

basis of negotiations was that the piece of land would be sold to recoup the Government their money. Mr. Ewing, when Minister for Education, was also concerned in the matter. No money would have been lent but for the understanding that the scheme would be accepted by the people and by Parliament, and the Class A reserve referred to in the Bill would be sold in order that the Government might be recouped. I hope that progress will be reported.

Hon. J. EWING: On the evidence submitted to the select committee, I think the finding was a wise one. If a division be called for to-night, I shall vote against the clause. I know the place well. I hope the Minister will agree to progress being reported in order that a further report may be obtained.

The Chief Secretary: We must finalise it.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I do not think any member of the select committee would object to further inquiries, but it is important that the rest of the Bill should be passed. Urgent matters are contained in it, and if there is delay for further inquiry, we may as well strike out the reference to the reserve in question, and then have a separate Bill to deal with it.

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

Ayes	..	..	..	..	5
Noes	..	..	..	..	14

Majority against .. .. 9

#### AYES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. G. Fraser	(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. G. A. Kempton	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. A. Lovekin	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. C. F. Baxter
	(Teller.)

#### PAIR.

AYE.	No.
Hon. C. B. Williams	Hon. H. Stewart

Clause thus negatived.

Clause 8, First Schedule—agreed to.

Second and Third Schedules, consequently, negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

*House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 12th November, 1929.*

	PAGE
Question: Cottesloe Municipal Standing Orders	1470
Motions: Standing Orders suspension	1470
Aberigues Act, to disallow regulation	1466
Main Roads Board, Contributory local authorities	1467
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax, 3s.	1471
Miner's Phthisis Act Amendment, 3s.	1471
Loan, £2,250,000, 3s.	1471
Sandalwood, 3s.	1471
Criminal Code Amendment, reports, 3s.	1471
Public Service Act Amendment, 2s.	1471
Industries Assistance, Council's Amendments	1476
State Savings Bank Act Amendment, 2s.	1476
Dried Fruits Act Continuance Council's Amendment	1481
Redistribution of Seats Act Amendment, 1s., 2s.	1494

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

### QUESTION—COTTESLOE MUNICIPAL STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Agricultural Water Supplies: 1, Is he aware that the "Government Gazette" of the 1st November contained a new set of standing orders for the Cottesloe municipality? 2, Will those standing orders be laid upon the Table this session? 3, Does not standing order No. 51 therein conflict with Section 158 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1906?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURAL WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, The last paragraph of By-law 51 is in conflict with Section 158 and the council has been so informed.

### MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

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

That during the remainder of the session the Standing Orders be suspended so far as is necessary to enable Bills to be introduced

without notice and to be passed through their remaining stages on the same day, and all messages from the Legislative Council to be taken into consideration on the day they are received.

It may be thought that this motion is being brought forward rather early in the session, but a glance at the Notice Paper will indicate to the House that there is little business remaining, and it should be disposed of in a few days. In order that we may have permission to deal with messages from another place, and also to deal with Bills and put them through all stages at one sitting, it is necessary that this motion should be passed. Of course I give the House an assurance at once that no advantage will be taken of the suspension of the Standing Orders unduly to deal with any matter that may be brought forward. If it is sought to put any Bill through all its stages at one sitting and members require further time for its consideration, there will be no objection to meeting their convenience in every possible way. No advantage will be taken of the suspension, but it is desired to facilitate the transaction of business at this stage of the session.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Norham) [4.37]: I accept the assurance of the Premier that no advantage will be taken of the suspension of the Standing Orders to push through legislation that ought to receive the full consideration of the House. On the Notice Paper there is only one really important matter, the State Savings Bank Act Amendment Bill. I do not know what it contains, but I gather from remarks already made that some time will be required to consider the Bill. Otherwise I think we can deal with all the matters on the Notice Paper quite well with the Standing Orders suspended. It is customary to suspend the Standing Orders towards the close of the session, and it is necessary to do so or we should never get through the business. I accept the assurance of the Premier that we shall have ample time to deal with all matters that come before the House. I am glad to know that no other Bills will be introduced. It would not be right for the Premier to ask for the suspension of the Standing Orders without telling us of any other Bills to be introduced.

The Premier: If I might explain, there are only two, or perhaps three, Bills that I know of, a sandalwood Bill, such as we pass

each year to deal with the sandalwood revenue, and an amendment of the Arbitration Act. I was informed yesterday that it will be necessary to pass an amendment of the Redistribution of Seats Act because of technical errors in it. I think the House will be satisfied that that Bill is of no importance, because it deals only with technical errors in the description contained in the schedule.

Mr. Latham: It will alter some of the boundaries.

The Premier: It might to a slight extent, but only as regards a few votes here and there.

Hon. G. Taylor: Will it restore the district of Mt. Margaret?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should like to know what amendment is proposed to the Arbitration Act. We should have time to consider such a measure. Arbitration is a matter that has important effects and we should not be asked to pass legislation hurriedly or without ample time for consideration. I have no objection to the passing of the motion.

Question put and passed.

#### **BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.**

- 1, Land Tax and Income Tax.
  - 2, Miner's Phthisis Act Amendment.
  - 3, Loan, £2,250,000.
  - 4, Sandalwood.
- Transmitted to the Council.

#### **BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.**

*Remaining Stages.*

Reports of Committee adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Council.

#### **BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.**

*Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.45] in moving the second reading said: There are several clauses in the Bill which deal with purely verbal alterations to fit in with our present system of classification only. There

are other clauses that are consequent upon the passing of the Public Service Appeal Board Act, 1920, which places the responsibility for the classification upon the Public Service Commissioner. Again, there are several clauses that are necessary owing to sections in the 1904 Act having become obsolete. Those clauses need not require attention by hon. members, but there are eight points in the Bill to which I will refer and which are worthy of consideration. The first is that which will give the Governor-in-Council power to appoint one assistant Commissioner where it is thought that one is necessary. The Act provides that we may appoint two such Commissioners. It will be realised that if it is considered that only one assistant Commissioner is necessary, there should be power to make such an appointment. At present there is no such power, and that is an amendment that will be readily agreed to by every hon. member. As to the next point, it is known that periodically there has been a reclassification of the service. Sometimes it has taken place after a long interval, and at other times at periods not quite so long. We know that nearly all wages, so far as the industrial section of the community is concerned, come up for revision at intervals of not less than three years. I refer to awards of the Arbitration Court, which very often are for terms of 12 months but in no case does the term exceed a period of three years.

Hon. G. Taylor: I do not remember any.

The PREMIER: No. There is no stated term for such reclassifications of the service in the Public Service Act. It may be left to the decision of the Public Service Commissioner and I do not know just where any power on the part of the Government may come in. There is an amendment in the Bill to provide for the reclassification of the service at least once in five years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Would it not be better to have a definite time fixed in the Bill? Perhaps that period would be too long.

The PREMIER: I think it is intended to mean every five years, although the Bill says that it shall be at intervals not exceeding five years.

Hon. G. Taylor: Would that prevent a reclassification taking place in less than a period of five years?

The PREMIER: It might, but the Bill says that it shall not exceed five years. In

the past there has not been at times a reclassification for seven or eight years, while, on the other hand, I think there have been reclassifications made at shorter periods. At any rate, the amendment will set out that the period shall not exceed five years. I shall have no objection to provide a stated period in the Bill if hon. members, when we deal with the measure in Committee, can show that it will be advisable. I do not think five years is too short a period for a review of the salaries and conditions of employment in connection with our Public Service. It will be understood that a reclassification does not necessarily mean an increase in salaries. It may mean a reclassification downwards, if that was in conformity with the cost of living. Arbitration Court awards may have a downward tendency, because of a reduction in the cost of living. Future reclassifications of the Public Service may take an upward or a downward trend as circumstances at the time may warrant. It will be seen, therefore, that a reclassification may mean that salaries will remain as they are: they may be increased, or they may be reduced. In my opinion, there ought to be a reclassification of the service at periods not greater than every five years. Then there is another amendment which has really become necessary because of the practice adopted in recent years. The 1904 Act provides that boys may enter the service by competitive examination, but not under the age of 16 years. For some time past the competitive examination system has been abolished. The Act was passed before the institution of the University examinations. Since the institution of those examinations, the competitive examinations have been abolished and we now take boys who have passed the junior examination.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And that is quite satisfactory.

The PREMIER: It is better than the old system and has worked satisfactorily. At present, however, many of the boys pass the junior examination at an age of 15, or even earlier than that. I have known boys to pass it at 14½ years. Those boys cannot be taken into the service because they are under 16 years of age, and so the service has lost some of our brighter boys because they have been taken up by banks and other business institutions.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The people do not lose their services.

The PREMIER: That is so, but the boys may prefer a Public Service career.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then they are very foolish.

The PREMIER: I think so, too, but sometimes their parents decide for them. I think it would be better for the bright boys if it was otherwise, but, perhaps, I should not say that. To secure the services of boys who have passed their junior examination at an earlier age than 16, we can only take them into the service as messengers and hold them until they are 16 years of age, when they are drafted into the clerical branch. Many boys are not satisfied to take positions as messengers in the interim, and they accept positions in offices and elsewhere. It is desirable that we should engage these boys regardless of their age, so long as they have passed the junior examination.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I think that is a bad argument. You stop them from adopting an outside career that would be better for them!

The PREMIER: That depends upon the boy.

Hon. G. Taylor: But it often depends upon the parents' decision.

The PREMIER: That is so.

Mr. Withers: Is the passing of the junior examination always a qualification?

The PREMIER: It has not been in the past, because the Act provided for a competitive examination, but we have been taking boys who have passed the junior examination.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And that has been so for years.

Hon. G. Taylor: And has proved satisfactory.

The PREMIER: That is so. In some respects the Government have not conformed strictly to the wording of the Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not think that worries some people.

The PREMIER: Perhaps few of us at one time or another have not broken some Acts of Parliament. The next point refers to the appointment of certain officers as magistrates without examination.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have done that now.

The PREMIER: No. At present we cannot appoint a magistrate unless he is a legally qualified person, or has passed the prescribed examination. We have five such officers in the Public Service who have been

there for a long time, and have been carrying on in an acting capacity as magistrates.

Hon. G. Taylor: And some of them are very good men.

The PREMIER: Yes. They are perhaps past the age when it is easy for a man to study and pass examinations. The time for that is during the years of youth, but the men to whom I refer have qualified by actual practical experience and each has, for many years past, been carrying on in an acting capacity as a magistrate.

