

the Minister will take steps to encourage the establishment of the industry.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 10th November, 1932.

MR. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [11.0]: I also am glad that the Minister had something nice to say about our tropical adviser. I can personally endorse what the Minister has said. Several settlers on the Gascoyne who previously knew nothing whatever about the growing of tropical fruits, by carefully following the advice given to them by Mr. Wise have not only established their groves, but are now making good profits and a comfortable living. We are very lucky in having a man of Mr. Wise's experience, and I am sure there is valuable work in front of him when the real development of the Kimberleys begins. To develop the cattle industry we must have improved stock and improved foddere. It is in relation to improved foddere that the knowledge and skill of the tropical adviser will prove invaluable. I have seen some reports sent by this officer, not only to the State Government, but also to the Commonwealth Government, and those reports prove that he is indeed a very capable man. There is the complaint about the poor price for potatoes, voiced by the Minister and by the member for Murray-Wellington. I would remind them of the figures I quoted here a few weeks ago, showing that Malaya is importing 10,000 tons of potatoes and 20,000 tons of onions per annum and that less than two per cent. of their vegetables are from Australia. We have the State steamers running to Malaya, so why cannot the local producers send a representative up there and see if we cannot capture that market?

Vote put and passed.

Vote. College of Agriculture, £7,057—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.5 p.m.

Return: Motor license fees	Page: 1731
Bill: Financial Emergency Tax Assessment, Com.	1732

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

RETURN—MOTOR LICENSE FEES.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I move—

That a return be laid on the Table showing the—1, Total number of private cars licensed in the metropolitan area? 2, Total amount of license fees collected on same? 3, Number of motor trucks licensed in metropolitan area? 4, Fees paid on 1-ton, 30-cwt., 2-ton trucks in metropolitan area? 5, Extra amount collected on such class of truck for carrier's licenses? 6, Total amount of fees collected for trucks in metropolitan area? 7, Total number of private cars licensed in country or outside metropolitan area? 8, Total amount of license fees collected on same? 9, Total number of motor trucks licensed outside metropolitan area? 10, Fees paid on 1-ton, 30-cwt., 2-ton trucks? 11, Total fees collected on trucks outside metropolitan area? 12, Extra fees imposed on 1-ton, 30-cwt., 2-ton truck owners plying for hire which necessitates their using main roads? 13, Total amount collected from drivers' licenses as issued by the police? 15, Total amount collected for bus and taxi licenses?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I understood from the Chief Secretary yesterday that the information required by the hon. member would cost a considerable amount to prepare. In view of that I think the hon. member should give reasons in support of his motion.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It struck me yesterday when the hon. member gave notice of his proposed motion that it was very much involved and that less than due consideration had been given to the framing of it. I agree with Mr. Seddon that since the collection of this information will involve inquiries all over the State it must cost considerable money and time. Mr. Thomson has not intimated whether this information is to supply a public need or merely his own need.

Hon. A. THOMSON: On the understanding that this motion was to be treated formally I did not consider it necessary to

take up the time of the House in giving reasons for it. My object is to ascertain the total amount of revenue collected from motor car and motor truck owners. I am endeavouring to link up this information with the select committee I hope the House will grant me to inquire into the finances of the Railway Department. This information would be very useful to that committee.

Hon. J. Cornell: If you get that committee, the committee itself will be able to secure the information.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It is generally understood to-day that the railways belong to the people, but many seem to forget that the roads also belong to the people, and further that the motorists have paid for the construction of the main roads. That is one reason why I desire to get the information specified in this return. The Minister for Works at the official opening of the road board conference quoted figures dealing with the total amount of fees collected in the metropolitan area and also in country districts. If the department has been keeping the books as they should be kept, only an hour would be required to produce the information I am asking for; because under the Traffic Act 22½ per cent. of the fees collected by certain road boards have to be returned to the Works Department, and so too with 12½ per cent. of the fees collected by another section of the road boards and 19 per cent. of those going to a third section. So the information I require should be available in the Works Department to-day.

