

## Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 16th September, 1942.

	PAGE
Bills: Justices Act Amendment, 1r. ....	570
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report ....	570
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2r. ....	580
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report ....	581
Mining Tenements (War Time Exemptions), 1r. ....	582
Criminal Code Amendment (No. 1), 2r. ....	582

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### BILL—JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by Hon. J. Cornell and read a first time.

### .. BILL—FEEDING STUFFS ACT AMENDMENT.

*Second Reading.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY [2.20] in moving the second reading said: The one and only purpose of this very small Bill is to amend the definition of the word "analyst" in the principal Act so as to enable a more practical procedure to be followed in the supply of an analytical certificate when this is required in any proceedings taken in a court. The Feeding Stuffs Act of 1928 provides for the proper control of the sale of feeding stuffs for stock, and every container, package and so forth of such feed must bear in a conspicuous position a guarantee and an analysis with respect to the contents; otherwise an offence is committed under the Act. In some instances it has been found that the contents are not as represented by the label.

In order that proceedings may be taken in a court, it is necessary that a certificate as to the composition of the article sold must be given by an analyst. The Act defines "analyst" as the Government Analyst or an analyst attached to the Department of Agriculture. This has caused difficulty, as it has been ruled that in order to obtain a conviction a certificate must be given by the Government Analyst himself that he has analysed the particular substance concerned. The present proposal is to alter the definition so as to permit of the work of the Government Analyst being delegated to any of his qualified assistants, and a certificate being given by such qualified assistant who has made the analysis. Unless the Bill is passed, then, on

the ruling which has been given, it will be necessary for the Government Analyst himself on each occasion to make the analysis, provide the certificate and appear in court to support it. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East): I have no desire to oppose the Bill, but one feature of the measure seems to me to call for comment. As I read the amendment proposed, it will mean that nobody outside certain Government departments will be able to carry out the duties of an analyst as provided in the Bill. We know that there are persons who practise as analysts, and there are, I believe, analysts attached to various municipalities. It appears to me that unless the point is cleared up, we shall be simply creating, by passing the Bill, a monopoly in this respect, restricting the work to the Government Analyst.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West): I, too, have no intention of opposing the Bill; but I take it Mr. Seddon is afraid that the passing of the measure will put all private analysts out of action. That is not my understanding at all. I understand that the only need for the amendment arises from the fact that in the case of prosecutions, if a private analyst has given a certain certificate and the Government Analyst on reading the certificate finds it to be incorrect and certifies accordingly, then the Government is debarred from taking action unless the Government Analyst appears in each case. Occasionally in the country we hear of certain commodities being below standard and I take it that unless this Bill is agreed to there will be difficulty in prosecuting people for breaches and in proving that analyses made, often for advertising purposes, are incorrect.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (in reply): I thought I had made it clear that the principal Act provides that the analysis upon which a prosecution rests shall be carried out by the Government Analyst and that we are endeavouring to make the position easier by altering the definition of "analyst" to provide that the word means the Government Analyst or any of his qualified assistants. Otherwise, whenever a prosecution was desired, the Government Analyst himself would have to



make the analysis, provide a certificate, and appear in court. It will be understood that many hundreds of analyses are made from time to time and it is not possible for the Government Analyst to carry out all of them. By this amendment we render it easier for prosecutions to be launched under the Act by providing that any qualified analyst attached to the Government Analyst's Department and also analysts associated with or attached to the Agricultural Department may give the necessary certificate. That is all the Bill provides for. It has nothing to do with private analysts, because they do not come under the scope of the original Act, which simply provides that the Government Analyst shall do this work.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.**

#### *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** [2.30] in moving the second reading said: The Bill contains three amendments, all, I think, non-contentious. The first proposal has relation to road board elections. As the Act stands at present, payment may be received by a chairman or a member of a board for services rendered as a returning officer at a road board election, without such officer jeopardising his right to sit as a board member. Provision is made in the Bill for similar protection to be extended to a member of a board when acting as a deputy returning officer. Such deputies are often appointed to act in the same way as the returning officer. If a road board desires to appoint a deputy returning officer he should receive the same protection as the board member who had been appointed a returning officer.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is repeatedly done now in a devious way.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY:** Yes. The next proposal in the Bill deals with the powers of a local authority to provide

homes for employees. Road boards have authority under the Act to erect on any land vested in the board or acquired for the purpose, houses to be leased to, and to be used as homes by, board employees, provided that loan money only shall be availed of for such purposes.