Hon. G. Taylor: I know one who has been acting for 28 years.

The PREMIER: I think the hon. member will know most of them when I mention their names.

Hon. G. Taylor: They are very capable men, too.

The PREMIER: That is so. For instance, there is Mr. Geary, the acting resident magistrate and warden at Kalgoorlie. His service consists of having acted as mining registrar and clerk of courts for 11 years and acting magistrate and acting warden for 19½ years. His service totals 34¼ years, yet it is not possible to appoint Warden Geary as a magistrate because of the provision in the Public Service Act, which requires that he shall either be a qualified legal practitioner or have passed the prescribed examination.

Mr. Mann: In any event, he will be too old to sit for the examination now.

The PREMIER: Of course. If he sat for the examination and passed, I have no doubt he would be appointed, but it will be recognised that after a man has attained a certain age, it is not easy for him to pass such an examination.

Mr. Mann: But even so, would he not be too old to sit in accordance with the regulations?

The PREMIER: I do not know about that, but if he did and passed, I think he could be appointed. But it is quite out of the question to ask these men, who have been carrying on for such a long period, to sit for such an examination. Then there is Mr. McGinn, who is the acting magistrate at Geraldton.

Hon. G. Taylor: He is a most capable man with long experience.

The PREMIER: That is so. He acted as mining registrar and clerk of courts for 28 years and has been holding his present position as acting magistrate and acting war-

den for 6¼ years, so that he has a total service of 34 years. As is known to some goldfields members, Mr. McGinn has acted on a number of occasions at Kalgoorlie and elsewhere on the goldfields when the warden has been away. Then there is Mr. Lang, who is to-day acting magistrate at Carnarvon. He has had 22 years of service as Principal Registrar at the Mines Department, and has acted as magistrate at various times from 1912 to 1921. He has done that while occupying his position as Chief Mining Registrar and has gone to Southern Cross, Ravensthorpe and other centres relieving magistrates for the time being. He, too, has a total service of 34 years.

Hon. G. Taylor: And a fine man, too.

The PREMIER: Mr. Horgan is another. He was at Carnarvon as magistrate, but has been transferred to the Children's Court. Then there is Colonel Mansbridge, who is at Broome. He was mining registrar and clerk of courts on the goldfields for a period of 25 years. He was filling one of those positions when he went to the war. On his return, he was appointed acting magistrate at Broome, and he has occupied that position ever since. Colonel Mansbridge has been there eight years. As Bill Adams said, referring to the Army that won for him the battle of Waterloo, "Good men, all of them." Mr. Mansbridge has had 38½ years service. Then there is Mr. Butler, who is acting resident magistrate and warden at Cue. He has been mining registrar and clerk of courts for 27 years and acting warden for 6¼ years. His total service is 34 years. Of the five officers I have mentioned, not one has less than 34 years service.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But this is not the way to alter the position.

The PREMIER: That is a question that might be considered, whether the law should be altered in regard to examinations. Very few of the gentlemen holding the positions I have referred to were legally qualified and none was asked to pass an examination. All the same, the State was fortunate in securing the services of very capable and practical men to fill these posts. One can scarcely recall an instance of an officer who, though not legally trained, was not sound and practical and who did not fail to render very good service to the State, particularly in the earlier years.

Hon. G. Taylor: Warden Finnerty was not a legal man.

The PREMIER: No, and he played a very important part in the early days of the gold discoveries. So it is thought that we should appoint these men in permanent capacities.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But this is the wrong way to do it.

The PREMIER: That may be, but it must be remembered that the instances to which I have referred are exceptional, and in each there is a splendid record of service in acting capacities. In these cases perhaps an exception might be made. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the whole question of examination for these appointments might be considered. For some years past there have been complaints because of the number of acting appointments that have been made to the magistracy. In two cases or perhaps three, positions have been advertised, but it has not been possible to make permanent appointments because the salary—I assume it was for that reason—was not sufficiently attractive. There was no response to the call for applicants for the positions and it was not surprising that men of standing did not try to secure the positions. Personally I consider that the salary ought to be increased to such an extent as to attract men of standing at the Bar. It has been remarked in this House during the discussion on the Estimates that the duties performed by magistrates are becoming increasingly important year after year. We have made an effort to do away with the position that has been existing for so many years, but we have failed, principally because the salaries offered have not been sufficient. Another amendment it is proposed to bring about is rather important. It is known that the Public Service Commissioner on re-classifying the service, always fixes minimum and maximum salaries. There is considerable difference between the minimum and the maximum. For many years past under a certain salary—I think about £270 or £280—the annual increment, that is, the progression from the minimum to the maximum, has been automatic. There has been a grade rise every year, going up in multiples of 12, until the maximum is reached. But increases to officers on salaries above £280 have not been automatic; it has been at the discretion of the Public

Service Commissioner, or to be more correct, the Government of the day whether increases should be granted or not. On reclassification the Public Service Commissioner says that the maximum salary is really the value of the position.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Oh no.

The PREMIER: He says that the position is worth the maximum, but the maximum is fixed mainly to meet the position. When new appointments are made and an officer is not regarded as efficient, the real value of the office is the minimum salary. There may be reasons why an officer should start at a figure below the maximum, and after that he works up by annual increments until the maximum is reached.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why should it not be reached in the first year, if a man is specially capable?

The PREMIER: An officer may be new to the position, and it is desirable that he should commence at the minimum salary and work his way up. But very often the position is classified at the maximum and the Public Service Commissioner determines what the salary shall be. Then he fixes the salary of the office at the maximum. He does not always commence at the minimum. The position may be classified, and, as has been done, the officer receives the maximum salary because it is considered that he is worth that salary. If, however, the office became vacant, and someone else were appointed, probably the new man would have to start at the minimum. The amendment now brings all into the same category, that is to say, the increments towards the maximum shall be annual. There is something to be said for and against that.

Hon. G. Taylor: Merit does not count.

The PREMIER: There is something to be said both ways. At the present time, it may be said an officer would remain at the minimum or at a sum midway between the minimum and the maximum, if he did not show efficiency and aptitude for the position.

Hon. G. Taylor: Which system would be better?

The PREMIER: A very small percentage of officers have progressed annually towards the maximum. During the war years when the financial difficulties of the State were great, increments were not paid; also in times of depression it may be thought that the State would be justified in holding up annual increments to officers of the service.

The next amendment provides for the payment of additional remuneration to officials acting in positions higher than their own. At the present time if an officer is filling a post higher than his own, he has to fill it for three months before he gets any additional remuneration; after the three months he receives half the difference between his salary and that of the officer he is relieving. The amendment in the Bill makes the period one month instead of three.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You might as well wipe out the month altogether.

The PREMIER: I do not suppose the Public Service would object to that, but there must be a short period. A month might be required in which to become acquainted with the duties of the higher position. The last amendment of any importance is the abolition of the present separate board to hear appeals against penalties. At present if the Public Service Commissioner should impose a penalty upon any officer for any misdemeanour, that officer has the right to appeal, but to an appeal board presided over by the Public Service Commissioner, who inflicted the penalty.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Better not to have these penalties at all.

The PREMIER: If there were no power to inflict penalties it might be that dismissal would follow. Generally it may be said that the Public Service Commissioner or any officer filling that position would be inclined to give the person concerned the benefit of the doubt and inflict a penalty. As I say, although in the past an officer penalised had the right to appeal, the appeal was from Caesar to Caesar, for the appeal board has been constituted of a representative of the Government, a representative of the Public Service, and the Public Service Commissioner as chairman. Now it is proposed that such appeals shall be made as appeals against classification are made, that is to say, to the appeal board appointed under the Act of 1920. Very few of these cases come up. It is not often that penalties are inflicted, so it will not mean any considerable addition to the work of the appeal board. It is but seldom that penalties are inflicted and in most cases there have been no appeals, the officers concerned having accepted the findings. So the amendment will not increase the work of the existing appeal board. I think it much preferable that the appeal should be heard by an entirely independent

board, instead of a board presided over by the Public Service Commissioner, who imposed the penalty.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Under this you will have a judge of the Supreme Court sitting on an appeal against a fine of 5s.

The PREMIER: I scarcely think an officer fined 5s. would be likely to appeal.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But it may have been an unjust decision, in which case he would certainly appeal.

The PREMIER: I think that generally the decision involving a fine is a perfectly fair one, that indeed the delinquent is treated leniently. Most of the officers will recognise that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the cost of the present appeal board appointed under the Act?

The PREMIER: Very little. That board seldom sits, except once in five years following on a reclassification.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But how many officers are likely to be appealing?

The PREMIER: Those fined have been very few indeed. After the last reclassification a large number of appeals were made against that reclassification. That occupied the time of the appeal board at some length. But once the board has disposed of such appeals it has virtually nothing to do until the next reclassification comes along, five years later. Of course an officer at any time can appeal to the appeal board if additional duties are imposed on him. But there are very few cases that the appeal board is called upon to deal with, except following on reclassifications, which have been made once in five years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But occasionally an officer is reclassified because of increased importance.

The PREMIER: Yes, at times, but such reclassifications are made only when an officer becomes vacant, or if it suddenly increases in importance. Those are the main points in the Bill, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

## **BILL—INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE.**

### *Council's Amendments.*

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee.*

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

No. 1. Clause 2, Subclause (1), paragraph (b).—Insert after "mortgagor" in line 19 the words "the whole or any part of."

Insert after "instalment" in line two, page two, the words "or any part thereof so refunded."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This proposed amendment is not at all necessary, but rather than argue about it I will accept it. 1 move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2. Clause 2, Subclause (2).—Insert after "interest" where it appears a second time in line five, the words "or any part thereof."

Insert after "instalment" in line eleven the words "or the part thereof."

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: This is largely consequential. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

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

## **BILL—STATE SAVINGS BANK ACT AMENDMENT.**

### *Second Reading.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [5.27] in moving the second reading said: As in many other Bills, some of the amendments in this measure are really of but minor importance.

Hon. G. Taylor: You are doing a lot of repair work this session.

The PREMIER: Well, with the passing of the years Acts become obsolete and have to be amended. In our State Savings Bank Act there are sections dealing with the old days of the Post Office Savings Bank. Those provisions have become entirely obsolete with the establishment of the Commonwealth Savings Bank. This Bill deals with amendments of the Savings Bank Act, and also

with the establishment of a rural bank department of the State Savings Bank.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I hope you will have a bit of cash in it, but at present it does not look promising.