Hon. J. Cornell: More than half the road boards have not paid.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Nevertheless the road board office which was previously in charge of Mr. Sanderson should be able to give the information in a very short time. We are entitled to know the total amount of revenue the local authorities are receiving from motor vehicles. I was surprised when the Minister said the supplying of the information would involve a considerable amount of expense. If so, it shows how lax is the book-keeping in the department, for the whole of the information should be quite easily collected. As for the license fees collected by the police, that information also should be readily available. I am asking for this information, not only on my own behalf, but on behalf of many people who are

interested. It would be of value to the State.

Question put and passed.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX ASSESSMENT.

In Committee.

Resumed from the previous day. Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Chief Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 4—Exemptions (partly considered):

The CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported yesterday, the question before the Chair was an amendment to insert a new paragraph (b) as follows:—"In receipt of salary or wages paid by way of sustenance for themselves or for themselves and their family."

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The object of the amendment is to exempt from payments under the Bill, those who are in receipt of sustenance. Mr. Kitson said the only people who would be affected would be those in receipt of two guineas a week. The point is whether the men are to have two guineas a week, less 4½d. in the pound tax, or nothing at all. I think I know which they would prefer. A promise has been made by the Premier to bring his Budget down to certain limits. The Government have carried out to a greater extent than any other State the Premier's Plan. Notwithstanding this, they still find they are short of the amount required to reduce the deficit to the necessary limit. Now that we are working under the Financial Agreement we have given up the control of our finances. By doing that we have given up the government of the country. We are no longer a sovereign State, because we are tied under the Financial Agreement. We have to consider whether we shall comply with the conditions laid down by the Loan Council, or go on spending without collecting additional revenue until we reach the stage when the Loan Council will practically stop our credit.

Hon. A. Thomson: The present situation was never anticipated when the Financial Agreement was made.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Some people cannot see beyond the town they live in. If I read the situation aright, those men who

are on sustenance have to decide in the circumstances between two guineas a week, less 4½d. in the pound, and nothing.

Hon. J. M. DREW: Mr. Holmes has built up his case on the Financial Agreement. If that agreement had not been adopted, we would have been presented with heavier taxation than faces us to-day. The per capita payments were abolished on the 30th June, 1927, but they were revived by the agreement. The present Government are enjoying the benefits of the saving on the sinking fund of £350,000 a year. Under the agreement the Commonwealth Government are finding half the interest on our sinking fund on future loans, and meeting half the amount on future loans. They have provided a sinking fund of 5s. per cent., and we are providing a similar amount. The agreement was accepted by a majority of 25,000 of the people of this State. It was not entirely acceptable to me, but we had to follow the best course open to us in the circumstances.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Western Australia comprises one-third of the Commonwealth of Australia. When the Commonwealth Government allocated the sum of £7,500,000 for distribution amongst the States, they gave this State £500,000, and to the remaining States £7,000,000.

Hon. G. FRASER: This amendment covers only sustenance men who are employed by local authorities. In the metropolitan area there are only 2,000 employed on sustenance. Of these at least 50 per cent. are persons who would in any case be exempt from the tax, as they are receiving wages ranging between 14s., 21s., 28s., and 35s. a week. Even suppose the whole of the 2,000 were exempt from the tax the sum involved would be very small, and would not make the difference between two guineas a week and nothing. I intend later on to move for the inclusion of relief workers amongst those who will be exempt.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I do not want my amendment confined to sustenance men, but wish to include those who are receiving wages by way of sustenance. It is intended to cover everyone employed by the Government or the local authorities, who are receiving wages or salary by way of sustenance. In order that the position may be placed beyond doubt, I think the words "or relief" ought to be added.

Hon. G. FRASER: I move an amendment on the amendment—

That after the word "sustenance" in the amendment the words "or relief from the Government" be inserted.