It has been found that this has prevented certain boards from purchasing houses already erected, which could have been secured at a price more advantageous to the boards than that involved in the erection of new houses. The building of houses is a costly and lengthy process because of the lack of materials and manpower. There are instances where local authorities are desirous of purchasing homes that will be occupied by their employees. Authority is therefore sought by this Bill to enable a board to make a purchase in such circumstances and that the purchase price may be provided from either revenue or loan money, subject in each case to the prior approval of the Minister.

The only other proposal in the Bill concern the introduction of a loose-leaf or card system of rate books in which respect it is desired that the Road Districts Act be brought into line with the Municipal Corporations Act, under which no difficulty has been experienced. The loose-leaf and card system has been found quite satisfactory by the auditing staff of the Public Works Department, and they advise that it can safely be introduced by road boards, which will first of all have to obtain the approval of the Minister.

It is considered that these amendments will result in the smoother working of the affairs of road boards. They have been requested by the various local authorities and have the support of the Road Board Association and the Public Works Department, all being of the opinion that the proposals are practicable and desirable. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. G. B. WOOD (East):** The House could very well support this Bill. It is designed to facilitate the work of road boards and the three amendments have been asked for by the Road Board Association. I hope the Bill will be accepted.

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



# **BILL—DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT.**

## *Second Reading.*

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** [2.35] in moving the second reading said: This is a continuance Bill, by which it is proposed to extend the operations of the Dried Fruits Act for a further period of two years until the 31st March, 1945. The principal Act was introduced in 1926, its purpose being to make provision for the marketing of dried fruits and for other purposes connected therewith. The measure was amended in 1928, and continuance Bills have since been passed by Parliament.

There was every necessity for the passing of the original Act in 1926 and experience has proved that it was justified in every way. Prior to then trouble was encountered through the lack of necessary control. Conditions were chaotic and the industry was faced with ruin. There appeared to be no organisation whatever at the time. Prices dropped to a very low figure. Growers in certain instances were compelled to hawk their fruit in Melbourne and elsewhere and to accept prices as low as 1½d. per lb. for raisins, delivered. As a result of such chaotic conditions, representations were made by the growers for the stabilisation of the dried fruits industry, hence the existing Act.

Legislation for the control and marketing of dried fruits is substantially the same throughout the Commonwealth. This undoubtedly has had a stabilising influence on the whole industry. There has been a steady increase in the quantity of dried fruits produced until today approximately 90,000 tons are produced annually throughout the Commonwealth. Of this amount 15,000 tons are used for home consumption, the balance being for export. The Fighting Forces require large quantities of dried fruits and the various arms of the Services will probably take 6,500 tons this year, which will mean an estimated home consumption of 21,500 tons. Fortunately, the British Government and the Dominion of Canada are extremely anxious to secure full supplies of dried vine fruits, and up to the present adequate shipping space has been secured.

Prior to 1926, the peak production of dried fruits in Australia was 45,000 tons, but in 1940, the output exceeded 100,000 tons. The production of dried vine fruits

in this State has steadily increased since 1927 and the following figures will indicate how it has progressed since that year:—

Year.	Currants.	Sultanas.	Lexias.	Total.
	tons.	tons.	tons.	tons.
1927 ....	1,168	118	300	1,576
1928 ....	1,308	103	605	2,076
1929 ....	1,353	100	355	1,808
1930 ....	1,497	280	306	2,173
1931 ....	1,700	224	308	2,232
1932 ....	1,400	303	480	2,271
1933 ....	1,552	445	227	2,224
1934 ....	1,203	327	251	1,871
1935 ....	2,104	440	186	2,738
1936 ....	2,082	405	282	2,800
1937 ....	1,971	379	284	2,625
1938 ....	2,013	453	280	2,696
1939 ....	3,151	356	401	3,908
1940 ....	2,971	430	259	3,660
1941 ....	2,457	301	166	2,924

Members will see that the total production in 1941 was considerably less than in the two previous years. I was interested in the position and wanted to know the reason for the reduced output. I have been advised that the main cause was that the industry had experienced a long dry season which consequently adversely affected production. All this goes to show that this particular branch of primary industry is affected by seasonal conditions, sometimes very materially so.

