

validating some minor act of the Government. This, however, is not a minor job but a very important one. Even if the work had been done legally it should not have been commenced until the House had an opportunity to deal with it. It was not a question of finding work for a few men because there was any amount of other work to go on with. The Government had waited so long before commencing the work, that they could well have waited a few weeks longer until the House had met. We do not know that the widening of the Causeway by 10 feet is the best way to deal with the situation. In five years time the old structure may fall down.

The Premier: No fear! It is made of good jarrah.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Then what is all the trouble about?

The Attorney General: That is what I would like to know.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It has got to be widened for Cup Day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: So that is at the bottom of it! It would be a good thing if some people had to swim to the Cup. Is that why the work could not wait until the House met? There was no real urgency for it.

The Minister for Works: There is nothing in the Act to say that the House should deal with the matter.

Hon. P. COLLIER: An obligation is cast on the Minister to bring it before us.

The Minister for Works: Not unless loan money was used for it.

Hon. A. McCallum: There is no power to use any other money but revenue or loan.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Minister used other money and did so illegally.

The Minister for Railways: The residents of the metropolitan area are entitled to some consideration.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not say the work should not be done.

The Minister for Railways: Do you say we should be doing a bigger job?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It might have been better to spend double the amount and make the structure 20 feet wider, but we have no means of knowing.

The Minister for Railways: How would the House arrive at a decision?

Hon. P. COLLIER: If we were to accept blindly the advice of experts, we might as well hand over the expenditure of all moneys to them. This country is strewn with monuments to so-called experts. They have cost the State hundreds of thousands of pounds; indeed, I doubt whether a million pounds would cover the impracticable works undertaken by Western Australia on the advice of so-called experts. The Committee should examine very closely all works recommended by experts. Therefore I am sorry this particular work has been commenced. It could have waited until the House met and had an opportunity of considering it.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 33:

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I move an amendment—

That Subclause 2 be struck out.

This subclause provides that country road boards shall have the contribution, but that metropolitan road boards shall not have it.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.51 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 14th September, 1932.

	PAGE
Question: Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department	579
Bills: Pearling Act Amendment, 1R.	579
Brands Act Amendment, 1R.	579
State Trading Concerns Act Amendment (No. 2), 1R.	579
Government Ferries, 1R.	579
Health Act Amendment, 1R.	579
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 1R.	579
Motion: Mines Regulation Act, to disallow regulations	579
Address-in-reply, ninth day	584

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

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE DEPARTMENT.

Hon. G. FRASER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is it correct that the Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Department are charging 7 per cent. interest on the cost of connecting up premises with the sewerage in East Fremantle? 2, If so, what is the reason for this high rate of interest? 3, Will the Government instruct the department to lower the interest rate?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, This rate, which has been in operation for the past fourteen years, was fixed on the cost of the money advanced, raised principally in London, and taking into consideration the fact that the amount advanced in each case was small and the number of clients large. Consequently the cost of administration and collection is increased. Advances have not been made for some time past but may be resumed. 3, The matter is already under consideration.

BILLS (6)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Pearling Act Amendment.
- 2, Brands Act Amendment.
- 3, State Trading Concerns Act Amendment (No. 2).
- 4, Government Ferries.
- 5, Health Act Amendment.
- 6, Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary.

MOTION—MINES REGULATION ACT.

To disallow regulations.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. J. Nicholson:—That the additions and amendments to Regulations under "The Mines Regulation Act, 1906," published in the *Government Gazette* on 27th May, 1932, and numbered 1529/17 and 1010/30, and laid on the Table of the House on 16th August, 1932, be and are hereby disallowed.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [4.40]: I was very pleased that Mr. Nicholson withdrew his opposition to the regulation dealing with the ventilation of mines. I find that this has been embodied in a min-

ing award issued in this State. The evidence tendered to the court by University authorities on the question of ventilation was examined by the mine owners as well as the representatives of the union. That which was agreed to was embodied in the award relating to ventilation. There are also some further regulations relating to dust. I wish to draw attention to the interpretation of mining districts. This means any district proclaimed by the Governor as a mining district under the Act. These regulations will apply to every mine in the State. The definition of a mine is a place within a mining district, where any operation for the purpose of obtaining any metal or mineral has been or is being carried on, or where the products of any such place are being treated or dealt with. So soon as a man pegs out an area in a mining district, of whatever dimensions, and starts operations on the surface, the whole of these regulations will apply to such operations.