The PREMIER: I think we shall be able to raise the cash if necessary. But in the first place I think the public will rush it with deposits, and so money will be available from that source.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: If they did, it would be the worst thing that could happen at the present juncture.

The PREMIER: I scarcely think people would place money on deposit in any bank if they had use for it in industry or in any other direction. In the Bill provision is made that the Treasurer in office at the time shall be a body corporate, and the assets and liabilities of the bank shall be invested in the bank as incorporated. One of the principal amendments deals with the appointment of a board; that is to say, the bank is to be administered by a board of directors. That is a new provision and is introduced because the work of the bank will be considerably widened if the rural bank department is established. In any case I think it advisable that a bank should be administered by a board of directors or by commissioners. I think I am speaking truly when I say there is not in Australia a savings bank not administered by commissioners or by a board of directors, even though that bank carries on savings bank business exclusively. The board shall consist of the Under Treasurer for the time being, as chairman, and two other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Council. The fee to be drawn by the members of the board will also be fixed by the Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Latham: Will they be life appointments?

The PREMIER: No. It is not desirable to appoint anyone for life to such a position.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They will have to be very carefully selected. You will not be able to take anyone.

The PREMIER: Of course. In the case of positions of importance, the persons appointed must be carefully selected. The success or failure of a bank, railways, or any other concern, depends upon the calibre of the men who are directing operations. We know that from experience. The business of the bank will be divided into two separate departments. There will be the savings bank and the rural bank.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Truly rural.

The PREMIER: That rolls easily off the tongue. The transactions and accounts relating to each department are to be kept separate from those relating to the other department. It will be agreed that is a necessary provision. The Bill provides for the use of the funds in a joint capacity during the month, but an adjustment shall be made at the end of each month. The officers of the bank will be permitted to carry on the duties of the two departments conjointly, and there will be an apportionment of the charges as between the savings bank and the rural bank. For the moment I am not dealing with the rural bank clauses. The savings bank may make advances to depositors by way of loan or overdraft.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That has been done for some time.

The PREMIER: There has been no authority to do it under the Act, although we have over a million pounds on fixed deposit. In respect to other Acts, things have been done that have been found necessary and advisable to do, although they have not been in strict conformity with the Acts concerned. We lose many clients because people cannot get temporary accommodation from us. We can only advance on mortgage, and considerable delay ensues in the preparation of documents in transactions of that kind. The Bill also provides for the investment of savings bank money in Commonwealth securities. The old section dealing with investments does not provide that. The Bill further provides that the savings bank may invest its funds in debentures to be issued by the new rural bank department. That is another direction whereby the rural bank department will obtain funds.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You will not get much out of that now.

The PREMIER: No. It is proposed also to increase the limit of advances from £5,000 to £10,000. This provision will probably not often be taken advantage of, but it will be within the judgment of the board to do so.

Mr. Latham: The board will see to that.

The PREMIER: We have found in recent years that friendly societies, in the erection of buildings, do most of their business with the savings bank. In many cases they desire loans in excess of £5,000, but under the Act have not been able to get them. It is desirable we should retain that business. Because of their membership throughout the State, they are a good adver-



tising medium for the bank and good for the business of the bank.

Mr. Angelo: You cannot call that a rural bank.

The PREMIER: These are the amendments dealing with the Savings Bank Act. I have not yet come to the rural bank. The clauses dealing with the rural bank are found in Part IV., Nos. 7 to 22. All are new. It will be seen that the savings bank is empowered to carry on a rural bank department. The purposes for which the bank would carry on business are specified in one of these clauses. For the information of members I will read it. The bank may—

Receive money on deposit for a fixed term, and pay interest thereon; receive deposits to be inscribed as "deposit stock" repayable on notice as prescribed and pay interest thereon; accept money on current account to be operated on by cheques; discount bills, drafts and Government securities; issue bills and drafts and grant letters of credit; borrow money

Mr. Latham: That is the principal thing it will have to do.

The PREMIER: This will be done by the issue of debentures. Furthermore, it may—

Make advances by way of loan, and grant overdrafts payable on demand to agricultural, pastoral, rural or primary producers, or to persons carrying on industries immediately associated with rural pursuits, on the security of land, crops, wool, stock, plant or machinery personal security, guarantees by co-operative societies or associations, promissory notes, bills of exchange, or other securities approved by the bank; do anything incidental to any of its powers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: In fact, general banking.

The PREMIER: Yes, with exceptions. Associated banks have no restrictions whatever. They do business with anyone in any phase of industry. This clause restricts the operations of the rural bank to rural or primary producers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: To those who carry on industry.

The PREMIER: The advances are restricted to those who carry on industries. This falls very far short of the scope of general banking as carried out by the Associated Banks.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It covers a lot of the ground.

The PREMIER: I think there is considerable limitation as compared with the activities of a private bank.

Mr. Latham: Would this cover country storekeepers?

The PREMIER: I do not think they could be said to be carrying on an industry associated with primary production.

Mr. Latham: But they buy wheat and that sort of thing.

The PREMIER: The buying of wheat is not an industry. They are not producers, and would not come within the definition. The same thing would apply to a blacksmith. If that were so, the definition could be extended to an unlimited extent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: To motor cars.

The PREMIER: To the motor car agent and all other people. These are the powers with regard to lending. No limitation or restriction is placed upon deposits. Anyone may deposit money with the bank, as is done with any other bank.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You need not worry about that part of it.

The PREMIER: If we have regard to the manner in which the Commonwealth Bank has progressed, it will be found there is a decided tendency on the part of the public to invest in Government banks.

Mr. Latham: If we had power to get out a note issue it would be all right.

The PREMIER: These powers are similar to those given to the rural bank department in New South Wales and Victoria. We are not launching out in any experiment with regard to Government banking. As a matter of fact, the clauses dealing with the rural bank are taken almost entirely from the New South Wales legislation, and partly from the Victorian. The New South Wales sections are much wider than those of Victoria, and of a later date. This is not general banking such as is done by associated banks.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Will overdrafts be given to members of Parliament?

The PREMIER: I am afraid not.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about secrecy?

The PREMIER: I think there are sections in the existing Act dealing with secrecy. If not, it will be necessary to insert something in this Bill. I will look into the matter.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You would get no business if there were no such provisions.

The PREMIER: If it is in the existing Act it will cover the position. The point is worthy of consideration. The Bill provides that the State guarantees all moneys used by the rural bank, just as is the case with the savings bank.

Mr. Latham: When you deposit your money with the savings bank you do not need to specify in which department you are banking it.

The PREMIER: Not at all. The money will be pooled, as it were, and adjustments made monthly.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are not going to pay interest on deposits in the rural bank, are you?

The PREMIER: Yes, of course.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: At savings bank rates?

The PREMIER: In the usual way.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You will have the interest creeping up to about 10 per cent.

The PREMIER: I think the interest will be on the lines of private banks.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No bank in the world could pay it. Do you want to ruin people engaged in the industry?

The PREMIER: I do not think it would be right to pay on a daily balance. As we have given the power to the Savings Bank to invest in debentures, so is power given to the rural bank department to issue debentures and to affix the common seal of the bank.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What about the limitation in the Financial Agreement?

The PREMIER: I do not think there is much relationship between this Bill and the Financial Agreement. The issue of debentures is the only means by which we can raise the capital required to carry on a rural bank. The due payment of principal and interest on the debentures will be a charge on the securities of the bank, and provision is made for a guarantee by the State for the payment of interest and principal in respect to debentures issued by the rural bank. There are several machinery clauses relating to the issue and transfer of debentures that go with any principle of this kind. Provision is made that the proceeds from the issue of debentures shall be applied by the rural bank department in pursuance of Part IV. of the measure; that is to say, the proceeds of any debentures issued shall be applied exclusively to the rural bank side of the business and will have nothing to do with the Savings Bank side. It is laid down that loans shall be granted on first mortgage, except only where a prior encumbrance exists under the Wire and Wire Netting Act or other statutory charges upon the land.

Mr. Latham: You would not advance on a second mortgage if the Agricultural Bank held the first mortgage?

The PREMIER: The Agricultural Bank has enough trouble with the first mortgages, without our taking a second mortgage under this measure. I would be sorry if a farmer could obtain accommodation in both ways.

Mr. Latham: They do obtain accommodation from the associated banks under second mortgages.

The Minister for Lands: Only if the security is good enough.

The PREMIER: I do not think the farmer gets accommodation anywhere unless he has security, except perhaps when he commences on the land and then the security is the work he carries out. He does not obtain a loan until he has done the work.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Everybody talks of the farmer as if he were a darned pest.

The PREMIER: And regards him somewhat in the light of those things dealt with under the Vermin Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is a rotten attitude.

The PREMIER: I do not think anything offensive to the farmer has been said. There is a long clause dealing with the forfeiture of Crown land securities and the procedure necessary by the bank. The sanction of the bank must be obtained before any dealings can take place in land mortgaged to the bank. It is also provided that the net profits earned by the rural bank in any one year shall be placed to a reserve fund for meeting losses or deficiencies on the department's workings. As the Leader of the Opposition knows, the profits from the Savings Bank are paid to the Treasury, but any net profit from the rural bank will be paid into a reserve fund. The hon. member smiles as if he thought there would be no profit.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course not.

The PREMIER: Anyhow, whatever net profit there is will be paid to a reserve fund and provision is made for the fund to be invested. The Bill is easy to follow. It consists of only 27 clauses, many of which are formal. The principal provisions are contained in Clauses 7 to 22 and deal with the rural bank proposal. It may be argued that it is not necessary for the State to enter upon such business, but I think all who have been engaged in rural pursuits

for many years will agree that there is room for a bank of this kind. In travelling around the country districts I have frequently been asked by agriculturists and other people to establish a bank of this kind, in order that we might provide rural credit when private banks will not do so.

Mr. Latham: I do not think they will get all they expect from this proposal.

The PREMIER: I am not sure of that. I do not think the hon. member has had much opportunity as yet to study the Bill.

Mr. Latham: I have read it carefully.