I have already mentioned that in 1926 the price received for dried fruits was less than 2d. per lb. Statistics show that in 1941 the price was 8 1/8d. per lb., which was approximately the same as that received in 1920 when conditions were vastly different. Comparative prices per pound for dried fruits (three-crown currants) in the years 1920, 1924, 1938 and 1941 were as follows:—

1920 .. ..	8¾d.
1924 .. ..	7d.
1938 .. ..	7½d.
1941 .. ..	8½d.

These figures are illuminating. They indicate that prices have been maintained, that a large portion of our output of dried fruits is exported, and that this State and the whole of Australia have much to gain by the retention of measures ensuring control and stabilisation, without which exploitation and extremely low returns to growers would undoubtedly result. It would be most difficult to advance any reason why the legislation should not be continued. It is the earnest wish of the growers and all those associated in the marketing of dried fruits that the Act shall be continued, and I trust that the Bill will have the ap-



proval of Parliament. I am sure that there will be no desire whatever to allow the legislation to lapse. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South): Before the debate is adjourned I wish to remind members that the subject matter embodied in it provides food for much thought. It is the first Bill introduced this session, and will probably be the last presented that will deal with primary products and their distribution. A few days ago I had a conversation with a gentleman on the subject of the repatriation of our soldiers and the placing of them on the land after hostilities had ceased. He said that the dried fruits proposals gave ample room for intense consideration in relation to the establishment of soldiers on the land because the Dried Fruits Act has worked entirely satisfactorily in the interests of all parties concerned. He pointed out, however, that the industry existed entirely upon Imperial preferences and upon nothing else.

He put a pertinent question to me when he asked what would become of the dried fruits and allied industries if effect were given to the terms of the Atlantic Charter. He pointed out that if effect were given to the charter the present sheet-anchor of the industry would go overboard and the whole problem of markets for our primary products would be opened up. We must pass this Bill. I have expressed these views so that members may in their spare time take into consideration what they think will happen to Australia's primary industries if the Atlantic Charter is given effect to. I support the second reading.

**HON. G. B. WOOD** (East): This is a measure which I am sure the House will pass. Probably no other marketing Act that has been in force in Australia or anywhere else has worked so smoothly as has the Dried Fruits Act. It is remarkable that originally the board consisted only of producers, although since it was established one outsider has been made a member of it, the chairman, who is not a producer. No-one can say that the producers have exploited the dried fruits market in any way whatever, or endeavoured to make the consumers pay more than was necessary for the goods controlled by the board. That is a wonderful thing to say of people who have had the running of the board practically entirely in their own

hands. It would be unthinkable for anyone to oppose this Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### *In Committee.*

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

### **BILL—MINING TENEMENTS (WAR TIME EXEMPTIONS).**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

### **BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT (No. 1.)**

#### *Second Reading.*

**HON. J. CORNELL** (South) [3.48] in moving the second reading said: This Bill is not unknown to the House. The measure that was brought down last year sought to amend Section 211 of the Criminal Code by providing that all offences thereunder should be tried by a magistrate. Later on a further Bill will be introduced to deal with the question of the decisions of magistrates being overridden by justices, and therefore no reference to that subject will be found in the Bill now before the House. The Bill that was introduced last session provided only for trial by magistrates. Strange to say, the measure, the second reading of which I am now moving, consists of an amendment that was made to the former Bill when it was dealt with in Committee. During the course of the debate on that occasion, the Chief Secretary intimated that whilst the words "knowingly and lawfully" remained in Section 211 of the Criminal Code, there was no chance of getting a conviction, despite the definition of "owner and occupier." The late Mr. Holmes, from his seat in the Chamber, interjected, "Then, let us take those words out," and accordingly the Committee did so. The Bill went to another place, where an unsuccessful attempt was made to stifle it on the first reading. Eventually, however, the Bill was thrown out altogether.