Hon. J. Cornell: Technically.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think actually.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Mr. Cornell suggested that the regulations would not affect the small mines. There is no definition of a small or a large mine. Some years ago we had before us a Bill to amend the Inspection of Machinery Act. Sir Hal Colebatch was then in charge of the House. That Bill provided that every motor and every digester should be registered. We submitted that the Bill should not cover all those things. We were informed by the then Leader of the House that the Bill would not apply to small motors. During the tea adjournment I produced a very small motor of low horsepower, just sufficient to drive a sewing machine, and exhibited it on the Table of the House. The late Mr. Lovekin also brought in a small digester which had cost him a guinea in the Old Country, and measured 8 by 9 inches. According to the Bill, every motor would have to be registered under the Inspection of Machinery Act, the driver would have to be certificated and the machinery made subject to the regulations. I submit that these regulations will apply to every mine. Mr. Cornell quoted the South African mines. In that country there is a list of the mines to which certain things will apply. In the case under review, the inspector has a right to enforce the Act where he thinks fit. The matter is left largely to

his discretion. There are hundreds of mines in this State, and some of them are hundreds of miles away from where the inspectors are usually located. If we are going to distinguish between large and small mines, we should have a list of those to which the regulations will apply, instead of its being left to the inspector to determine in which cases he will enforce the Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: Could discriminatory regulations be drawn up?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: A schedule of the mines to which particular regulations would apply should be drawn up. From time to time that list could be added to by amending the regulations. In the mining industry a certain rate of wages is fixed for a certain class of job. In the schedule at the end of the award provision is made for the rate of payment, and this schedule is amended from time to time in accordance with any amendment that may be made to the award. I will deal with the regulations seriatim and will refer first to that relating to carbide. It appears to me that the regulation is hardly fair in this respect, that it provides that no person shall cause or permit to be carried any calcium carbide underground except in lamps approved by the manager, who is to be the sole authority as to what type of lamp shall be used. It also provides that no one shall carry calcium carbide except in a water-tight receptacle of a type approved by the district inspector of mines and also by the manager. In the first instance the manager is the person to approve, and, in the second instance, the type of receptacle is such as must appeal to the inspector but must subsequently be approved by the manager. In effect, that means that the manager will have to approve of what the inspector desires to be done, and the manager will really be the man vested with the power. I understand that the majority of the men who use the carbide lamps carry their spare carbide in small two-ounce tobacco tins that are put in their pockets. There is not much trouble underground at present in that respect. Anyone accustomed to the use of carbide knows that there is always a little material left unspent at the bottom of the lamp. The custom is to tip the residue out somewhere near the plat at the shaft. The regulation was framed as the result of some men tipping some unspent carbide at a plat where water was dripping from the shaft. When some other men went to the plat with their

candles, a fire resulted, and the regulations were framed in consequence. There may not be 20 mines in Western Australia where carbide lamps are in use, but, nevertheless, the regulation will apply to every mine.

Hon. J. Cornell: Where they use carbide lamps.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, but very few mines use those lamps, except the big concerns. The regulations, to which Mr. Nicholson objects, are in operation, as Mr. Williams pointed out, on the Lake View mine. My opinion is that the management found these provisions excellent in a big mine, and the inspectors therefore suggested that the conditions should be embodied in regulations. Probably they had in mind not to enforce the regulations in every instance. Take the position regarding the cutting of fuses and making provisions for firing. The regulation would be excellent when applied to large mines, but it would be different if it were sought to apply it to small mines. In the latter instance, men would probably take the materials below and the bracemen would prepare the rods for them. If there were three shifts on a mine, it would be quite as easy for the work to be done below as on the surface. I presume that the regulation has been framed with the object of having the rods dealt with in daylight. Then again the regulation provides the particular time when blasting operations shall take place. Work of that type is governed by the faces that are being worked in the mine. If operations are being carried out in a large mine, the management make provision for the men being transported from one part to another when firing is to take place at a specific time. They so regulate the work that it can be continuous without interference by the blasting arrangements. On the other hand, if the regulation is to have general application to all mines, what will happen where operations are in the initial stages and one face only is being worked? When operations are at that stage it is necessary to fire the holes immediately. But under the regulations, work would have to be suspended until the hour specified for blasting operations.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: Could not such men get a permit to fire when they required?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, if an inspector were living next door.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: Where are the inspectors?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: One is at Kalgoorlie, another is at Meekatharra, and I think another is at Southern Cross. Of course, the people could write to the inspector, but the latter might be absent from his centre and might be called away to attend an accident 100 miles up the line. It might be two weeks before a reply could be obtained to an application for a permit. In the circumstances, men would not wait that long.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you not think the regulation would be carried out in a common-sense way?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I do, but I cannot see the force of, say, a hundred men obeying the regulation whereas 900 would dodge it. It would be better to withdraw the regulation and frame another specifying to which mines it would apply.