The PREMIER: I am prepared to consider any proposals the hon. member might make to increase the scope of the bank. The Government do not want to go so far as to make it a general bank, but insofar as it is necessary to embrace all that is connected with rural industries and their actual development, I shall be prepared to go a long way. The purpose of the Bill is to assist to provide rural credit and enable people engaged in agricultural pursuits to do their banking through this institution. I think we shall be able to provide rural credit when other banks are disinclined to do so. Very often there is a tightening up by the private banks because of conditions existing in other States. Although we may have prosperous years and be doing good commercial business, because of depressed conditions in the Eastern States, where every one of our banks has its headquarters—there is no truly Western Australian Bank to-day—and where they have their general managers and directors and shareholders, there is a considerable curtailment of credit here because the money is required by the banks at headquarters. I venture to say that a large number of producers have found that to be so, and they have not been able to understand why credit has not been available to them, although good seasons have been experienced in this State. They have not looked beyond and realised that it was due to the fact of our banks being controlled outside Western Australia that the business done here has been balanced, as it were, with the business done in the Eastern States. Consequently, in times such as the present, when there is a great tightening of credit and when it is essential that primary producers should have credit available to them, this bank should be able to assist them, quite irrespective of

what the private banks may be doing because of conditions existing beyond the boundaries of the State.

Mr. Stubbs: It will not conflict with the Agricultural Bank?

The PREMIER: It will not come into touch with the Agricultural Bank in any shape or form. The Agricultural Bank will continue in the future as in the past, but the rural bank's work will be supplementary to the work of the Agricultural Bank. As members are aware, the Agricultural Bank, in conjunction with the Industries Assistance Board, has brought farmers out of a difficult and struggling position to a state of comparative independence. They have been able to wipe off their indebtedness not only to the Industries Assistance Board but to the Agricultural Bank. We have taken the risk in bad days, and then have handed over good clients as a going concern to the associated banks. If such a man desires to do his banking business with the State, he should be able to do it. I consider that the Agricultural Bank in itself is incomplete unless we supplement it with some such institution as a rural bank. I am not wedded to the scope of the Bill. If the measure can be improved in Committee, so long as the principle underlying the Bill is preserved, I shall be glad to listen to any amendments.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The main point is, where is the money to come from?

The PREMIER: I do not think there will be any difficulty in raising money by the issue of debentures.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You do not want to take money that is already in use.

The PREMIER: If people were inclined to withdraw their money from whatever direction it may be employed and take up debentures in the rural bank, they would be the class of people who would invest their money in Commonwealth bonds and similar securities. There is a class of investor who prefers the gilt-edged security. Such investors, I should say, would put their money into rural bank debentures, guaranteed by the State just as Savings Bank money is guaranteed, whereas otherwise they would put it into Commonwealth or similar securities. I agree that it is bad for the State for people to withdraw their capital from investment, or prevent its being put back into industry. If a person has £5,000 at his command and puts it into the further development of the agricultural or pastoral in-

dustry, the State derives much better results than it would do if the money were invested in Government bonds.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is no doubt about that.

Mr. Davy: Raising money in Australia results in its being withdrawn from work and invested with the Government.

The PREMIER: That was accentuated during the war and since the war, because the Commonwealth and the States have gone on the Australian market as borrowers to a large extent, and to that extent money is withdrawn from industries. Many people are content to put their money into Government stocks or bonds, and to sit down and draw the interest. On the other hand, it would be much better for the country if their money were put back into industries that assist in the development of the State. There would be a greater return to the whole of the people than would be possible if money were invested in Government stock, and the Government had the spending of it.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yet you are proposing this legislation in order to get people to invest their money in Government debentures!

The PREMIER: I claim that we will not encourage the diversion of money as suggested. I say we will draw off money only so far as it affects people who prefer to take up such debentures. I do not think it will affect money that would otherwise be used for the development of industries. We may divert some of the money that would otherwise go into Commonwealth bonds or other Government securities. Then again the money lent to the State Savings Bank under the Bill will assist the State in that it will be devoted to the development of our agricultural areas by means of loans to farmers and others, and that will do more good for the State than if the money were to be invested in Commonwealth securities to be spent elsewhere for other purposes. These are the main features of the Bill, and I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

## BILL—DRIED FRUITS ACT CONTINUANCE.

### *Council's Amendment.*

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

### *In Committee.*

Mr. Lambert in the Chair; the Minister for Agriculture in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Delete the words “thirty-one” in the last line and insert “thirty-two.”

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: The Bill sought to continue the operations of the Dried Fruits Act from the 31st March, 1930, to the 31st March, 1931. The effect of the Council's amend is to extend it to 1932, thus providing for a two years' extension instead of for 12 months only. I see no particular objection to the Council's amendment.

Mr. Davy: You do not intend to accept it!

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: It merely extends the operations of the Act for another year.

Mr. Davy: That is 100 per cent. objection.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: We can understand any member objecting to the course suggested if he is opposed to the Bill itself. As I pointed out during the second reading stage, this is a controlling measure, and as such should have a period fixed for its continuance. We are working in co-operation with the Commonwealth and the Eastern States in the control of dried fruits. In New South Wales the Act is a continuous one, whereas in other States a five-year period is provided. Our measure would be useless if we did not provide for the continuation of the legislation to bring us into line with the Eastern States where the dried fruits industry is carried on. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. DAVY: When the Legislative Council sends down an amendment, we should give it due consideration.

Mr. Sleeman: But not too much.

Mr. DAVY: We should grasp what they are driving at. The Minister seems to have a perfect love for amendments received from another place. When amendments are moved here, I do not say that he turns them down with contempt, because he is never rude, but he does turn them down firmly. When

amendments, often exactly similar, are received from the Legislative Council, he agrees to them with avidity. A few days ago amendments received from the Council were accepted readily and were welcomed by the Minister. Some of them represented amendments that had actually been moved in this Chamber, but the Minister would not listen to them here.

The Minister for Agriculture: They were all innocuous, and did not amount to anything.

Mr. DAVY: Then why did not the Minister accept them here?

The Minister for Agriculture: All that they set out could have been done, and would have been done, by way of regulations.

Mr. DAVY: That is not the point. The amendments were moved in Committee here and rejected firmly by the Minister. When they were received from the Legislative Council, he accepted them as being right and proper.

The Minister for Agriculture: No.

Mr. DAVY: Then what is the matter? Is the Minister afraid of himself? Does he regard amendments moved in this Chamber as traps?

Mr Sleeman: They are more likely to be traps when received from another place.

Mr. DAVY: I should imagine so.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not reflect upon another place.

Mr. DAVY: That is so, and I do not wish to reflect upon the members there. As the result of our experience of each other, gained during the six years we have been together, I should think we should be able to impose a certain amount of trust in each other, and give each other credit for sincerity, even though we may be wrong at times. I take it the Government framed the Bill in their wisdom and considered that the measure was one that should not remain on the statute book for all time, but should be reviewed from year to year. Personally, I think it should be looked into at once and then kicked into the waste paper basket, to remain there for the rest of the time Parliament exists in Western Australia.

The Minister for Agriculture: We could not do that.

Mr. DAVY: Although the Minister does not agree with me on that point, he shares my distrust and dislike of the Act sufficiently to say that it should not be made permanent, but should be reviewed from time to time.

The Minister for Agriculture: I assure you that the Eastern States Acts are for a longer period than ours.

Mr. DAVY: They do things in the Eastern States that make me shudder! Their legislation is infinitely worse than I have ever feared Western Australian legislation could become! As we decided that the extension of the Act should be for one year, I cannot see any justification for accepting the amendment from the Council.

The Minister for Agriculture: You do not believe in control, but you would not like the Eastern States to dump their fruit in Western Australia!

Mr. DAVY: The measure will not have the slightest effect on that. That is not the object of the Bill. The point is that the Government decided that the Act was so dangerous that it ought not to be on the statute-book for more than one year at a time.

The Minister for Agriculture: It ought not to be permanent.

Mr. DAVY: No, and the Government decided that we should reconsider the matter from year to year.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think the Government did anything of the sort. That position was forced on them by the Legislative Council.

Mr. DAVY: At any rate, the Government asked Parliament this year to decide that the Act should be continued for one year. Had they thought it advisable to continue it for two years, they would have legislated accordingly. The amendment is one that should not be accepted from a House of review. I am surprised and pained that the Minister should be so ready to accept it, and I shall vote against it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I can understand the member for West Perth being opposed to the extension of legislation of this kind, because we know from his utterances he is not deeply interested in the welfare of the producers of this country.

Mr. DAVY: That is a most unfair thing to say! I am surprised at you!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I warn the hon. member that he should be careful in his attacks upon the introducers of legislation of this description.

Mr. DAVY: I have not attacked anyone! You are doing the attacking!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am doing so in the interests of the hon. member, and

I am endeavouring to save him from himself!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The member for West Perth must be much obliged to you!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I would remind the hon. member of what happened to the member for Perth in the House of Representatives who was disloyal to his party regarding both his actions and his utterances. In this particular instance, the legislation affecting the dried fruits industry was fathered by the National Party through the Federal Government. Therefore the hon. member should be careful when he launches an attack on his own party in respect of legislation such as that now before us. The Bill is required because the Commonwealth Government initiated such legislation to save the producers from disaster. It was to protect returned soldiers who had taken up land and were interested in viticulture.

Mr. Latham: And for the protection of the people of the State.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think the Federal Government were much interested in the welfare of the settlers of this State, but were influenced by the parlous position in which the settlers on the Murray Flats in South Australia and, to an extent, others in Victoria and New South Wales found themselves, and they introduced legislation to enable them to render the assistance required for the protection of the struggling growers. That was useless unless the States co-operated, and each State interested in viticulture extended that co-operation by passing the necessary legislation. In this State the legislation introduced was to have been permanent but the limitation was forced upon the Government by another place. In introducing the Bill now before us, the Government no doubt thought they would please the Council by continuing that limitation and fixing the extended period to one year only, but in this instance the Council have decided that the extension should be for two years. There is a definite reason for that, and it is a practical proposition. The board to administer the legislation is elected for two years and surely it is merely common sense to continue the operations of the Act for a similar period! I am sorry it is not being extended for five years. The growers in this State were in a deplorable condition. They organised themselves with a view to placing the marketing of their products on a reasonably profitable basis,

but they failed. Since the board has been in control of the position, its efforts have succeeded and the dried fruits have been marketed on a basis that has returned a fair profit to the growers. The members of the board have arranged the percentage of exports by each producer, thus enabling the balance to be marketed in Australia at reasonable prices.