As I understand the position, from the reports of the Commissioner of Police and from other people, as well as from the answer I received from the Chief Secretary to a question I asked yesterday, with the law as it stands there is no chance of ob-



taining a conviction against the owner or occupier of premises used as S.P. betting shops, under Section 211 of the Criminal Code unless the owner or occupier, as the case may be, or both of them, is or are the actual person or persons conducting the business. The Bill now before the House is an attempt to rope in the owner and the occupier, whether they are the persons who are running the betting business or not. I am given to understand on reliable information that the main reason for the disparity between the fines imposed in Fremantle and in Perth is that under the present law the real culprit is never brought before the Bench. There is a good deal of logic in that view.

Why should the Bench go on fining people up to £75 when it does not get at the actual person or beneficiary engaged in the business? I believe that is one reason for the small fines imposed in Fremantle. If this Bill becomes law, we shall catch the owner and the occupier of the premises, the real offenders.

It is extraordinary that the S.P. business and the sale of liquor should run together. Invariably we find a hotel quite close to S.P. shops. Three or four young bloods may each have 5s. with which to bet. They go to an S.P. shop and if one of the four is successful in his bet, the other three will say to him: "You lucky bargee, what about turning it on?" The party then adjourns to the hotel where the winner buys drinks, and the whole of the winnings goes into the pockets of the publican. On the other hand, if the bet is unsuccessful the S.P. bookmaker collects the £1. Eventually the young bloods are left with nothing. The two establishments run hand in hand.

Can we afford to continue what is now going on? One of the main purposes of my endeavour to curtail S.P. betting is to protect fools from themselves. I was a fool once. I would deprive those persons of whom I am speaking of the opportunity to throw their money away, either in an S.P. shop or in a hotel. If members will turn to page 850 of "Hansard" of last session, they will find that for the four financial years from 1936-37 onwards a total of £91,795 was paid in fines by S.P. bookmakers. The question answered yesterday by the Chief Secretary shows that for the years 1940-41 and 1941-42 the sum of £48,819 was paid in fines in the metropolitan area alone.

The Honorary Minister: Which indicates that there are many fools about.

Hon. J. CORNELL: These figures make a total of £140,644 in six years. To that total we have to add, according to the report of the Commissioner of Police for 1940-41, a further sum of £6,786 that was paid in fines during that year outside the metropolitan area. I do not know what was paid in fines elsewhere, but the figures I have given come to a total of £147,400 odd as having been paid in fines in six years. Who pays these fines? I imagine they are paid by the fools, those who think they can pick winners. If that were the only item of outgoing, the position would not be so bad. According to what the Chief Secretary said yesterday in answer to my question, it took something like £700 in costs to recover portion of that amount. Then we have to consider the rental of the 61 premises in the metropolitan area and the fact that each of them would average about three employees per day. If everything is taken into consideration, we will probably find that in the six years under review £250,000 has been spent by S.P. bookmakers.

Hon. L. Craig: Much more than that!

Hon. G. W. Miles: Nearer £1,000,000 I should say.

Hon. J. CORNELL: In today's paper the Deputy Premier is said to have notified the Prime Minister that the people of this State have no desire further to curtail racing or trotting. He went on to say that both racing and trotting had been cut down by half in the last 12 months. Those sports have been cut to the bone in the Eastern States, and yet there appears to be no diminution in the amount of fines imposed and the amount of money put into the hands of S.P. bookmakers. Can we afford all this? The greater part of the money is subscribed by working men, their wives and children, including daughters. The people conducting the S.P. betting shops have no bowels of compassion. They do not consider how little they will accept for a bet; they will taken even 6d., but they will balk at a large wager. They have no respect for sex or age. On that ground alone Parliament should do something to alter the existing state of affairs.

I well recollect how in my super-foolish days the bookmakers on the goldfields refused to accept a bet of less than 5s. and



would allow neither women nor children to bet with them or be on their premises. The law in those days was administered. Every person found on betting premises was rounded up, in the same way as John Chinaman is rounded up today. The position now is that only the keeper of the premises is proceeded against. The other day I heard that the whole staff of one shop had been prosecuted and had to toe the line. I understand, despite what was said to the contrary, that that information is correct.