Hon. C. B. Williams: When you were an engine driver, how often did you ignore a regulation?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I have known regulations to be ignored many times. I may have seen the hon. member ignore them. That does not say that I have ever ignored them. Whenever I was asked to do so, I made the people sit up by telling them that I was working under an Act and I had to conform to the regulations framed under that measure.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You suggest that the regulations should be honoured in the observance and not in the breach?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes. Mr. Williams referred to men going down a shaft in a cage in which drills and other plant had been placed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You would not have lowered those men down?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It would have nothing to do with me as an engine driver. My job would be to answer the bell. Next there is the regulation dealing with blowers and dust in drives. Those conditions do not apply to many mines, but nevertheless the regulation will cover all mines. The regulation embodies some satisfactory clauses, and I would not object to the regulation as a whole. If the House determines to disallow the regulations to which Mr. Nicholson takes exception, it would provide the Government with an opportunity to frame other regulations and indicate to which mines they would apply. That is also the regulation relating to detonators and fuses. I discussed that matter with some miners who are machine men working on the Golden Mile. They told

me that it was a common thing to ask for more fuses and detonators than were actually required. The object of that was that if one of the holes misfired, the men would have another rod ready to fire the hole properly. It is customary to hang the spare fuses and rods over a piece of timber in the mine, and, if they are not forgotten, they are used the next time firing is undertaken. Of course that is a breach of the regulations, and as Mr. Williams said—he is an authority on such a subject—there are many such breaches in the mines. The whole point is that the regulations cannot be applied in their entirety nor can they be applied to small mines as they can to big mines. I therefore commend my suggestion to the Leader of the House regarding the withdrawal of the regulations with a view to substituting them with others in which will be specified the mines to which they will apply. It would be better to pursue that course than to have breaches of the regulations a matter of common practice.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.58]: I wish to offer a few remarks generally on the disallowance of the regulations, because it appears to me some points raised have not been placed before members quite clearly. In my opinion sufficient opportunity is given to the Government under the existing regulations to carry out all the necessary steps they require with regard to the provision for the welfare of workers and the institution of the highest standards of mine working. I am inclined to agree with the contention raised by Mr. Nicholson that undoubtedly Regulation 1529/17 is distinctly ultra vires the Mines Regulation Act. He made his point quite clear, and obviously, if the department wish to carry out that particular amendment to the regulations, the better course would be to move under another section instead of that referred to in the motion. With regard to Regulation 1010/30, the contention is that the application of the regulation to small mines, as pointed out by Mr. Harris, would be harassing and unworkable. The Act is quite definite. Although the inspector may exercise a certain amount of discrimination, it must be remembered that in doing so the inspector acts on his own responsibility to that extent, and therefore incurs a certain amount of responsibility which perhaps another inspector would not be prepared to accept. There is a good deal of

the personal element in the application of the regulations. One might get through with them, but should any trouble arise through a breach, the inspector might find himself in an awkward position.

Hon. J. Cornell: He would be in the position of a doctor; other inspectors would have to prosecute.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I have heard the hon. member say that a doctor could bury his mistakes. An inspector of mines could not do that. It is quite possible, therefore, that an inspector might find himself in a very awkward position. Another point arises. You might have a man who is particularly conscientious in carrying out the regulations. If that inspector insists on the regulations being adhered to to the letter, the hon. member can see what a lot of trouble he might make because he is trying to do his duty. In these circumstances it appears to me that the regulations should be scrutinised very closely. I believe arrangements have been made for an appeal from the inspector to the State Mining Engineer. The contention is, and I think it is well-founded, that this would be an appeal simply from Caesar to Caesar. The State Mining Engineer, who is responsible for the regulations, must necessarily stand by his officers, and there is also the point that if he were inclined to waive any particular regulation, he would do so with a full knowledge that he was taking upon his own shoulders a certain responsibility which would be sharply brought home to him in the event of any accident arising therefrom. There has been a question as to whether discrimination can be exercised with regard to the various mines. One principal objection to these regulations is that they will apply to all mines and they embody a practice which has been adopted on most of the efficient mines on the Golden Mile. The regulations appear to me to be entirely well drafted, but it is when you come to the smaller mines that difficulties will be encountered. In Section 34 provision is made whereby the regulations can be applied to particular mines. Mr. Cornell last night made the position clear with regard to the practice that obtains in South Africa. That practice has not been adopted in Western Australia, although I understand the Minister for Mines is seriously considering applying it to the mines of Western Australia. But there is still power under Section 34 for the Mines De-