All over the State the number of men on Government relief, including sustenance workers and men on relief work, is 11,000. Quite a number of those men would not come under the Act. Among the sustenance workers are many who are earning less than £2 a week. Only those on two guineas and £2 9s. a week would be affected. Of those in the country on relief work quite a number would not come under the Act. All the 14s. men earn only 34s. when they go to the country. Of the others who would now come under the Act, there are men in the country who are forced to keep two homes on £2 1s. a week, going up to a maximum of £3 a week. My amendment on the amendment would cover these men. At the most there are not more than 8,000 of them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Again I remind members that the Government have brought in this temporary measure to assist in providing relief for those who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed. If we are going to create exemptions, how are we going to raise the money that we require? Why exemptions in this direction and not in others? During the period Mr. Drew was a responsible Minister in the Labour Government, that Government refused to assist single men at all. Those men were left to shift for themselves and if they could not obtain work, then the only alternative was to beg or starve. That was in the time when there was plenty of money available and the result was that riots and disturbances were common, whereas there has been comparatively little trouble since the present Government have been in office, for we recognised the fact that even single men were entitled to be fed, even if we could not provide employment for them.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: It was a long time before you recognised it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member's Government did not recognise it at all. The total sustenance that may be granted to a man with a family in this State amounts to £3 9s. per week and exceeds the Federal and other basic wage rates.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: That is not right; the maximum is £3.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, it is £3 9s. After all, a sustenance man will only be assessed on the actual cash he receives, if he is paid 20s. in cash and receives an order for goods to the value of 20s., the latter would not be taken into account. If Mr. Drew's proposed amendment were given effect to, it would mean that a man drawing the full rate of sustenance allowed, would be in receipt of a total amount of £3 9s. per week and would not pay any tax, whereas a man in receipt of an actual salary or wage of 21s. would have to pay the tax.

In the circumstances this would not be equitable. In 1929 the basic wage for male workers was fixed at £4 7s. per week, and at that period the rates of sustenance were fixed on the basis of the cost of living at that date. But now the basic wage has fallen, owing to the reduction in the cost of living to £2 19s. 5d. per week but the rate of sustenance has not been altered. The unit of value has fallen from 7s. to 5s. 3d.: in other words the amount of 5s. 3d. will now purchase goods that would have cost 7s. in 1929. This means that £2 2s. will to-day purchase goods that would have cost £2 16s. in 1929. On that basis a family receiving sustenance payments of £2 2s. per week to-day is receiving 10s. per week more in value than did a family receiving the same amount in 1929. This proves conclusively that the unfortunate people who are being helped by the Government to-day are receiving more sympathetic treatment from this Government than they did from the Labour Government, and even the incidence of a tax of 4½d. in the pound will leave them in a better position than they were in in 1929. In Victoria sustenance allowances are only about one-third of our generous rate. In that State they have an emergency tax also, under which a person in receipt of £52 per annum and under £104 per annum pays one penny in the pound, but a person in receipt of £2 per week or £104 per year and under £3 per week, or £156 per year, pays 6d. in the pound, and over that amount one shilling in the pound, with no discrimination between married and single men. So that our flat rate of 4½d. in the pound will not be such a heavy burden on the family man or man with dependants, as the Victorian graduated scale would prove to be. If the proposed rate of this tax is reduced so that the amount required to meet the gap between expenditure and the amount of deficit allowed by

the Loan Council, then it will mean that the Government will be forced to seek other avenue of reduction in expenditure, and may be forced to review the sustenance rates with a consequent reduction that would perhaps mean a loss to the people concerned of considerably more than 4½d. in the pound. We must have money to carry on. I repeat that the position is better than it was in 1929 by 10s. 6d., so why differentiate? We have very little time in which to get the money in now.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are late as it is.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I cannot accept the amendment because it will only whittle away the little we hope to get in.

Hon. G. FRASER: I have had dealings with hundreds of men and their relations with the Unemployment Board and I have yet to find one who has received more than £3 a week.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There has been endless discussion on the amount of sustenance being paid. The amount of sustenance does not enter into the question. The matter before the Chair is sustenance or relief irrespective of the amount, and I hope members will confine themselves to that.

Hon. G. FRASER: One must show the amounts that are being paid. I could have brought correspondence from the Unemployment Board to definitely show that the maximum amount any man can be paid is £3 a week. If a man is on the £2 7s. rate, he can only receive the additional 11s. Under my amendment 8,000 men would receive relief.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And under Mr. Drew's amendment?