I would like the Chief Secretary to consider another phase. Some doubt exists whether or not, under the new system of income taxation, betting fines will be allowable deductions from income. I received an answer a few days ago that such fines are deductible from income. I am also under the impression that when both Federal and State income taxes were in operation, the fines were allowed as a deduction in respect of both Federal and State income taxes. An employee of a person conducting an S.P. betting shop was fined and the amount of the fine was allowed as a deduction from his income, according to the answer to a question asked by me last session. I followed up the question by asking whether a publican, who was fined because he served liquor after hours, would be allowed to deduct from his income the amount of the fine. The answer I received was that the amount could not be deducted, as the fine was not incurred in the course of the publican's business. What is the difference between the two cases? Assuming that, under the new system of income taxation, these fines will be an allowable deduction, this state of affairs arises: There are 61 betting shops in the metropolitan area and it is safe to say that at least 20 or 25, perhaps 30 of them are conducted by four or five men. If one went to the trouble of ascertaining the number of convictions against, say, John Brown, the proprietor of four of the shops, and it was found that he had seven convictions and was fined £75 on each of them, one would realise the large sum of money involved. If that amount were deducted from John Brown's taxable income, I venture the opinion that he would probably pay a very small fine indeed. I will not speak further on the measure as the Bill is practically the same as that introduced by me last session. I commend it to the House and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

**HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH** (Metropolitan): I desire to endorse all that Mr. Cornell has said, but also to ask the House to consider a phase of the question on which I think insufficient emphasis has so far been laid. We are all aware that a similar Bill was passed by this House last session, but it was rejected in another place. It seems to me that, as a matter of courtesy, we should not just merely send the same Bill forward again, but that we should give reasons for doing so. In order that those reasons may be ample and of a character to be regarded as conclusive, I intend to move at a later stage that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Such a course of action could not be taken unless the matter was one of very great importance, and I shall try to satisfy the House that it is. In peace-time, we might permit the application of the old adage that a fool and his money are soon parted. But the fact that we allow the law to be broken in any particular is demoralising. It reflects on the law itself. It reflects upon the Government and upon Parliament. But we are not in peace-time now.

I maintain that this and similar activities are playing a tremendous part in preventing Australia from fulfilling its wartime obligations. I shall not at this stage question the wisdom of the Commonwealth Government in relying upon voluntary contribution as the chief method of meeting war expenditure; but I do say that if reliance is to be placed on voluntary contribution, then it should be the effort of State Governments and State Parliaments to make that voluntary contribution effective and remove everything that, in our mind, tends to prevent that method from being properly carried into effect. I have no hesitation in saying that in this State—and in the other States, too—the influences that are operating more than anything else to prevent the right response to the appeal for voluntary contribution are drinking, sport and gambling.

So far as drinking is concerned, I understand that the State Governments refused the request of the Commonwealth Government to reduce the hours of liquor trading by two per day, but instead undertook to reduce such hours by one. Our State Government, "keeping the word of promise to the ear, but breaking it to the hope," cut out an hour that could not possibly have any effect at all upon the quantity of liquor consumed. With regard to racing, with which



this matter is closely associated, we have the statement that further curtailment is unnecessary. As to gambling, there is neglect to put into operation the law of the land. I have often been asked why it is that S.P. bookmakers can afford to pay such heavy fines week by week. There are two answers. One is that the profits arising from this particular method of preying upon the simple-minded are enormous. The other is the one suggested by Mr. Cornell, the extraordinary right that is given to an S.P. bookmaker to deduct from his income fines imposed upon his employees, upon men he is paying to break the law.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is scandalous.

Hon. SIR HAL COLEBATCH: To my mind the position is extraordinary. During the discussion on uniform taxation it was shown that in certain circumstances a man with an income of £3,500 a year could, by donating £1,000 to the Red Cross Society, retain more income in his pocket than if he had paid tax on the whole £3,500. I can quite understand, since the income of an S.P. bookmaker is so large, that the allowance of fines as a deduction from income would have the effect of reducing not only his income liable to taxation, but also the rate of the tax, to such an extent that probably the actual fines would be reduced by 50 per cent., 75 per cent., or even more. That is one reason why the heavy fine is no deterrent. We have the answer given by the Chief Secretary yesterday that the owners of some premises are known, but that in no case are they the occupiers, and under the existing law it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction against them. That statement in itself should be sufficient to justify an amendment of the law.