partment to schedule certain mines to which these regulations could apply. If the proposal of scheduling is considered by the department, I feel sure the department will obtain all the control they desire to exercise over those mines to which they desire the regulations to apply. With regard to the regulations themselves, the practice has been introduced, which has been found to be efficient on the big mines, of making up rods. As Mr. Williams pointed out, this has resulted in a saving of time, and narrowed down the danger of accidents because one man is responsible for the making of those rods. On the other hand one realises that the old regulations as far as the small mines are concerned will be far more practicable. With regard to carbide, the suggestion has been made that the insertion of the words "receptacle approved of by the mining inspector" might, for example, give too much power and allow a certain officer to insist on a safe type of apparatus, whereas the receptacle now used should be quite sufficient with regard to the protection of the carbide. As to the question of the time for blasting, the reason for the introduction of this regulation is set out in the first paragraph. It is there pointed out that the manager shall cause the times of working shifts and of blasting operations in every section of the mine to be so arranged that workmen shall not be exposed to fumes and dust from blasting. It goes on to say that blasting shall be allowed only at noon, 4 p.m., 8 p.m., and midnight, except for removing obstructions in ore passes, and that blasting during crib time shall be permitted only after workmen have been removed to the intake side of all places where blasting is to be done and where the resultant smoke and dust do not affect them in the section where they congregate during crib time. This is a most desirable regulation because inspectors again and again have simply been foiled in their attempt to enforce the regulations which have been gazetted to protect the lives of men through indiscriminate firing. There is the poisoning of the air which passes through various workings. A man might be working on one level and the air having become affected through men blasting in workings from which the air current is coming to him. It was because of that that the hours were set out. Further trouble has arisen through certain of the old workings being inter-connected, and on account of the

fact that ventilation has not yet attained that state of perfection that is desired. It is possible that blasting in one mine might result in the poisoning of the air which passes into another mine.

Hon. J. Cornell: And it holds dust in suspension.

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is useless for inspectors or conscientious managers to try to keep the conditions right in their mines if they are to be interfered with by neighbours. The fixing of certain hours for blasting appears to me to be rather too rigid. It would be quite possible for set hours to be arranged with the managers of the mines, and the hours fixed could be those that would be convenient at the particular mine.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Could you improve on the hours mentioned?

Hon. H. SEDDON: It is quite possible that those hours might not suit certain mines. The mentioning of specific hours tends to make the regulation too rigid. Had the principle been maintained of fixing regular hours, and having times fixed by the management of the mine, I think that would have met all requirements. It appears to me that better results can be obtained from the control of mines by insisting on the principle being observed rather than insisting on the carrying out of regulations to the letter. There is too great an inclination towards machine control, rather than seeing that general principles are observed, and placing on the management the responsibility of carrying out those general principles. If managers are responsible for their employees, it becomes their responsibility to see that the regulations are carried out. They can still be given a fair amount of latitude in which to apply the regulations and they accept full responsibility for any action they take. There is also a regulation which deals with dust officers. It provides that certain dust and ventilation inspectors shall be appointed. This regulation is impracticable from the standpoint that it may involve the appointment of a considerable number of trained men to police the workings in a mine. The regulation is definite. The inspector has to examine all working faces of the mine, and he has to travel over the mine to take tests of dust. Some of our mines have workings which cover 25 to 30 miles. Hon. members will realise what an arduous task it would be to attempt to cover that ground. On the other hand, if you ap-

point a number of officers, it will add considerably to the expense.