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

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If we had not an Act such as this, the other States would be able to exploit our local market, rendering the position of our producers absolutely impossible; and that position is bad enough now, without inter-state competition. This legislation was introduced here because of the passing of the Commonwealth legislation. The board have been functioning, have appealed to the producers and have been re-elected by them. Moreover, the producers in conference have recently declared themselves unanimously in favour of the Act. The dried fruits industry has been materially assisted by the board's operations, which have prevented disastrous dumping. My only regret is that the Council have not made the period five or ten years. Control of the industry is essential, as is proved by the almost world-wide adoption of similar measures and devices.

Mr. STUBBS: For various reasons I support the Council's amendment. Largely, I am in accord with the previous speaker's views. Co-operation is essential to the existence of the dried fruits industry; but those engaged in that industry should be warned that there must be, as well as co-operation, a system of marketing that will ensure our fruit bearing inspection and passing muster. Many of our growers have in the past placed on the market fruit equal to that coming from California, and from the Mediterranean countries, in which countries labour is cheap. Assuredly I do not advocate cheap labour for Australia. I regard cheap labour as incompatible with permanent prosperity.

Mr. Sampson: The Mexican labour employed in California's fruit industry is low-priced.

Mr. STUBBS: No member is justified in voting for the Bill unless he holds that Australia can produce the article in a form acceptable to customers. Not long ago growers produced to me fruit the taste of which

was excellent, but which lacked bloom, and appearance. That incident illustrates the difficulties encountered by growers. It is in the finishing touches some growers fail. The Commonwealth legislation protects growers against themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is making a nice second reading speech, but his remarks are not relevant to the question before the Chair.

Mr. STUBBS: Let us give the men who have returned from the firing line a chance to make good in the Swan Valley and elsewhere. Let us try to keep within the State the money this community spends on dried fruits.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In reply to the member for Guildford, we are not now dealing with co-operation, but with marketing. The Bill is well understood, a similar measure having been passed more than once.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the amendment is well understood, in view of the way members have been straying.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I shall either deal with the amendment or sit down. The amendment means that the people of this State shall for two years pay more for dried fruits than people at Home will be paying.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is not the producers you are worrying about.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Nothing like what this Bill proposes is done in Denmark, the home of co-operation, which sells its products abroad. The Bill compels our people to pay more for fruit in order that the industry may survive.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is not all it does.

Hon. Sir James MITCHELL: Absolutely that is what the Bill does. We are willing that it should be done, but let us not deceive the people. I do not believe in humbugging either the public or the producer.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Bill assists the producer, and you do not like that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member interjecting never in his life, I believe, assisted anybody. I am perfectly willing to do for the dried fruits industry what is done by legislation for the sugar industry and the butter industry. I am not averse to passing the amendment as it is; I know we are going to continue this method of dealing with dried fruits for years to come.

The Minister for Agriculture: We have to.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But I want to be clear about what we are doing. We are asked to say this method of control shall last for two years instead of one. We can pass the amendment with advantage to the taxpayers, if only to save the cost of discussion.

Mr. LATHAM: I am glad the Minister has agreed to accept the amendment. I will not have it that another place has no right to amend our legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: Their rights are not disputed; the question is whether the period shall be one year or two.

Mr. LATHAM: They have made a recommendation to this House.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but their rights are not in question.

Mr. LATHAM: All I am sorry for is that we have not made it for a longer period. When the original Act was introduced in 1926 the period then fixed was 1930, and since then this is the first time the Bill has been before us. It must have been an oversight on the part of the Minister when he fixed the extension for one year. I am sorry it is not five years.

Mr. SAMPSON: I feel that this Chamber and the State owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Yelland, a member of another place, for submitting the amendment to extend the period.

The Premier: Now you have settled it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I regret that the hon. member did not go further. He could have followed the very good example set by the growers in South Australia.

The Minister for Lands: A rotten example!

Mr. SAMPSON: I would like the hon. member to hear a portion of the text of a petition presented to the Premier of South Australia as recorded in the "Murray Pioneer"—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Surely the hon. member has been here long enough to know that he cannot transgress the Standing Orders in this disgraceful manner. The question is whether the word "two" shall be inserted instead of "one."

The Premier: And confine yourself to Western Australia.

Mr. SAMPSON: You are aware as well as I am that any matter properly bearing on this subject—

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled that what the hon. member wants to quote has no bearing on the subject, directly or indirectly.

I do not know whether the hon. member has read the Council's amendment; if not, I will read it to him.

Mr. SAMPSON: I submit that the action being taken in South Australia has a direct bearing on this clause, and it is an action we might well emulate. The amendment is a further indication that organisation along the lines of the measure is essential.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That question is not being discussed. The hon. member must confine the discussion to the Council's amendment; otherwise I shall not allow him to proceed.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am in favour of extending the period to 1932 because at this juncture it is impossible to secure an indefinite extension. We had an opportunity the other evening to note the increasing popularity that organisation in respect of marketing is receiving. We had an instance of it in the Sandalwood Bill which was accepted without opposition. Travelling in the other States we find that the principle is also being adopted. Orderly marketing versus chaos can be properly brought into this.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will soon be in a state of chaos if he does not speak to the amendment.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope, Mr. Chairman, you are not saying that seriously.

The CHAIRMAN: I am saying it over-seriously, because I have already warned the hon. member.

Mr. SAMPSON: I support the amendment from another place. It is desirable that the period should be longer if only because our Notice Paper is flooded every year with Bills to re-enact statutes and which very largely are formal measures.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is remarkable the right-about-turn taken by some hon. members in this House. If we had a jam industry, would they do for that what they are doing for the dried fruits industry? The same remarks can be made to apply to the manufacture of implements in the State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: For one or two years.

Mr. SLEEMAN: One or two or five years, or ever and ever, amen, if you like. When a measure such as the Dried Fruits Bill is brought forward we are told it is our duty to support it. I agree it is, but when it comes to other industries hon. members opposite forget all about them. I hope members will be a little more consistent when

other Bills dealing with industries come up for consideration.

Mr. DAVY: I seem to be the only person objecting to this. I remember when the Bill was originally introduced, the member for Guildford made an impassioned speech and expressed great disappointment that the Minister for Lands submitted it somewhat apologetically. He said he could not understand why the Minister for Lands should be apologetic because he said it was a socialist party in Parliament and this was a socialistic measure. I remember, too, the then member for North-East Fremantle expressing amazement at any person claiming to be a socialist thinking the Bill could have the slightest resemblance to socialism. It is not socialism, it is purely selfish syndicalism.

The CHAIRMAN: Not the slightest resemblance to the amendment proposed by another place.

Mr. DAVY: What has not?

The CHAIRMAN: Your remarks.

Mr. DAVY: I stand corrected, but perhaps I have been led slightly from the straight and narrow path because of the latitude allowed by you, Mr. Chairman, to the member for Guildford. I shall continue to protest against this form of legislation, not because I am opposed to the dried fruits industry or the interests of the people in it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They would interpret it the same way that I do.

Mr. DAVY: There might be some excuse for them to do so, but there is no excuse for the member for Guildford interpreting it in any such way. For the member for Guildford to pretend that because I oppose this Bill I am opposed to the interests of the persons engaged in the dried fruits industry is a greater piece of humbug than the Bill as it is. If an hon. member cannot oppose a measure that purports to be in the interests of certain persons without being accused of opposition to those persons, free debate and honest expression of opinion in this House will gradually vanish. My opposition to the Bill and to the Council's amendment is that it cannot be anything but in the worst interests of Western Australia, that it is a piece of legalised extortion from the bulk of the people in favour of one section of the people, who by this measure are artificially kept in the industry which, as the member for Swan has assured us, can never possibly stand on its own feet.



Mr. Sampson: Not if the present economic situation continues.

Mr. DAVY: Since we can look forward to its continuance for many years to come, apparently those people can never hope to run their industry economically. Am I to be accused of being opposed to those people because I desire that they should get out of this industry and into something they can carry on profitably and without artificial assistance? I said the other night, and the member for Swan did not deny it,—

Mr. Sampson: While you are speaking there is not much chance to deny anything you say.

Mr. DAVY: When another member makes an intelligent interjection, I pause.

The Premier: That is why you never pause.

Mr. DAVY: Well, if an hon. member looks intelligent enough, I will pause.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, you look at the Chairman.

Mr. DAVY: I object to being accused of being hostile to individuals because I oppose some Bill. Surely one is entitled to take the view that this measure, evil if it is to be continued for one year, and doubly evil if continued for two years, is not really in the interests of the producers of dried fruits at all.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then they do not know what they are doing? They know more than you do about this industry.

Mr. DAVY: I know nothing about it, but I do know that to keep a number of people engaged in an industry by compelling them to join in the combine and charge the people of Western Australia sufficient, not only to pay for what the people of Western Australia consume, but also to pay for over ten times that quantity, which is exported abroad, is the maddest kind of folly. I know, too, that eventually, when all other industries are given the same protection, we shall get the hideous crash we are bound to have if we do not stop our folly. I am convinced that this measure is bad for Western Australia and particularly bad for the people engaged in this industry.

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

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

## MOTION—ABORIGINES ACT.

### *To Disallow Regulation.*

Debate resumed from the 30th October, upon the following motion moved by Mr. Coverley:

That this House disagrees with amended Regulation 13a under the Aborigines Act, 1905, laid upon the Table of the House on the 16th October, 1929; and that the regulation be hereby disallowed.

## THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

Hon. H. Millington—Leederville) [8.8]: The regulation this motion seeks to disallow gives power to the Chief Protector of Aborigines to grant permits to take photographs within an aborigines' station or reserve. It is conceded that it is necessary to have this power, but the objection taken by the member for Kimberley is that the power is vested in the Chief Protector of Aborigines, not in the Minister. Our experience is that it is very necessary to have such a regulation. However, we do not disagree with the hon. member, who suggests that it might be preferable that the power should vest in the Minister. Therefore, if the hon. member is agreeable to let the regulation stand, we will give an undertaking that the regulation shall be altered and that the power, instead of being vested in the Chief Protector of Aborigines, shall be vested in the Minister. If that will meet the objection of the hon. member, I will give an undertaking that the necessary alterations shall be made in the regulation.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.10]: I understand from the member for Kimberley that already there is in the Act sufficient power to prevent anybody from going on to an aborigines' reserve at all. If people are prohibited by law from going on to such a reserve, I cannot see any necessity for the regulation.