Because of this and other influences, we are falling down on our job so far as contributing to the cost of the war is concerned. Let us take the matter of war bonds and war savings certificates. The people who should subscribe to them are the people who are putting their money into the pockets of the S.P. bookmakers and the State lotteries, although I do not propose to deal with the latter point just now. Between the period from the 15th April of this year and the 30th June of next year, the Commonwealth Government is relying upon the people of Australia—

not the people with big incomes—to contribute £60,000,000 to the war effort by purchasing war bonds and war savings certificates. A third of that period has already elapsed and the total amount subscribed is only just over £6,000,000—a little over one-tenth of the amount in one-third of the period. Western Australia makes the best showing of all the States; but even in our case, instead of having found a third of the amount required, we have provided only 13.5 per cent. For the whole of Australia, instead of one-third being subscribed, the total is only 10.5 per cent. That is discreditable and threatens the gravest trouble to Australia. It threatens the satisfactory prosecution of the war. How does Australia compare with other countries? In the Old Country the per capita contribution to war savings is infinitely higher than it is in Australia, and I am quite sure that the general run of wage-earners and small-income people in the Old Country are in no better position than are ours. They are not in anything like as good a position as are the same classes of people in Australia.

Let us consider our sister Dominion of Canada, the population of which is about 50 per cent. greater than that of Australia. It has, however, a smaller purely British population, and among the non-British population, as we know from the Press, there is a large section not wholeheartedly behind Great Britain in this war. In Australia, in order to finance the requirements of the war, we have already had to increase our note issue almost up to the limit of safety and are now talking of depending for the financing of the present Budget on a further issue of £100,000,000 of Commonwealth Bank credit. But what are they doing in Canada? They are not only financing their war effort, but have made a free-will gift to Great Britain of £1,000,000,000 dollars worth of food and munitions; and with no question of payment now or in the future.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It has cost them nothing to date.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: They have made a loan to Great Britain of 700,000,000 dollars free of interest for the war period; they have bought 295,000,000 dollars worth of Canadian Government railway securities, making that sum available to Britain for purchases abroad. In addition to that, they



have given unstinted co-operation in the war movement and sent large armies to Britain and paid and maintained them exclusively at the cost of the Canadian taxpayer.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is only a small number.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: We are able, in proportion to our population, to do as much as Canada. One reason why we are not doing it is because instead of pressing on with this demand for voluntary help here and there, we are not only permitting but encouraging the spending on non-essentials of money that ought to be invested in war-savings certificates and war-bonds. In these three matters—drinking, sport and gambling—the Government is not only permitting but is encouraging the abuses that are hindering the war effort in this State and the other States of the Commonwealth. We have, to some extent, an example in South Australia where, I understand, a far better job is being done, but even there the contributions to the war-savings certificates fall lamentably below what is required.

I support the measure and hope that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee in order that the whole of the facts will be placed not only before another place, but before the country so that the people—even those who at the present time support the S.P. bookmaker—will understand the offence they are committing, not only against their own prudence and savings, but against the safety of their country.

**HON. E. H. H. HALL** (Central): Other members will please themselves what attitude they adopt on this matter, but I feel that it is up to me not to sit quiet and listen to the remarks passed by Sir Hal Colebatch without rising to say that I agree wholeheartedly with what he said. Somebody has posted to me—and I take it to all members of Parliament—a booklet containing the figures given by the hon. member about the war effort made by our sister Dominion of Canada. It makes us think, I had the pleasure of listening to a member in another place. He supports the present Government. He was speaking on our war effort and said that whether it cost him his seat in the House or not he was going to say what he thought. If ever there was a time when we need to be courageous and say what we think, it is now. That member said that he thought there was altogether too

much hypocrisy in connection with our war effort.