Hon. J. Cornell: The South African mines, some with 10,000 men, do it.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The point arises as to whether or not the appointment of officers to carry out these duties should be more or less regulated by the size of the mine and the number of men engaged in it, and the number of faces being operated. The regulation will be expensive to put into operation and it will impose a responsibility on an officer that he should not be expected to take. The regulation should be gazetted to apply to a particular mine. It appears to me that the conditions laid down by the principal mines comply not only with sound practice but also with economy. I consider that the beneficial results can be obtained by enunciating general principles and by expecting mine managers to comply with them. Where a manager departs from them, he should be held fully responsible. At the same time, there is no need to insist on the strict conditions laid down in rigid regulations.

HON. SIR EDWARD WITTENOOM (North) [5.16]: I have listened carefully to both sides of the debate on this question; and whilst I feel sure that Mr. Nicholson has sound reasons for submitting the motion, I must admit that those opposed to him have made out a strong case. In order to make my position quite clear, I rise to say that I intend to support Mr. Nicholson, in the hope that these regulations will be done away with for the simple purpose of making the way quite clear for the Government to bring in regulations that will be suitable for meeting the case. The special reason operating in my mind is that while these regulations are to a large extent good, they may be applied in cases for which they are not suited. From what I can learn, they are not suitable to be applied to all classes of mines. Therefore I consider that if we did away with these regulations and left it open for the Government to bring in regulations in accordance with the ideas expressed in this debate, it would do good. In the circumstances, so far as I see at present, I shall support Mr. Nicholson.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [5.18]: I also support Mr. Nicholson. I think it will be generally admitted that the mining regulations of Western Aus-

tralia are probably as good as any mining regulations in the world; but, at the same time, they contain many matters that should be looked into. We cannot regard all these regulations as perfect, and as fit to be applied to all cases. The regulations may be quite good so far as the big mines are concerned; but at this period there is much private mining, and also much prospecting, going on, and the methods applying to large mines do not apply to prospecting shows and small mines. Small mines should be looked after, in my opinion. A good deal of reliance should be placed on the management of small mines to see that things are safe and that the lives and health of the men working in them are looked after. Now as regards Regulation 46, referring to carbide. The suggestion that the health of the miner is safeguarded by the introduction of this regulation is absurd. Carbide is only taken underground in miners' lamps, which burn for half a shift. As it is necessary for the miner to have sufficient carbide to carry on for a full shift, the extra carbide is handed to him in a container provided by his employer. The change of carbide must take place underground. There is no risk in the operation of changing the carbide. Spent carbide, which is said to be injurious to the health of the miner, consists of nothing but lime. One mine actually uses spent carbide for whitewashing certain places underground, to enable the men to have better light and thus to work better. There was an interjection from Mr. Williams to that effect.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I did not argue about that regulation. It is not worth arguing about.

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: As regards time for blasting with which Regulation 47 deals, I think that all the words after "prescribed" should be deleted. I fully agree with the general sentiment of the amendment, inasmuch as it will be beneficial to the health of the miners. However, it is felt that shaft sinking and winzing are special work almost always associated with the improvement of ventilation. There should be no restriction on the progress of such work. With reference to dust and ventilation, I consider that regulation 48 should be amended to read "40 feet from the through air current." I further consider that the words from "any working face where dust is formed" down to "necessary" should be deleted.

Hon. J. Cornell: Are these the hon. member's ideas, or have they been manufactured for him?

Hon. C. H. WITTENOOM: Further, there should be an amendment to make the rule read "dust and ventilation officer," instead of "officers," as it is unnecessary for more than one man on each big mine to be appointed to do this work. Most of the big mines have already appointed a dust and ventilation officer. The last paragraph of Clause 2, paragraph (d), should be deleted. The manager is already held responsible under the Mines Regulation Act for the safe working of his mine, and all the members of the staff should be responsible to him only. It is quite unnecessary to inform the Inspector of Mines, as is required by the provision in question; and there is no necessity to keep a record book. Small mines cannot afford to pay the expenses of several inspectors. One man should be able to do the job. The appointment of any ventilation officer with the necessary qualifications to carry out the duties referred to is quite beyond the capacity of any but the very large mines. It is all right in those mines; but, as I have already said, it is wrong in small mines. The owners of small mines should be assisted, and these burdens should not be placed on their shoulders. I support Mr. Nicholson.

