the workers. Wages in Australia compare favourably with wages paid in any other part of the world. But capitalistic organisations do not tackle the problem of taxation in that way. They do it scientifically. They impose an indirect tax, so that the worker will not realise how much he is giving back. If one had the ability and the time, it would be an interesting study to ascertain the amount paid by the worker indirectly to-day, compared with what he was paying ten years ago. I have brought this matter before the House previously. I opposed the establishment of the lotteries. Why? I opposed the lotteries on principle. I objected to the State associating itself with practices of that kind. I opposed lotteries for the further reason that the worker would, by his contribution to the lotteries, be maintaining charitable institutions. Most of the money spent in lotteries is an indirect impost on the workers. I have said before—and I desire to repeat—

that 80 per cent. of the tickets sold are bought by workers. After having deducted the amounts paid in prizes and the cost of administration, an enormous sum of money is contributed indirectly for the relief of our poor that should be raised by means of taxation. Before the lotteries were introduced, the upkeep of institutions established to care for the sick and poor was an impost on the wealthy. The wealthy people contributed the money, and rightly so, for the care of the indigent and distressed. All that has changed. The indirect method has been introduced, and now the workers pay. The contributions made by the workers to the lotteries relieve the capitalist of this burden. It is morally wrong, in my opinion—and I have said so before—to take money subscribed for the lotteries and apply it to the upkeep of charitable and other institutions. These have a right to exist and have a great task to perform, but they should be supported by the wealthy people.

Mr. Styants: Subscriptions to lotteries are made voluntarily.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, if a worker is foolish to contribute.

Mr. Marshall: The sales tax is not voluntary.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is taxation at the source.

Mr. Hughes: The beer-drinker pays a voluntary tax.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We need not go into those details. I admit that no one is compelled to buy tickets in a lottery; but when he does buy a ticket he contributes to the upkeep of the institutions to which I have referred. That money should go into general revenue; it should not be earmarked for a specific purpose. Parliament should be able to vote that money for the most urgent cases of distress. Dealing with starting-price betting, exactly the same thing operates. The revenue from this source is mounting like the revenue from the financial emergency tax. This tax first yielded £400,000 per annum; now, it is yielding over £1,000,000 per annum. I do not know whether starting price betting is moving forward as quickly as that, but the Government's revenue from it is mounting.

Mr. Patrick: It is not paid by the book-makers.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. The point is that just as that increases so the worker is relieved of some of his wages. It is the worker who patronises the starting price bookmaker and the fines that are imposed contribute to the needs of the State. If we analyse all the facts we find that the indirect burden on the worker today is enormous compared with what it used to be. These contributions have been earmarked in some cases for special purposes, and in a very few cases is the money taken into general revenue. The fines paid by starting price bookmakers go into general revenue and the Government can use that money as it thinks fit. It has been suggested that we are removing the burden from the man with a small income and placing it on the man with a high income. That is just. Taxation should be placed on the shoulders of those best able to bear it, particularly the man with an income of £3,000 or £4,000 a year. That man has surplus wealth. He cannot use it. It is his personal income which he cannot possibly use. From it he can obtain a far greater standard of comfort and standard of living than the man in poorer circumstances. He gets more enjoyment and more recreation than does the poorer person.

The Premier: But he has a little more worry.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would like to experience that side of it. I cannot imagine that I would worry if I had an income of a couple of thousand a year. The fact remains that I hear people speak of the impost put upon those who are fortunate enough to have an income of £3,000 or £5,000 a year. That always annoys me because the money cannot possibly be used by the person who has it. It is not thinkable that he can use it, and therefore he has surplus wealth. Surely the man with surplus wealth is the person that should be called upon to do something towards the needs of the State in the various ways in which we are called upon to provide for the State. I do like to hear people talk about those who possess wealth. I often wonder how much wealth stands idly in our streets every day of the week, wealth in the shape of motor cars. The expansion in this direction in our city is simply enormous. Go where we will we see motor cars standing idly at the kerbside. If we live on one of the main roads—I happen to live in Mount's Bay-road—it is interesting to watch the number of cars that

pass in the morning, cars that probably cost between £400 and £500, and many of them with only one person, the person driving. No one can tell me that that man is hard up against it. He brings his car into town in the morning although he is given by the State the best transport service in the State. I refer to the trolley buses that run as far as Claremont. We give that man the best of facilities for travelling, yet he rides in his motor car into the city, parks it sometimes in a parking area and pays a fee for the privilege, and at other times he just parks it against the kerb and uses it once or twice during the day. The point I am making is that all the cars we see around us represent idle money and I should say, it must run into millions. The worker sees all this, and that is how the discontent arises.