Hon. G. FRASER: About 2,000. Going the very limit that anyone would be called upon to pay, and that would be 1s., the amount involved for the whole year would be £20,000, but as the Bill will operate for about seven months the figure will be considerably less than that.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: There is one point on which Mr. Drew might enlighten the Committee. Assuming this relief is granted to the sustenance worker who is earning £2 9s. a week, would it not create rather a difficult position for, say, the casual worker not on sustenance and who might be earning an equivalent amount? Would it not mean that the sustenance worker earning the same amount would get relief from

the tax, and that the casual worker would have to pay?

Hon. J. M. DREW: I have no objection to Sir Charles Nathan moving an amendment to exempt the men to whom he referred. I do not know of any State where the exemption is so low as £52. or where the rate is 4½d. in the pound. In New South Wales it was 1s., but there the basic wage was £4 5s., and in addition there was endowment of 5s. for each child. That was a genuine unemployment tax. In Victoria, the rate starts at 1d. in the pound. The Collier Government were responsible for the scale of allowance adopted by the present Government. Single men were sent to the country to work. If married men could not go to the country, they were paid sustenance. They wanted work, not sustenance, and that was the cause of the trouble.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am sorry that Mr. Drew did not answer Sir Charles Nathan's question. Six hundred men are working on the sawmills on part-time. Some have gone on sustenance. Many men would sooner work part-time, but under the amendment those who stuck to their work at a low rate of pay would be penalised, while others who went on sustenance would be exempt.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The same thing would apply to the farmer.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. We are asked to differentiate in favour of men who have been treated very generously.

Hon. V. Hamersley: In fact, it is a new industry that has sprung up.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Minister could have obtained figures to show the number of men on sustenance or relief work who have three or more children. Then we could have estimated what the amendment would cost. The Minister spoke of the rate as £3 9s. per week. A man on relief work is allowed to earn £1 per week over and above the sustenance rate. If he has five children or more, his sustenance rate would be £2 9s., and the extra £1 would bring him to £3 9s., but the Government impose a maximum of £3. For their convenience, and to a lesser degree for the convenience of the workers, the Government allow them to work three or four weeks and then stand down until the amount earned has been cut out at the rate of £3 a week. It has been stated that single

men who had earned more than the 25s. 2d. per week would not be allowed to draw the whole of their money when they finished the job, but would be paid at the rate of 25s. 2d. per week until the amount earned had been cut out. When it has been cut out, they have been given to understand there will be no work or sustenance for them, and they will be on their beam ends. If the Government do not alter that policy, the position will be serious. Of the men on relief and sustenance work, only a very small proportion have four or more children. Regarding the question raised by Sir Charles Nathan, I would not make a distinction if the Government would exempt the men in private employment earning only £2 9s. a week. Still, they are in fairly regular employment, whereas the man on relief work is there for only a limited period. There is no guarantee that relief work will last more than a month. Part-time work has been introduced by private employers to ensure continuity of employment. Is it fair that a sustenance worker with four or five children, drawing the maximum of £3 per week, should be taxed at the same rate as a married man without children, engaged on the same work? Many men have been out of work for periods ranging from six months to 2½ years, and the condition of their homes is deplorable. They have been denuded of everything of value, and the only clothes that the occupants have are those on their backs. If the Government followed the Victorian example by adopting a graduated tax—not the graduations adopted there—they would get more money, and would get greater support from me.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Why not adopt the Victorian graduations, if it is a good thing?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is straying from the amendment.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: I have no wish to do that, but I do desire to secure some relief for the people I have mentioned. If necessary, let us increase the tax on the people who are in a position to pay.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	17
					—
Majority against	9
					—

AVES.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. E. H. Hall
Hon. E. H. Gray	(Teller.)
Hon. W. H. Kitson	

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. T. Franklyn	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. V. Piesse
Hon. E. H. Harris	" H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. L. B. Bolton
Hon. G. W. Miles	(Teller.)

Amendment on amendment thus negatived.

Amendment put and negatived.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I move an amendment—

That in line 1 of paragraph (b) "twenty-one" be struck out and the word "forty" inserted in lieu.