On motion by Hon. G. Fraser, debate adjourned.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Ninth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. ROSE (South-West [5.25]): Before addressing myself to the motion, I desire to join with other members in congratulating you, Sir, upon your return to the House and also on being re-elected President. These two re-elections show the confidence which the electors of your province have in you, and the respect in which you are held by members of this Chamber. I also desire to join with other members in expressing sorrow at the loss which the House has sustained in the death of some of its finest members, and at the loss of those members who were defeated at the polls. Whilst congratulating new members on their election, we cannot but express our regret for members whom we have known so long and who have fallen by the wayside. I have

listened attentively to the speeches made by various hon. members on the Address-in-reply. I agree with some of those speeches, and not with others. First and foremost, I cannot altogether accept the views expressed by Sir Charles Nathan. I have not that optimism which he possesses when he says that the corner has already been turned. It is a very big corner indeed, and to get round it will take us a long while. True, there is a silver lining to every cloud; but how long is the present state of affairs to continue? I hope that I am wrong in my view, and that Sir Charles is right in his optimism. The depression, however, does not affect Western Australia alone: it is world-wide, unfortunately. Until such time as we are able to stabilise the markets for our products, I see no chance of getting around the corner and looking ahead to a bright future. Money in Australia appears to be the same as in other parts of the world. What has become of it? One hon. member will say that the banks have it. They have a certain amount, but until we can get our unemployed into work of a permanent nature I see no prospect of overcoming our present troubles. In Western Australia, as in other parts of the world, the unemployed represent a difficult problem for the Government to face. In my opinion, the Government are to be commended on the works they have started, and are continuing, for the benefit of the unemployed. One of my friends says that the works are a waste of money, an instance being the operations at Harvey. Surely it is much better for men to be working in the country on something of a reproductive nature, than for them to be sent to Blackboy Camp to do nothing, but be kept in idleness. I have been through the Myalup and Stonehouse Camps, and have talked to a great many of the unemployed there. They all tell me that they much prefer being there to being at Blackboy or Stonehouse. Some are satisfied, in one way. They wanted to get work of a continuous nature, and two days' pay per week they thought was very little for them to earn. However, they were satisfied when they took into consideration the condition of the finances. They were much more satisfied at being at Myalup instead of Blackboy. They had pitched their tents on high, warm ground, and there was plenty of firewood available. Further, there was a little for them to do, if they chose, after

working the two or three days per week. The works undertaken by the Government during the last year or two started with the irrigation and drainage works at Waroona, which are not quite completed yet. A condensed milk factory has started since at Waroona. The optimistic views expressed by our Premier here and during his trips to the East induced the owners of the factory to invest a considerable amount of money in Western Australia. We are pleased and proud to have Nestle's Company amongst us. They would not put so much money into the district unless they saw something bright ahead. Certainly the factory is an established fact. It is operating at Waroona, solely owing to the foresight of the Government. Going down to Harvey, we see irrigation and drainage works in process of construction there. Let hon. members consider the population established there on small holdings. The same thing applies to Waroona. Were it not for the works put in hand by the Government, would the population be there? Something like 300 children are going to school at Harvey, largely in consequence of the irrigation and drainage scheme there. Mr. Moore the other night said it was a waste of money, diverting the river into the sea 14 miles away.

Hon. T. Moore: And wasteful methods, too, in the way it is being done.

Hon. E. ROSE: The Government were looking to find work for the men. That is why those methods were adopted. That work will certainly be reproductive. It is going from Harvey across to the ocean, and it has more than a 90ft. fall in 12 or 14 miles. The country that is going to be reclaimed between Harvey and the Mandurah Estuary consists of flats carrying a rich deposit brought down from the hills. When that land is settled, the hon. member will agree that the work was well justified.

Hon. T. Moore: They told us that about the Peel Estate.

Hon. E. ROSE: That is a different concern altogether. Nor is the Peel Estate a total failure, for settlement is going on there. It was experimental work, and we have to pay for our experience. No country can go ahead if it has no experiments and so no money wasted. We have only to see what is being done at Harvey, the erection of the condensed milk factory and of the butter fac-

tory. Would private people spend all that money there if they were not sure of some return? Those Harvey flats when they are properly settled will be employing thousands of men. That, of course, will be in the years to come. The work will certainly prove to be fully reproductive. Then there is the irrigation and drainage scheme at the Collie River. That, too, will employ numbers of men, and in addition will be the means of bursting up a lot of large estates and bringing about closer settlement. Three or four years ago a member who was then here said we were not making sufficient butter in Western Australia to grease a child's head. If that member were here to-day he would see how the butter industry has developed. Last year, the first year of export, one company alone sent away 25,000 cases.