Mr. Patrick: Don't forget that a number of workers are employed by the motor car people.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Undoubtedly, but the employment so afforded is small compared with the cost of the car. I should imagine that the principal work in that respect is brought about by accidents that take place only too frequently in our streets. By the way, I saw an accident this morning, the first I have ever seen close up. A truck was coming out from the kerb and a car that was approaching ran into it. I said to the truck driver, "Why did you not put out your hand?" He replied, "I did." The trouble was that the truck had a big casing around it and the driver's hand when it was put out could not be seen, and so the man in the car that was coming along in the same direction ran into him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member had better get back to the Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I could see Mr. Speaker that you were becoming fidgety at my digression. What I desired was to give an idea of the idle wealth blatantly exposed to the eyes of the workers every day, workers who are going to and returning from their work. They see all this idle capital in the streets and they begin by asking questions. Then it is that they talk about iniquitous taxation. We are taking from the worker that which he cannot pay and preventing him from maintaining that standard of comfort that he has every right to expect, a privilege granted to him by the Arbitration Court. The workers have paid

the tax and will pay under this proposal, but when everything is taken into consideration their income will be below the basic wage. There is no doubt that the worker is irritated by the display of idle wealth to which I have referred. It is all very fine for members opposite to talk about those with big incomes having to pay heavier taxation, but we have only to look around and go into the homes of the workers to see how depleted they are of everything in the way of comfort. Therefore I commend the Government for trying to relieve the burden that has been imposed upon the worker over the years. This is a contribution towards relief for the worker, and I am not blind to the fact that by taxing at the source the worker will still pay and that the other fellow will be better able to pay. As it is, the worker has been contributing on a basis that is neither equitable nor just, and the measure of reform now proposed will receive my support.

Hon. P. Collier: Does the hon. member know that a percentage of workers who are earning say £5 a week own motor cars?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not wish to go into that matter.

Hon. P. Collier: There are very few workers earning £5 a week today who do not own cars.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: All I know is that my economic position does not permit me to own a car. I earn £600 a year and I cannot afford a car.

Hon. P. Collier: I know of people in receipt of £5 a week who own cars.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Even today with this measure of reform the worker is still paying out of all proportion to his capacity to pay, and the other fellow is not paying in that proportion that we are taking money from the worker.

MR. TRIAT (Mount Magnet) [8.57]: I have much pleasure in supporting the proposal of the Government on this occasion, and when I say that, I mean I have much pleasure in supporting the increase in taxation. I realise, however, the necessity for some explanation, and probably it is there. I am pleased to support this measure because it will relieve the worker of the burden of the financial emergency tax taking into account his responsibility as a married man. In my opinion that is the one important point of the Bill; it gives this re-

lief. I also support it because it permits of the collection of the tax at the source. Speaking from my own experience, I find a difficulty when the time arrives in getting sufficient money to pay the tax I am called upon to meet. Under the Bill I will be taxed to the extent of £4 more, but I will not feel the effect of that increase because it will be deducted each fortnight from my earnings. If a man is paying £1 a week rent and he pays it each week, he finds it much easier to pay that way than he would if he were obliged to find the lump sum at the end of the year. A taxing measure is based on the same principle. The man whose tax is deducted at the source will not miss the money to the same extent as if he allowed the payment to stand over until the end of 12 months.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: He does not realise he is being taxed.

Mr. TRIAT: No.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You will never get reform in that way.

Mr. TRIAT: The hon. member should not lose sight of the fact that a wages man gives his employer a fortnight's credit for every fortnights work. The worker does not say he will charge his employer interest because his money is only paid to him at the end of a fortnight. On the goldfields men have to wait 15 or 16 days for their pay, but one never hears any outcry about interest. Undoubtedly, however, the wages man is giving his employer the use of money free of interest. That is the system in operation, and people do not mind working under it. The payment of taxation at the source is a system that can well be justified. The piece-worker on the goldfields may earn a considerable sum in one year, say £600. By the time he is called upon to pay his tax at the end of 12 months, he may have lost a great deal of his income, and be earning only, say, £200. On the basis of an annual payment of taxation, therefore, he cannot afford to pay the tax on the £600 he earned the year before. In some instances the proposed new system will be of great benefit to a married man, who has a wife and several children. I am very pleased to give my support to the measure. I feel sure that when members return to their electorates in the country, and discuss the proposal with their constituents—those who are working on the wages system—they too will secure support from their electors.

**MR. PATRICK** (Greenough) [9.2]: Most members agree with the principle of taxation at the source. I merely rise to ask for information from the Premier. I have here two tables, both presumably prepared by experts. One table was prepared for the Premier and the other appears in the "Western Australian Pocket Year Book". The year book sets out the State taxation, the different amounts and the rates paid. Let me instance an income of £1,000 a year. The rate given in the year book is 8.3d. in the pound, aggregating a tax of £34. According to the Premier's table, the tax on £1,000 would be £27 13s. 4d. The rate on an income of £5,000 is 36d. in the pound, making a total of £756 in taxation. According to the Premier's experts, the income tax on that amount is not more than £605, a discrepancy of £150. The increase, therefore, if the Government Statistician is correct, instead of being £270 would be only £120. That applied in the case of incomes from £1,000 to £5,000 would make an enormous difference. If the year book is correct,—they are the figures of the Government Statistician—a big difference will be shown in the amount the Premier will receive. We have heard a great deal about experts tonight, but here are two sets of figures prepared by experts and showing this tremendous discrepancy. I should like the Premier to look into the matter and ascertain which set of figures is correct.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton—in reply) [9.4]: Almost invariably members who have joined in the debate have been prepared to support the Bill. A great deal that has been said about taxation has been due to the tables that were laid on the Table of the House for the information of members. What will happen, if the proposal becomes law, is that next year the House will be asked to pass a Taxation Bill. As members of the Opposition, and members of another place, desired to have some idea of the extent of taxation before they passed that Bill, and as ours will probably be the Government that will impose the taxation under the new law, I thought it reasonable to have the tables prepared. Having done so, I cannot blame members of the House for discussing the proposed rates, although nothing we can do in the course of the passage of this Bill will have any influence upon that point. The