My aim is to increase the amount of exemption for single men. The Government admit that it costs £1 a week to feed and lodge a person and yet if he gets 21s. a week he is to be taxed. If we are to legislate along those lines, it will be no time before many of the people will be almost stark naked for they will have but a shilling or two with which to replenish their clothing. It is paltry to introduce legislation of this description.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment. The persons Mr. Drew alludes to pay no taxation to-day. They enjoy free services provided by the State and in a time of emergency such as this when the Government ask that for a few months these people shall assist in the crisis, they should be prepared to do so. If we start tinkering with the exemptions, where will they finish and where shall we get the money?

Hon. W. H. KITSON: It is the same old question: Where shall we get the money? The Minister has been told time and again how the money can be obtained by other means. The Government have said that men who are in receipt of 25s. 2d. a week now will be put off as soon as their present work terminates, and they will get no further assistance. They will have to look for jobs for themselves. It is hard to find language adequate to express my feelings. Not one member of the House would do such a thing in his private capacity, and I am astonished to think that they

can adopt their present attitude in public matters.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I have been getting the cane from some members because I was not moderate in my language the other night. I am too moderate with some of them, and in future I do not want any member to criticise my attitude, whether moderate or otherwise. I am disgusted at these proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must speak within the four corners of the Standing Orders.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: It has been stated that Mr. Drew spoke in a nice gentle way, but he did not get a single additional vote, although he did not speak in the strong terms that I adopted. It is all sheer hypocrisy.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment. While I appreciate his feelings, he must abide by the Standing Orders.

Hon. C. B. WILLIAMS: I hope some members may be converted to a more humane attitude, even in their old age, so that they can assist men who are not so fortunate as themselves. The Chief Secretary has a majority with him and they will see that he gets the money he requires. Members here will vote solidly to make the poor pay and they will go home content in the knowledge that they and others in their position, are not required to pay what they ought to. I am disgusted at the Chief Secretary complaining about people earning £1 a week who, he said, were dodging taxation. The Chief Secretary should be ashamed to make such a statement. There are thousands of people who are living in rotten conditions, and are now to be forced to pay their 4½d. a week. It is absolute rot. The trouble is that too many members here want those unfortunates to pay because they are afraid they may be called upon to pay it themselves. I feel ashamed of members, and I do not want to speak to them any more.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am sorry that I cannot support the amendment although I would like to be in a position to do so. In these times every section of the community should shoulder its proportion of the burden. In no other part of the world are single men treated better than in Western Australia. When I was a young man in Victoria in 1890 there was no 25s a week made available for their assistance.

Hon. C. B. Williams: In those days a family could live on £1 a week. What is the good of talking like that in these days.

Hon. A. THOMSON: There are single people to-day who are batching for 10s. a week.

Hon. C. B. Williams: More shame to the country.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Some are asked to live on 7s. a week.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The Government have made an honest endeavour to meet a very difficult position.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Have you been asked to do without your rents at Kataning?

Hon. A. THOMSON: If I cared to, I could give the hon. member some interesting information about the rents some of us expected to receive, and what happened. If I did, he would see that some of us have done all that was humanly possible to relieve the situation. No member of this Chamber would willingly support this measure if it were possible not to do so. It is a matter of dire necessity.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is not.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I would like to ask Mr. Williams if it is not a fact that the unions are demanding from men in receipt of sustenance, payments towards a certain organisation.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Speak of things within your knowledge.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You do not often speak here of things that you know of, and you waste a lot of time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the dialogue to continue.

Hon. A. THOMSON: After all, the single men to-day are looked after very much better in Western Australia than elsewhere. I do not say, however, that the treatment meted out to them here is too generous. I deeply regret that there are so many people who are placed in the unfortunate position of having to accept sustenance. I am aware, as Mr. Kitson has already stated, that there are many men and women who are now arriving at the stage when they have little

clothing left; but still I think it is not a hardship for a single man to have to pay this tax of 4½d. in the pound. It simply means that once a month he cannot go to the pictures.

Hon. G. Fraser: He goes on a free ticket.

Hon. A. THOMSON: All of them do not. Of course, I do not want to deprive these men of some enjoyment; it is only right that they should have it. We should not, however, always try to throw the whole burden on to the other fellow's shoulders. The time has come when we must all put our shoulders to the wheel and do the best we can. I regret that I am unable to support the amendment. I believe the single men to-day are better off than many of the married men, strange as it may seem to make that assertion. The single men are getting 25s. 2d. a week.