Hon. T. Moore: Is that a fair result for the £6,000,000 that have been spent?

Hon. E. H. ROSE: The hon. member can blame his own party largely for the spending of that £6,000,000.

The PRESIDENT: This dialogue is very interesting, but is scarcely in order.

Hon. E. ROSE: Interjections like that of the hon. member may be helpful. This money, which it is said has been wasted, was spent on a tremendous experiment down there. I daresay some of it was wasted. But look at the way the land there has been developed all along the railways. There is going to be a very large settlement through there. We have only to go to the group settlements to see what is being produced and see the cattle that have been collected down there. The Government were wise in starting those settlements, although not wise in continuing them after receiving the Royal Commission's report on the Peel and Bate-man Estates. At that time only 1½ millions had been spent on group settlement. I happened to be one of the Royal Commissioners, and shortly after our report was presented the Mitchell Government were defeated and the Collier Government took office. Then they blamed the Mitchell Government for all the expenditure of the 1½ millions. The Mitchell Government, perhaps, had put the country to the cost of another three-quarters of a million. Had they acted on the Royal Commission's report there would not have been that money wasted, and the Peel Estate would not have had so much money lavished on it. I remember that three or four years

ago Sir Edward Wittenoom twitted me over the unimproved land along the railways. He said he had yet to learn there was along the railways so much good land that had not been turned to account.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I said it was open to settlement.

Hon. E. ROSE: There are still thousands of acres available, and by entering upon these schemes the present Government will be the means of bursting up big estates and finding employment for a great many men.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That land is all alienated, in the hands of private owners.

Hon. E. ROSE: Still there is so much of it lying idle. Consequently our railways run through that land at a loss, whereas if the country were developed, they would pay handsomely. I have been charged with boosting the South-West. I am optimistic about the South-West. I can assure members that the dairying industry in the South-West is going to do for Western Australia what the industry did for Victoria: it is going to pull us out of the mire and help us back to prosperity. With all this development taking place, with the schemes going on at Collie, Roelands, Bunbury, Dardanup and Waterloo, the dairying industry is going to be the means of producing a tremendous lot of commodities. But the next thing is what are we going to do with them? I do not think the Government are looking ahead sufficiently. They are spending all this money and having the land cut up and settled, but are not giving us any outlet for our produce. There is the Bunbury Harbour, where the ships will have to come to take our produce away. But we have not there the necessary depth of water, for the Government are allowing the harbour to silt up. We have a local committee working down there, going into the question of cool storage. But they have reached a deadlock, and they say they have the money promised and everything else ready, but cannot determine where the cool stores are to be, since they know not where the harbour will be. It is the duty of the Government after developing that country to give us a decent port. Take our fruit, which has to be railed from Bridgetown and Manjimup right through to Fremantle. I have seen a train load of fruit going through with the temperature at 108 in the shade, and that fruit, I believe, was left in the trucks for four days.

How is it possible for us to put on the export market choice fruit or mutton, when it has to be railed that distance and in such conditions? Then the South-West is well suited to the lamb trade. Not long ago we had a deputation to the Premier in reference to that, and I have here certain figures then quoted, showing the exports from Bunbury for the last 12 months to June 30th, 1932. They are as follows:—

Jarrah and karri 48,131 loads, value £250,717; wheat 107,777 tons, value £565,829; coal (bunker) 6,256 tons, value £9,384; general, including ships' stores, 969 tons, value £9,690.

During the same period the imports were—

General, 1,525 tons, value £15,250; crude sulphur, 2,916 tons, value £13,122; phosphatic rock 18,746 tons, value £18,746. The vessels entering the port were 84, comprising 49 steam, 34 motor, and one sailing. Their gross tonnage was 337,293, and their net tonnage 208,485, while the total cargo handled was 218,407 tons. While timber again shows a decrease, it will be noticed that wheat holds a prominent place in the total exports, and is a trade which must increase with the lapse of years. The harbour authorities have made provision in the matter of storage of wheat to the satisfaction of exporters, and must meet export trade with further facilities.