The Premier: It may be desirable that some people should be allowed to take photographs, while others are not.

Mr. LATHAM: But already they are prohibited by law from going on to an aborigines' reserve.

The Premier: We do not wish to prohibit some people from taking photographs, but others we do.

Mr. LATHAM: Evidently there is some reason for this regulation, but the House is

not informed as to what that reason is. Until we hear something further than we have heard from the Minister for Agriculture, I will support the motion to disallow the regulation. It is a violation of the law for anybody to go on to an aborigines' reserve, so the Minister has not the power to grant permission to anybody to enter upon such a reserve. The only way out I can see is that a person wishing to take a photograph should stand outside the reserve to take his picture.

The Minister for Works: There are picket fences all around these aborigines' reserves.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course the Minister knows all about it, and I would not contradict him.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The whole thing is against the Act.

Mr. LATHAM: That is so. I do not know where Ministers get the power to allow persons to go on to natives' reserves, and consequently I do not see how permission can be granted to anybody to take photographs on such reserves. Of course the object of the regulation may be to prevent the servants of the State engaged on those reserves from taking photographs without the consent of the Minister. I do not know what the object really is.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And I do not know what attraction the photographer can find.

Mr. LATHAM: We are asked to deal with a regulation we know nothing about, and I think the Minister for Agriculture might have made it clear why the regulation was framed, and why power should be vested in the Minister to override the law.

**MR. COVERLEY** (Kimberley—in reply) [S.12]: My object in moving the motion was to have vested in the Minister the power which, under the regulation, is to be vested in the Chief Protector of Aborigines. On the assurance of the Minister for Agriculture that the regulation will be so altered as to vest the power in the Minister, by leave of the House I will withdraw the motion.

Leave refused.

Motion put and negatived.

## MOTION—MAIN ROADS BOARD.

### *Contributory Local Authorities.*

Debate resumed from the 30th October upon the following motion moved by Mr. Griffiths:—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing—(a) The names of each local authority that is to contribute 22½ per cent. of its license revenue to the Main Roads Board. (b) The amount of unimproved land value in each local authority's area. (c) The amount of license revenue each receives from vehicular sources. (d) The value of proposed main road work in each area.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum—South Fremantle) [8.14]: I think I understand just what is desired by the mover of the motion, although certainly it is not clearly stated. In paragraph (a) the hon. member desires the names of each local authority that is to contribute 22½ per cent. of its license revenue to the main roads fund. It is not stated under what law or regulation, or proposal, that 22½ per cent. is to be contributed. It says "is to contribute to the Main Roads Board." How and when?

Mr. Latham: That is implied in the legislation we have passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is no law to say that any local authority has to contribute 22½ per cent. No Act has been passed to that effect. This motion does not say under what provision this comes, whether it is a suggested law, an Act, a regulation, a proposal, or what it is.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It passed this House.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not the law of the country.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not yet.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. The motion does not say to what this applies. The first point I make against the motion is that it does not indicate, if I have to get out a return showing the 22½ per cent., under what law, regulation, or proposal I am to examine the whole question. Under what law, regulation, or decision am I to compile a return regarding the 22½ per cent.? There is nothing to guide the department as to what is intended.

Mr. Latham: You know what is meant.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The mover should have told the House what he meant.

Mr. Latham: There is no need for a sermon.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Such a thing as this should not have been brought before Parliament. It does not indicate what is in the mind of the mover. The second point is that there is no decision of Parliament on the subject. A Bill is before another place and there is no telling whether it will become law or not. The work set out in this proposal is pretty considerable, and it appears to me it would be wrong to incur the expense and take up the time of the department in compiling the information for something which may never become the law of the land. It is a waste of money. The information may not be of use to anyone if the Bill fails to pass. In (b) it says, "the amount of unimproved land values in each local authority area." Whose value?

Mr. Latham: That is easy to obtain.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Is it? I know of at least two different valuations, namely the local road board valuations, and the State land tax valuations. Which one does he want?

Mr. Latham: The one you are taking, the department's.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Which department?

Mr. Latham: The Taxation Department.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: How does the hon. member know that?

Mr. Latham: I know they take the valuation of the department.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member does not know what will be done by the department. Here is a motion which says that the unimproved land value is required. The local authorities place their own valuations upon land, and the Taxation Department put on a separate valuation. This motion does not say whether it is the local authority's valuation, the Taxation Department's valuation, or someone else's.

The Premier: Or the farmer's valuation, which is a very low one.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is nothing to set out exactly what is intended.

Mr. Latham: You are only stone-walling.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I want to show how ridiculous it is to put up a proposition framed as this is, and claim for it the serious consideration of Parliament. It would also put the department to time, trouble and expense at the cost of the taxpayer to get information which may not

be needed. The question is put up in a vague and ambiguous manner. It may mean 100 different things. We do not know what it means. In (c) the motion says, "the amount of license revenue each receives from vehicular sources." To get that information the department would have to communicate with every local governing body and ask for the information. If the hon. member wants that he should do it himself.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you have got it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It should not be obtained by officers of the Public Service. We have not got the information.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You brought it to the House and told us how much you would get under the system.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I compiled figures for certain years in order to get information for the Bill I introduced. I got this by writing specially for it. The motion does not say for what year the information is required, whether it be for the 10 years past, for 10 years hence, or for this or last year. How am I to know? This does not tell me what is wanted. It does not say what period is covered. The way the motion is framed is absolutely ridiculous. If the hon. member wants information at the expense of the taxpayers, it is his job to write for it himself. In (d) the motion says, "the value of proposed main road work in each area." The value of what work? Does the hon. member mean the value of the work which has been done since the scheme started, or the value of the work done in any year, or of that which is likely to be done for 10, 20 or 30 years? Have you, Sir, in all your experience, seen a proposition put up to Parliament so meaningless and so impossible to answer and deal with as this motion?

The Premier: It must mean the value for the next ten years.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: To take up the time of the House in bringing forward a proposition such as this is an abuse of the privileges of Parliament.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is an abuse of Parliamentary privilege.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Instead of agreeing that officers of the service should devote their time to compiling this information, it would be better if we passed a vote of censure on the hon. member for

taking up the time of the House by submitting such a meaningless, vague and impossible proposition.

Mr. Latham: We will extend it to you for your services.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The House would be wrong to direct that this information should be obtained. It is impossible for any person to know what is intended by the motion. If I set the staff of the department to answer these questions they might look at them from a hundred different aspects, and then be unable to satisfy the hon. member.

The Premier: And the election would be over before we got the information.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It would cost a considerable sum of money to get, and would mean a waste of valuable time on the part of officers, who could spend it in a very much better way. Although the motion does not say so, I suppose it refers to the Bill now before another place. That may never become law, and the information may never be of any value to anyone. It is a waste of time and money to compile it. I doubt if anyone could understand the motion, or could say what information is really required to answer the questions asked.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam) [8.23]: It is not the fault of the mover that the Minister does not understand the question. He does not want to understand it. It is quite clear that the hon. member wishes to get the names of each local authority who will contribute the 22½ per cent. from their license revenue, if the Bill before another place becomes law. The Minister should give the fullest information on the point. He has told the House what he will collect.

The Minister for Works: If I have told the House, why is a return asked for?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The sum has been published. The Minister must have made it up by getting the names of the local authorities who would contribute that amount of license fees. It would be easy to give the House the information. I hope members will not be influenced by the Minister's way of dealing with the question, and, in the interests of their own local authorities, will insist on the information being supplied. It will not cost anything to carry out the terms of the motion. If it did cost

a lot of money, the Minister might well ask the House to pause before passing the motion. Already the Minister has sufficient information at his disposal to satisfy members. With regard to the unimproved land value, no doubt it would cause considerable trouble to get the information, because the Minister has not dealt with that side of the question. He could give us all the information about license fees if he cared to. The motion asks the value of the proposed main road work each year. The hon. member means the amount of money to be spent.

The Minister for Works: Which year or for which period? How can you place a value on the work?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister cannot place a value on the work, but can show the amount it is proposed to spend.

The Minister for Works: The motion does not say that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member may have made a mistake.

The Premier: How do you know that? He may have meant what he says.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I agree that the Minister cannot set any value on the work done, but he can say the amount to be expended.

The Minister for Works: The work done may be worth thousands more than was spent.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member wants to know what it is proposed to spend. We ought to be careful about the expenditure of these moneys. We were not careful when we appointed a man recently at a cost of £700 or £800 a year.

The Minister for Works: I showed that this would mean a saving of money.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It will not mean that. It was wrong to make the appointment. The Premier has to-day asked us to agree to amend certain Bills dealing with the Civil Service. Appointments such as this, should be brought under the Act, so that money can be saved to the Main Roads Board and other departments. Money is being wasted by the appointment I have just referred to. I want to know the name of the official concerned. I understand that £3,000 more was given for certain material by reason of the lowest tender, put in by a satisfactory firm, not being accepted. That is a lot of money. I will move to-morrow for the production of the papers. The Min-

ister has certainly explained the matter in his own way.

The Minister for Works: Move for the papers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I will. If we have thousands to give away in this fashion, there should be no question about giving the House this information to enable us to do our work properly.

Mr. Withers: You would not ask for information pending something happening.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The session will be over by the time the Bill is passed, and we shall never have an opportunity to deal with the matter. The hon. member wants the information the Minister used when he introduced the Bill.

The Minister for Works: Then why does he want a return now?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister said so much would be collected on the basis of 22½ per cent. and so on. The hon. member now wants the names of the boards which will contribute 22½ per cent. The Minister must have the information; so we are not asking for much expenditure in connection with the return.

The Minister for Works: How can you say what he wants? You cannot interpret that motion.

The Premier: It is difficult to justify the hon. member's arguments.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Why do the Government want to avoid giving the information? What is behind their refusal? Why this laughter from the Government side? Has this question been discussed by caucus, and has it been decided that the hon. member shall not be given the information? Of course that is the position. They are afraid to give the hon. member the information—afraid that the boards will know how they are to be treated.

Mr. Withers interjected.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The road boards in the Bunbury electorate will want to know this information, but the member for Bunbury says they are not to know. There is a nigger in the woodpile. Members opposite are blind followers of the Government and must support them. I suppose every one of them represents a road board, and I hope the road boards will remember that they decided that information dealing with business of the country was not to be made available to them.