Hon. G. Fraser: They do not all get that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Those of them who are working do. If they are careful, there is no reason why, after they have provided themselves with food and tobacco, they should not have a clear 10s. a week left.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: We are told that the reason for this tax is to raise funds for the Government to provide relief or sustenance for the unemployed, yet we find the Government saying to these single men, "You are earning 25s. 2d. and we expect you to pay 4½d. in the pound out of that by way of tax; this work is of very limited duration and when it is completed there is neither work nor sustenance for you." The Government have made that announcement.

Hon. A. Thomson: But you do not believe it.

Hon. W. H. KITSON: The Government have made that announcement so far as the single men are concerned. I certainly am not going to cast a vote which will assist the Government to carry out a policy of that kind.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	8
Noes	18
					—
Majority against	10
					—

	AYES.	
Hon. J. M. Drew		Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser		Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray		Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. H. Hall		Hon. A. M. Clydesdale
		(Teller.)

	NOES.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter		Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. L. B. Bolton		Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Ewing		Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin		Hon. H. V. Piessé
Hon. V. Hamersley		Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris		Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane		Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann		Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. G. W. Miles		Hon. J. J. Holmes
		(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I move an amendment—

That in line 8 of paragraph (c) the words "fifty-two" be struck out and "one hundred and four" be inserted in lieu.

This paragraph is intended by the Government to reach not only those who are earning salary or wages, but also those who are earning other income. A widow without children may have a house of her own and let a couple of rooms for, say 10s. a week and she may, in addition, earn 15s. a week as a charwoman. She will be affected by this particular paragraph. With hospital tax added, the poor woman would have to pay 32s. 6d. per annum in order to assist to reduce the deficit. If her total income were only £52 per annum, then she would have to pay 26s. a year. I am sure hon. members can hardly sanction such legislation and they ought to vote for my amendment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I oppose the amendment, for the same reason that I opposed the previous one.

Hon. G. FRASER: I will support the amendment. I have gone through the amount of income tax collections and the number of persons collected from during 1930. From that I find that the average amount of tax in that year was only 3d. and a fraction per pound. How, then, can it be said there is no other source of revenue that could be taxed to make up the amount required by the Government?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There will be the 4½d. added to that 3d.

Hon. G. FRASER: But those persons paying that 3d. are in receipt of £300 and over, and to avoid taking more from them we are going to tax persons on £52 per annum.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	18

Majority against	10
------------------	----	----	----

	AYES.	
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale		Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. J. M. Drew		Hon. T. Moore
Hon. G. Fraser		Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. H. Hall		Hon. E. H. Gray
		(Teller.)

	NOES.	
Hon. C. F. Baxter		Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton		Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing		Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. T. Franklin		Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley		Hon. H. V. Piessé
Hon. E. H. Harris		Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes		Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane		Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann		Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
		(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. J. M. DREW: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of paragraph (d) "two" be struck out and "four" inserted in lieu.

The effect of this amendment, if carried, will be that those who are maintaining dependants will be exempt up to £4 per week. Even under the drastic Premiers' Plan no man's salary or wages was reduced below £185 per annum. Fancy taxing a married man with a wife and seven or eight children on his earnings in excess of £104 per annum! If the amendment be carried, the Government will not get from this tax all the money they require, but they can get it by an amendment of the Land and Income Tax Act. The Government should have introduced special taxation on a graduated scale 2½ years ago. Alternatively, they should now increase the income tax rate, which at present is the lowest in Australia. On a net income of £1,000 in Victoria a man pays, on income from personal exertion £62, and on income from property £99; in New South Wales the respective figures are £100 and £116; in South Australia the figures are £112 and £138; in Queensland they are £122 and £146, whereas in Western Australia, whether the income be from personal exertion or from property, the total tax paid on £1,000 is only £33 18s. 4d.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will oppose the amendment.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	18

Majority against .. 10

AYES.

Hon. A. M. Clyde-dale	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. T. Moore

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. V. Piessé
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. A. Thomson

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I move an amendment—

That paragraph (c) be struck out.