whole question will come before the House next year. In the light of all that will transpire between now and then, and the amount of taxation received, the House will be asked to consider the taxing Bill and will do with it what it pleases. These tables were prepared to give members an idea of what will occur. I trust they have proved useful to members, and will to some extent secure the passage of this measure. No one likes to leap into the unknown. When we have proposals that are definite and clear, members will understand what they mean, will be prepared to take them on their merits, and be ready to vote accordingly. With regard to the suggestion of the member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick). I will have the figures checked and will let him know the result.

Mr. Patrick: The Year Book gives the actual rates.

The PREMIER: The whole thing depends on exemptions and other things.

Mr. Patrick: No exemptions are given here.

The PREMIER: The Government Statistician may have taken the average rate, but I have not looked at that aspect of the matter. I am pleased at the reception given to the Bill, and can only hope that in another place an equally good reception will be given to it so that it can become law. We shall then be able to adopt the principle, to which I referred in my Budget speech, of levying taxation upon those best able to bear it, with definite exemptions in the case of taxpayers with family responsibilities.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL—INCOME TAX (RATES FOR DEDUCTION).**

*Second Reading.*

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

HON. C. G. LATHAM (York) [9.10]: I said practically all there was to say on the previous Bill. This measure instructs the Treasurer to impose taxation at the source at

the rate of 6d. up to £8 a week and 9d. on all amounts in excess of £8 a week. Originally we permitted him to increase the amount as he desired, but that has been provided for under this Bill. I suppose the Treasurer will be able to tell us, when he brings down his taxation measure later on, what amount of taxation he expects to receive. It is intended that this measure shall apply only until Parliament imposes the tax. I understand that the Commissioner of Taxation will, from the 1st July next year, make these collections.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: After that, at the first opportunity, the Treasurer will come down with a taxing measure, and impose a tax that may or may not be 6d. and 9d. respectively.

The Premier: The tax will be collected in this way at the specified rates.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: In the meantime we are authorising the Commissioner of Taxation to collect a tax of 6d. in the pound up to £8 a week and 9d. in the pound in excess of that until Parliament otherwise orders. When the amount has come in the Treasurer will have some idea of the revenue he is likely to get, and will then ask the House either to increase or decrease the tax. I have no objection to the Bill. We clearly understood the principle involved when we passed the assessment Bill, and knew that that Bill must be followed by this one.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee.*

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

#### **BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Council's Amendment.*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

*In Committee.*

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

Clause 2:—Add a further proviso, as follows:—

Provided also, that notwithstanding the next preceding proviso this section

shall apply if and when the person from whom the property passes, whether under a will or a settlement or settlements or a non-testamentary disposition is at the time of his death a member of the military, air, or naval forces of His Majesty the King, engaged on active service in connection with any war being waged between the Commonwealth of Australia and any other Power, and his death is the direct result of such person being engaged on such active service aforesaid.

The PREMIER: When the Bill was discussed in this Chamber reference was made to the contributions and increases that might otherwise be imposed upon members of the A.I.F., and I gave an assurance that an amendment would be submitted in the Legislative Council to deal with that point. In collaboration with the member for Nedlands, the amendment was drafted and was accepted in the Council. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

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

*House adjourned at 9.18 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Thursday, 16th November, 1939.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bills .....	1989
Motion: Native Administration Act, to disallow regulations, withdrawn .....	1989
Return: Government Motor Cars .....	1990
Bills: Dairy Industry Act Amendment, report .....	1990
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2a., Com. ....	1990
Firearms and Guns Act Amendment, 2a. ....	1994
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2a., Com. ....	1998
Administration Act Amendment, Assembly's message .....	2000
Reserves (No. 2), 1a. ....	2000
Income Tax (Rates for Deduction), 1a. ....	2000
Income Tax Assessment Act Amendment, 1a. ....	2001
Tramways Purchase Act Amendment, 2a. ....	2001
Financial Emergency Tax, Assembly's message .....	2004
Land Tax and Income Tax, Assembly's message .....	2004
Builders' Registration, 2a. ....	2004
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 2a. ....	2007
Main Roads Act Amendment, 2a. ....	2013
Land Act Amendment, 2a. ....	2014

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

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

### MOTION—NATIVE ADMINISTRATION ACT.

*To Disallow Regulations.—Withdrawn.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 31st October on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (East):—

That regulations Nos. 65 and 106R made under the Native Administration Act, 1905-1936, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 8th September, 1939, and laid on the Table of the House on the 12th September, 1939, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East—in reply) [4.35]: The Minister for the North-West having agreed to amend these regulations, I ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.