I have listened in this House to other members who go from place to place and meet people and who have always, without exception, deplored the want of wholehearted enthusiasm—an attitude which permeates the people of this State in connection with our war effort. It is as disturbing to me as it must be to other members. We have to ask ourselves: Why is it? Are we not as loyal as the people of Canada or any other part of the British Empire? I think we can say that we are. But I do think that this charge of hypocrisy made against us can be largely sustained, much as I dislike saying so, because of the want of action by the Government of this State and the Commonwealth Government on matters such as are desired to be reformed by the hon. member who has introduced the Bill now before the House. It is no use telling us that we have to live hard and join in this austerity campaign when the figures given to this House show that a vast amount of money is being frittered away by people who are allowed to take part in an illegal act without Parliament or the Government making any effort to prevent it. Members and the taxpayers know that that is true. Parliament has to be led by the Government. A general election takes place and the party with the largest number of members returned occupies the Treasury bench. Many people outside Parliament do not seem to know, notwithstanding the fact that we have had compulsory education here for a number of years, that Parliament can only pass certain legislation provided it has been brought down by the Government.

Reverting to the Bill, the present Government has so far failed to grapple with the evil it deals with—because that is what it is—in a manner satisfactory to the majority of the people in this State. I commend Mr. Cornell who introduced this legislative proposal and wish to convey to Sir Hal Colebatch my appreciation of the sentiments expressed by him. I frequently disagree with the hon. member. He has not been very kind to me. In matters which I have championed here he has not given me the support which I think he should have. As a matter of fact, on one occasion he promised, without my asking, to support me, but did not fulfil his promise. I am not now going behind his back to say so.



Hon. C. B. Williams: His remarks cannot be very sincere if that is the case.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: If I hear any remarks with which I am one hundred per cent. in sympathy, no member will prevent me from rising in my place and expressing publicly my appreciation. I support the Bill.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 3.25 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Wednesday, 16th September, 1942.*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, wheat haulage .....	587
Traffic accidents .....	587
Civil defence, requisitioned premises .....	587
Vegetable growing, as to water rate concession .....	588
Bills: Mining Tenements (War Time Exemptions), 3A .....	588
Water Boards Act Amendment, report .....	588
Criminal Code Act Amendment, 2A .....	608
Motions: Lighting of motor vehicles, as to reversion to State control .....	588
Point of order .....	591
Post-War reconstruction, to inquire by Select Committee .....	598
Licensing Act, liquor trading hours .....	603
Betting, as to closing S.F. premises .....	605

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

### QUESTIONS (4).

#### RAILWAYS, WHEAT HAULAGE.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that the transport of wheat from country centres to depots is so far in arrears that farmers' deliveries of the ensuing harvest are liable to be seriously disorganised, with consequent economic loss to the State? 2, Are such arrears in transport due to insufficient hauling equipment? 3, If so, how can he justify the recent transfer of locomotives and other rolling stock to an eastern State? 4, What are the details of the railway equipment so forwarded?

The MINISTER replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3 and 4, The transfer is in accord with the proclaimed policy of the Government, namely, to co-operate to the utmost with the Commonwealth Government in regard to the defence of Australia.

#### TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister representing the Minister for Police: 1, What number of accidents has occurred in which trams and motor vehicles have been concerned for the period of two months ended the 15th September, 1942? 2, Of the total, what number of motor vehicles figuring in these collisions was controlled by the Military authorities?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST (for the Minister for Police) replied: 1, 50 accidents. 2, Figures not available.

#### CIVIL DEFENCE.

##### *Requisitioned Premises.*

Mr. McDONALD asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is he aware that, under the authority of the National Security Order made by the Premier, premises in West Perth have been requisitioned and wholly occupied for some months for civil defence purposes and may be so occupied for an indefinite period, the owner being the widow of a man who was killed in the R.A.A.F. and being now left with a liability for interest and rates of £100 per annum on the premises and, under the National Security Order, with no right to receive any rent? 2, Will he take up the matter with the Commonwealth Government to ensure that an injustice such as this is not allowed to continue?

The MINISTER replied: 1, Yes. The premises were requisitioned by the Perth City Council of its own initiative and in connection with its A.R.P. operations within the City of Perth area. 2, The matter has already been taken up with the Commonwealth Government.

#### VEGETABLE GROWING.

##### *As to Water Rate Concession.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Minister for Water Supplies: 1, Has the Government yet come to a decision on the question of an allowance or concession in the water rate to householders growing vegetables in their home gardens? 2, If so, what is the nature of that decision?

The MINISTER replied: 1 and 2, No concession below the excess charge of 1s. per 1,000 gallons has been approved for the metropolitan area. In some goldfields districts where the price of excess water ranges from