The Minister for Works: You will try hard.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is scandalous that we should have to stand here and tear up a speech delivered by the Minister. Fancy the Minister talking to a member on this side of the House as he has done! It is not that he cannot give the information; it is that he does not wish to give it, and perhaps in a way he is wise. Members opposite may smile and vote with the Minister, but they will have to vote on this question.

MR. LATHAM (York) [8.32]: I regret that the Minister has not viewed the matter differently. He must realise that members on this side of the House have a perfect right to ask for information. They represent an intelligent body of electors, just as do members opposite. I am sure members on the Government side would not like to be treated in this way. It may be that the member for Avon has not been quite definite enough in framing this motion, but without doubt his intentions are perfectly clear. I have not discussed the matter with him but I guarantee that I can interpret his wishes.

Mr. Withers: Did he not speak on the second reading of the Bill?

Mr. LATHAM: We are not discussing the Bill.

Mr. Withers: The Bill has not yet become law.

Mr. LATHAM: I am discussing the motion of the member for Avon, who has asked for certain information that is of vital interest to the local governing bodies in his electorate, of which there are several. I am sorry the Minister has not agreed to give the information. I know there cannot be any great difficulty in obtaining answers to the first two requests.

The Minister for Works: Take the second, what values does he mean?

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member meant the Taxation Department's valuations.

The Premier: How do you know that if you have not consulted him?

Mr. LATHAM: I am interpreting his request.

The Minister for Works: I am interpreting it quite differently.

Mr. LATHAM: I know the Minister well enough to be sure that he could take an intelligent view of the question.

The Minister for Works: Would it not be just as intelligent to take the local government valuations?

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister knows that in nearly every instance the valuations of the Taxation Department have been accepted by the local authority.

The Minister for Works: I know nothing of the sort; in fact I know the contrary.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister is not controlling local governing bodies at present.

The Minister for Works: I know that statement is quite wrong.

Mr. LATHAM: A great many of the local authorities have adopted the Taxation Department's valuations.

The Minister for Works: Quite a few.

Mr. LATHAM: A great many of them. All of them have not, because the whole of the valuations have not been completed.

The Minister for Works: Which one would you take?

Mr. LATHAM: I think I am interpreting the hon. member's intentions when I say he desired the Taxation Department's valuations.

The Minister for Works: And you yourself say they have not yet been completed.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member really had no need to ask that question, because he could have obtained the information from the annual report of the Taxation Department. As regards the amount of license revenue each local authority receives from vehicular sources, there is no doubt the Minister had those figures when he introduced the Bill.

The Minister for Works: But for what year?

Mr. LATHAM: The current year.

The Minister for Works: I have not got them.

Mr. LATHAM: Well, for last year.

The Minister for Works: I had to write specifically in order to get them.

Mr. LATHAM: I know the Minister has them.

The Premier: How do you know the hon. member wanted the figures for last year? The motion does not say so.

Mr. LATHAM: I am interpreting the motion.

The Premier: You may be entirely wrong.

Mr. LATHAM: I may be, but I do not think I am.

The Premier: How were the Government to know what the hon. member meant?

Mr. LATHAM: I am not going to be led astray in that way.

The Premier: There is no leading astray about it.

Mr. LATHAM: The Premier is as capable of judging the hon. member's intentions as I am. There was no need to deliver a sermon on the shortcomings of the hon. gentleman in his method of putting up questions. We can frame questions only so far as our capabilities permit us. The Minister might at least have said that he would like the motion amended to make more clear the intention of the hon. member.

The Premier: It would not have been agreed to by the House.

Mr. LATHAM: I would not mind that, but I do object to Ministers delivering sermons to members.

The Premier: The Minister is entitled to speak in any manner he likes.

Mr. LATHAM: But I object to it.

The Premier: You can object.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister would not like us to treat him in that way.

The Premier: I have known more objectionable things to be done by the hon. member, who gave his word and ran away from it the next day.

Mr. LATHAM: I know very well that I did not do so.

The Premier: Broke your word the next day.

Mr. LATHAM: I did not, and I defy the Premier to say that I ever did so.

The Premier: You did it on the franchise Bill.

Mr. LATHAM: I did not. I did not give an undertaking to support the third reading of that Bill. I stood to what I undertook to do.

The Premier: I know what you undertook.

Mr. LATHAM: And I stood to my undertaking.

The Premier: You did not.

Mr. LATHAM: I know what I undertook, to do.

Hon. G. Taylor: You erred on the second reading.

Mr. LATHAM: I voted on the second reading and I also voted a second time that day, but I did not give an undertaking regarding the third reading. I have never given an undertaking and run away from it, and I hope that so long as I am here I shall never do so. Consequently we have settled that point.

Hon. G. Taylor: It is not too clear yet.

Mr. LATHAM: I think the Minister for Works will realise that the member for Avon is entitled to the information.

The Minister for Works: How do you interpret paragraph (d)?

Mr. LATHAM: I interpret it to mean the value of the work proposed for the year.

The Minister for Works: Which year?

Mr. LATHAM: The current year.

The Minister for Works: The work that it is proposed to do this year and three or four months of the year have gone? I do not know what it means.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister might have considered that it covered the five or six years' work.

The Minister for Works: I would say it covered the full ten years' period.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know whether the Minister has a schedule of works for the ten years, but I know the local authorities were asked to forward recommendations for a period of years ahead. Suppose the hon. member did not make himself quite clear, it would not have been difficult to ask him to amend his motion so that it would be understood. There is a better way of doing it than that adopted by the Minister. I am sorry the Minister has not agreed to supply the information.

Mr. Withers: Have another second reading speech on a Bill already passed by the House!

Mr. LATHAM: It is not a second-reading speech. The motion could have been amended to make quite clear the hon. member's intention.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.42]: I propose to support the hon. member in asking for this information. I am disappointed at the attitude adopted by the Minister for Works and the Premier. The intention of the hon. member can easily be determined.

The Premier: We cannot be expected to be mind readers.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a question not of being mind readers, but of answering questions. Some particulars are annually submitted to the departments.

The Premier: If they are, why not get them from the reports?

Mr. SAMPSON: It would take a good deal of dissecting to arrive at the information.

The Minister for Works: Which one is annually submitted to the department? Not one of them.

Mr. SAMPSON: The information asked for in paragraph (b). While those figures are given in the local government returns,

they are not shown separately, and some dissection would be required. How could the hon. member dissect the figures?

The Minister for Works: Why not take the returns of the Commissioner of Taxation? How do I know which return was meant?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister should have done what I would have done in the circumstances.

The Minister for Works: I do not think there is much chance of that.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think the Minister should have taken the return relating to the particular department or branch referred to. There is no one of whom I would ask a question with greater confidence of getting the right answer in certain circumstances than the Premier.

Hon. G. Taylor: That will bring him.

Mr. SAMPSON: Especially if the question were submitted in a respectful way. That has been done. The motion was received by you, Mr. Speaker, and no objection was raised by the Minister at the time. Later on the Minister gave it consideration and said, "I am not going to take this motion; I shall put it back on to the member for Avon and pour ridicule on his head." That was very painful.

The Minister for Works: I think I was very kind.

Mr. SAMPSON: Cruel only to be kind, maybe, but not altogether kind. From this question—

The Premier: An absurd, electioneering question brought forward every day! I am tired of them.

Mr. SAMPSON: From this question there may be derived some information that will be helpful not only to the member for Avon but to others who are desirous of knowing the names of the local authorities who are to contribute the 22½ per cent.

The Premier: Contributing 22½ per cent of what?

Mr. SAMPSON: Of the traffic fees.

The Premier: To whom?

Mr. SAMPSON: To the Main Roads Board.

Mr. Withers: Under which Act?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier knows this matter so well that he realises the position. It was, comparatively speaking, only yesterday that we were discussing it, and the position is fresh in the minds of hon. members. It is a matter of paramount import-

ance to members interested in road work, to secure this information. We should applaud the hon. member's industry and activity in seeking to obtain the information indicated in the motion. In other circumstances, this would be a virtue; now it seems to be a crime! The spectacle of the Minister for Works acknowledging that he could not understand what was meant by the series of questions, is likely to damage his reputation. With a good deal of confidence, I could say there is not one of the questions to which the Minister could not give an approximately correct answer without reference to his department. The Minister has the payments fairly well tabulated in his mind now, for he was the chairman of the select committee that dealt with this matter. Notwithstanding what has been said, I hope the information will be forthcoming. With your persuasive eloquence, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would be able to induce the Minister to furnish it.

The Minister for Works: You are paying a great compliment to the Speaker.

Mr. Chesson: You must have kissed the Blarney stone.

Mr. SAMPSON: I support the motion, and hope the House will agree to it.

**MR. H. A. GRIFFITHS** (Avon—in reply) [8.48]: The Minister for Works was pleased to be facetious—I will put it that way. When I was giving evidence before the select committee, of which the Minister was chairman, the fact was mentioned that the Kellerberrin people wanted the petrol tax. The Minister, in his usual courteous way, said to me, "Do you not know that the petrol tax is ultra vires; it is out?" I replied that I had been in the country for some time. He replied facetiously, "Where have you been for the last nine months?"

The Minister for Works: The last two years!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: At any rate, it was nine months that you mentioned then.

The Minister for Works: Away in the country for two days, and did not know what had happened during two years!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Think of the humorous nature of this Minister. Only a night or two before that he had told the House that the petrol tax was likely to be

revived in South Australia, and that is what I referred to. The Minister knew that, but he tried to throw ridicule on what I had to say, as he always attempts to do here.

The Minister for Works: Absent in the country for two days, and did not know what had happened during two years!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: There he goes! That is a sample of what the Minister always does. He gives half truths. In this instance the petrol tax was likely to be revived in South Australia and he told the House that he was watching the position with a great deal of interest because we would take steps in this State if possible. That is what I alluded to, and that demonstrates the sarcasm indulged in by the Minister. You, Mr. Minister, know what I want just as well as I do.

The Minister for Works: I am not a mind-reader.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: You know very well what the question means.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order The hon. member must address the Chair, not the Minister.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The Minister knows what the 22½ per cent. refers to. His smoke-screen does not cut any ice with me. I told him that if it would mean a lot of expense to compile the return, I would not press for it. There was no need for the Minister for Works, in his Mussolini style, to rise and talk in the way he did. As to the question relating to land values, the idea in my mind was that the Taxation Department would—

The Minister for Works: There you go; you were wrong.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The intention was there all right, and it is all very well for the Minister to throw out his smoke-screen.