This relates to racing clubs. I can see no justification for including them amongst the exemptions.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I should like to know from the Minister whether it is clear that agricultural societies will be exempt from the provisions of the Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under Section 18 of the Land and Income Tax Act, agricultural societies will be exempt. Race clubs, however, do not come within the scope of those exemptions. During the last year or two they have been seriously affected by various forms of taxation, and I think all of them are losing heavily at the moment. For that reason it is proposed to include them amongst the exemptions in this Bill.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	18

Majority against .. 14

AYES

Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. R. G. Moore	Hon. H. Seddon

(Teller.)

NOES

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. W. H. Kitson
Hon. L. B. Bolton	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. A. M. Clyde-dale	Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. Ewing	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. H. V. Piessé
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. J. T. Franklin

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Tax in respect of income:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That in Subclause 1, paragraph (b), after "rates" in line 5, the words "and taxes" be inserted.

I believe it is an oversight that these words were not included.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I will accept the amendment, but would like to make a personal explanation on another matter. Before the tea adjournment I stated that the sustenance rate reached £3 9s. a week. I now find that the information supplied to me was incorrect, and that Mr. Kitson was right when he said that the actual amount was £3. I desire to apologise to members for using the wrong figures.

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

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—In certain cases salary or wages to be treated as income for the purposes of tax to be paid by the taxpayer:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I should like to know what is the meaning of the words "legal grounds." No legal grounds are specified upon which one may object under the Act, and I suggest that these particular words be struck out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I hope the words will not be struck out. The reason they are there is that objections can be lodged on legal grounds under the Land and Income Tax Assessment Act.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It does not say so.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But that is the intention and it is important that the words should be there.

Amendment put and negatived.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I move an amendment—

That the following be added to stand as Subclause 2:—

(2.) Where any salary or wages consists of fees paid to directors of companies or to members of boards, trusts or commissions or commissions paid to an agent and the taxpayer satisfies the Commissioner that expense has been incurred in earning such salary or wages or that for any other reason the payment of tax in respect of such salary or wages under and in accordance with section nine would be inequitable, the Commissioner may by writing under his hand direct that such salary or wages of such taxpayer shall be assessed as income for the purpose of this Act and the tax under this Act shall be payable by the taxpayer under and in the manner provided in this Act for tax in respect of income.

The opinion was expressed last night that possibly an injustice might be done to agents, although it was not the intention that that should occur, and to get over the difficulty the subclause I have just moved has been framed. The Committee will realise that there are included directors and other persons as being liable to come within the definition. The amendment will put the position beyond all doubt.

Hon. G. FRASER: This seems to me a terrible somersault on the part of the Government. We find now that a director may be permitted to deduct certain expenses incurred in earning salary or wages and at the same time we refuse a similar right to a man on a maximum of £3. After all, expenditure is incurred by the sustenance man in earning his sustenance payment.

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

Clauses 11 to 16—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 2, Interpretation:

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I move an amendment—

That the words "and commission paid to agents" in the interpretation of "salary and wages" be struck out.

My object is to bring this definition more into line with the definition in the Hospital Fund Act.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The amendment is not necessary. Any difficulty that might be likely to occur will be provided for

by the new subclause which has just been added to Clause 10.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

House adjourned at 7.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 10th November, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Douglas credit proposals	1740
Farmers' disabilities	1740
Leave of absence	1741
Bill: Mining Act Amendment, 2R.	1741
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed ...	1747
Aborigines Native Stations, Goldfields Water Supply, Kalgoorlie Abattoirs, Metropolitan Abattoirs and Sale Yards	1747
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department	1747
Other Hydraulic Undertakings	1753
Railways, Tramways, Ferries, and Electricity Supply	1754

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

QUESTION—DOUGLAS CREDIT PROPOSALS.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Premier: In view of the public interest in the Douglas social credit plan, will opportunity be given to discuss the motion tabled by the member for Claremont?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

QUESTION—FARMERS' DISABILITIES.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Premier: 1, What decision was arrived at by the sub-committee of the Premiers' Conference regarding—(a) giving farmers security of tenure for five years; (b) adjustment of liabilities during that period; (c) amendment of the Bankruptcy Act? 2, Is State legislation to be introduced to give effect to (a) and (b)?