The Minister for Works: The member for York says you were wrong.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The Minister could give some approximate idea because he has the figures in his office.

The Minister for Works: I have not.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Then there was the question regarding the value of the main roads.



The Premier: That is a very clear question! Absolutely easy to answer.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: When the Minister for Works says that £1,250,000 is to be spent during the current year—

Mr. Sampson: Surely there must be a schedule of works!

Mr. GRIFFITHS: Of course. The question is quite clear, and we should have the information.

Hon. G. Taylor: You have not much chance of getting it.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: No. I would not insist upon the return if it meant expense, but I object to the Minister making such statements as he has this evening. I object to him endeavouring to throw ridicule upon a question that anyone with average brains could grasp the meaning of.

The Minister for Works: There you go. According to that the member for York has not an average brain, because he misunderstood the question.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: The idiotic statements of the Minister cut no ice with me. Many members on both sides of the House would like to get the information. We would like to know the intentions of the Government regarding the expenditure of £1,250,000, and how that work is to be distributed. We would like to know where big crowds of men will be sent.

Hon. G. Taylor: You will know all about it in March next.

Mr. Clydesdale: We will give you due notice.

Mr. GRIFFITHS: I am not afraid; I can keep up my end.

Mr. Angelo: Beware of the Ides of March!

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

Ayes . . . . .	12
Noes . . . . .	18
Majority against	6

#### AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Doney	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Latham	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. North

(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. Chesson	Mr. Lamond
Mr. Clydesdale	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Collier	Mr. Millington
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Rowe
Mr. Cowan	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Cunningham	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnson	Mr. A. Wansbrough
Mr. Kennedy	Mr. Withers
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Wilson

(Teller.)

#### PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Barnard	Miss Holman
Mr. Stubbs	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Brown	Mr. Corboy
Mr. George	Mr. Lutey

Question thus negatived.

## BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ACT AMENDMENT.

### First Reading.

On motion by the Premier, leave obtained to introduce the Bill, which was read a first time.

### Second Reading.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [8.58] in moving the second reading said: I desire to explain that the Bill has been found necessary because of errors in the descriptions in the Schedule of the Act. It was only when a commencement was made on the rolls that the Chief Electoral Officer discovered the defects, and pointed out to the members of the Commission the difficulties that had arisen. It was then found by the Commissioners themselves that the boundaries of some of the electoral districts, as described in the Schedule, were not as they desired or intended them to be.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They must have been pretty careless in their work.

The PREMIER: I would not say that. In some instances it was merely a question of the number of locations.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is quite understandable.

The PREMIER: It will make no difference to the boundaries, or at any rate not much, except in the matter of the number of electors.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There are several like that.

The PREMIER: In others, it means some slight alterations regarding the boundaries and affects a few of the electors, but not

many, so far as I can understand. When the matter was submitted to me, I asked that it should be referred to the Commissioners who framed the boundaries, for their concurrence. Perhaps I can best explain the purposes of the Bill by reading a statement by the Surveyor General, one of the Commissioners. The following is a minute addressed to the Chairman of the Electoral Commission by Mr. Camm:—

(1) It appears that certain errors have occurred in the technical descriptions of the boundaries of the electoral districts, as shown in our report, which affect the actual working of the Act, and do not convey the real intentions of the Commissioners. (2) These errors are as shown in attached minute from the Chief Draftsman, Lands Department, dated 30-10-29. (3) It is also found that the boundary between the Leederville and Mt. Hawthorn electorates, although correctly described, passes through the centre of the Home of the Good Shepherd. It is suggested that for obvious reasons the boundary should be amended. ((4) The boundary between Subiaco and Mt. Hawthorn electorates also passes through the St. John of God Hospital, and the boundary requires amending. This is a draftsman's error, due to the use of an old litho. when description was being prepared. (5) Also it is found that the boundary between Middle Swan and Canning passes through a number of small private subdivisions, making it very difficult for the Electoral Department to decide enrolments. It is suggested that the Welshpool-road be made the boundary. (6) An amendment to the Act will be necessary to remedy these errors, which I understand the Government are prepared to introduce, and a recommendation from the Commission is desired.

I shall now read the Commission's recommendations, signed by the three Commissioners. The communication is addressed to the Minister for Justice, and is as follows:—

(1) It appears that certain errors in the technical descriptions of some of the boundaries of the electoral districts recommended by this Commission have been discovered which nullify the intentions of the Commissioners and affect the working of the Act. (2) These errors are set out in the minute from the Chief Draftsman, Lands Department, dated 30-10-29. (3) It is also found that the boundary between Mt. Hawthorn and Leederville electorates passes through the centre of the Home of the Good Shepherd; that the boundary between Mt. Hawthorn and Subiaco electorates passes through the St. John of God Hospital buildings, due to a draftsman's error, and that the boundary between Middle Swan and Canning electorates passes through a number of small private subdivisions, imposing difficulties in enrolment in the Electoral Department. (4) It is desirable to put these matters in order, and the Commissioners would recommend that the necessary Bill be introduced to amend the Act, embodying the amend-

ments to boundaries, as suggested by the Chief Draftsman, Lands Department. (5) It is suggested that the boundary between Leederville and Mt. Hawthorn be amended as shown in blue on litho., throwing the 56 electors affected into the Leederville electorate. (6) It is also suggested that the boundary between Subiaco and Mt. Hawthorn be amended, as in blue on litho., to conform with the present Salvado-road, the Commissioners' original intention thus placing the 90 electors affected in Mt. Hawthorn. (7) In view of the difficulties experienced by the Electoral Department it is also recommended that the boundary between Canning and Middle Swan be amended as shown in blue on litho., to follow the Welshpool-road. The electors affected thereby would number 50 as against 82, resulting in an addition of 32 to the Canning and a consequent reduction in the Middle Swan electorate.

That communication is signed by Mr. Justice Northmore, Mr. Camm the Surveyor General, and Mr. Way the Commonwealth Electoral Officer. On reference to the Bill itself hon. members will find that some other districts are affected. In the case of Canning, instead of a line or two of the schedule being amended, a new schedule, with the alterations suggested, is substituted. I thought that would be a better way of doing it than to amend the schedule itself, although in some cases, where the misdescription is merely an error in the number of a location, one set of figures is substituted for another instead of the whole schedule being struck out and a new one inserted. Collie electorate is affected merely to the extent that the word "west" should be "east." It makes no difference in the boundaries, or in the number of electors. In the case of Greenough electorate it is proposed to omit the words "and that of the Sandford River." The alteration, I understand, affects the boundaries between Greenough and Gascoyne. Although a considerable area of country is involved in the alteration, the number of electors affected is small—40 or under. The mistake arose through giving a river or watercourse the wrong name.

Mr. Angelo: Does the amendment leave the Gascoyne electorate as it was before?

The PREMIER: The schedule as it passed this Chamber did not leave Gascoyne as it was previously, although the recommendation of the Commissioners was that the four North-West seats should remain as they were. When the boundaries were defined, it was found that the description of Greenough in the schedule would not leave Gascoyne exactly as it was before. The

amendment leaves Gascoyne as the Commissioners intended it should be. Leederville electorate is affected because of the boundary running through the Home of the Good Shepherd. In the case of Middle Swan and Canning a boundary runs through private subdivisions instead of a highway or a road; and thus it is most difficult for the Electoral Department to decide, in some cases, whether an elector lives in this electorate or in the other. Mt. Hawthorn and Subiaco are also involved in what I have quoted. In the case of Wagin the alteration is a mere transposition of some figures—4,150 should be 4,105, apparently a mere printer's error. The same correction is required in connection with Williams-Narrogin. I propose to lay the file on the Table. I am not asking that the Bill should be proceeded with this evening.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you need a statutory majority?

The PREMIER: I am not sure. As the Bill effects alterations in boundaries, it might be thought that there was something in the measure. However, I have given hon. members the whole of the information I have on the subject. The matter originated with the Chief Electoral Officer, and was then gone into by the chief draughtsman of the Lands Department; he put up a report which is supported by the Surveyor General and endorsed by the Commission. Only three of the proposed alterations are of any consequence; and even these affect, comparatively speaking, only a few electors. Shortly after the existing Act had passed through this Chamber, the members most closely concerned discovered that a boundary ran right through the St. John of God Hospital and the Home of the Good Shepherd, with results that would be inconvenient and confusing. I lay the file on the Table, and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. Sir James Mitchell, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.13 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Wednesday, 13th November, 1929.*

	PAGE
Questions: Miner's Phthisis ... ..	1496
Wheat, bulk handling ... ..	1497
Bills: Premium Bonds, 1A. ... ..	1497
Cremation, 3A. ... ..	1497
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, report ...	1497
Reserves, report ... ..	1497
Main Roads Act Amendment, Com., report ...	1497
Redistribution of Seats Act Amendment, 1A. ...	1509
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2A. ...	1509
Mental Deficiency, 2A. ... ..	1511
Aborigines Act Amendment, 2A. ... ..	1520

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

### QUESTION—MINER'S PHTHISIS.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Honorary Minister: 1, What are the rates and conditions of compensation payable to beneficiaries under Subsection 4 (a) and (b) of Section 9 of the Miner's Phthisis Act, 1922-25"? 2, How many men have been excluded from the mining industry under Section 8, Subsection (1) of the Miner's Phthisis Act, 1922" (a) prior to 31st December, 1925; (b) since 1st January, 1926? 3, How many of these excluded men have received compensation under the (a) Miner's Phthisis Act, 1922-25"; (b) Workers' Compensation Act? 4, How many persons have been, or are receiving compensation under Subsections 4 (c) and (d) of Section 9 of the Miner's Phthisis Act, 1925"? 5, How many persons have received compensation under Section 7 of the Workers' Compensation Act?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, Married men: half wages, with an additional payment in respect of dependants, as under: wife, father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, step-father, step-mother, £1 per week each; son, daughter, illegitimate son, illegitimate daughter, grandson, granddaughter, step-son, step-daughter, brother, sister, half-brother, half-sister, under 16 years, 8s. 6d. per week each; the maximum payment not to exceed the basic wage for the time being in the district. On the death of a married man his widow becomes entitled to £2 per week until re-marriage or death, but no alteration is made in the rates payable to his other dependants. Single men or widowers: half wages, with an additional payment in respect of depen-