With reference to the export trade in wheat, it must increase considerably since we have our fertiliser works down there; for when the wheat is brought in, the farmers will be bound to load up with fertiliser for the return journey. Here is some more of the information I was quoting—

It is a fact that owing to siltage the depth of water at the two deep berths has been reduced from 27 feet 6 inches to 26 feet, a very grave restriction in the depth of water available. This will undoubtedly interfere with future chartering, both for general trade and bunkering, and indeed already has. For it has practically cut out the bunkering trade at Bunbury, and it is earnestly hoped for an immediate restoration of the original depth of 27 feet 6 inches, otherwise the custom of loading vessels calling at Bunbury (bound overseas from the Eastern States) to replenish bunkers will be absolutely lost. To illustrate this phase: With 27 feet 6 inches of water available, the total tonnage of coal bunkered at Bunbury over the last five years averaged 15,100 tons per year, while for the past year, with the depth at 26 feet, only 6,250 tons were shipped. Further, the provision of a deep berth providing no less than 30 feet of water is an absolute necessity at the present time, and so also is the necessity for shed-to-ship handling, if the port is to handle the trade of the province successfully and economically.

If we are going in for bulk handling, how are we to instal it at Bunbury if we have to reload the wheat on to trucks and take it along the jetty? It is necessary that we should have something definite, so that we may know what is to be done.

Although the inward trade has lost the petroleum business owing to the lack of facilities to handle bulk oils, this has been more than replaced by the crude materials received from the Picton phosphate works. During the year just closed a total of 22,000 tons was discharged, and this business on present indications must increase.

With the development of the country the quantity of superphosphate used on the land will not only be doubled but trebled.

Up to the year ended 30th June, 1915, the Harbour Board had met all its obligations for interest and sinking fund, and, in addition, paid to the Treasury a surplus of £45,417.

That shows what the shipping business was like when the timber export industry was at its best.

A matter of interest, particularly to the Harbour Board, which is expected to pay interest and maintenance from revenue, is that of non-paying goods 'products of the State.' Since 1915 of 5,006,129 tons of cargo shipped from Bunbury, 1,117,123 tons were free of dues. Had a wharfage charge on the basis of that made on timber, which is also a product of the State, been levied, the port authorities would have consistently paid interest and maintenance.

When it is realised that this free cargo represented more than 25 per cent. of the total shipments over a spread period of 18 years, and as the percentage must become greater as trade increases, the question of a port's requirements in serving a district such as the South-West (where economic transport costs are so vital to its success) is not entirely a matter of being able to pay interest and sinking fund, since credit in this direction should be given because of the Government policy of free wharfage to the State's staple productions.

The trade of the South-West at present is greater than the trade through Fremantle when the big scheme there was inaugurated.

A sum of £2,000,000 was spent to open up a harbour at Fremantle when the trade was no greater than the present trade of Bunbury. The expenditure to provide the necessary facilities at Bunbury would be largely incurred on labour. Very little of the money would be sent out of the State. It is a crying shame that the Government do not provide for the needs of the port. Year after year promises have been made that adequate facilities would be

provided, especially just previous to a general election. We fully expected that something would be done this year. Ministers have visited Bunbury, addressed meetings, and promised that a deep-water berth would be provided, but the port is still lacking this essential accommodation. True, the jetty has been lengthened a little and the breakwater has been lengthened. The breakwater will be of great advantage to the shipping, but the deep-water berth is indispensable. We should adopt a policy of decentralisation. It is wrong to centralise all the business at the port of Fremantle. I do not object to Fremantle receiving its just due, but the out-ports should be enabled to cater for their share of the shipping trade. No matter what party might be in power, it is their duty to provide facilities at the ports to enable produce to be handled as inexpensively and as expeditiously as possible.

A committee is in existence to launch a cool storage scheme to meet the exportable requirements of the South-West. The shipping companies providing refrigerated cargo space are prepared to call at the port of Bunbury if proper facilities are established, and these facilities must include a 30 feet berth at least.

It would not be difficult to provide a 30ft. berth. The present Government are obviously optimistic about the future of the South-West; otherwise they would not be incurring such large expenditure on drainage and irrigation works.

Unless port facilities are provided for these ships to call and pick up the perishable products of the district, the Government's policy will be largely negated by the cost of transport. To-day all overseas perishable products from this district have to be shipped through Fremantle. To emphasise the matter of transport to the export port, take the dairying industry. It is understood that within four to five years the butter manufacturers anticipate an exportable tonnage reaching the vicinity of 5,000 tons yearly. The cost of sending butter for export from Bunbury to Fremantle is £2 6s. 8d. per ton. Provide facilities at the port of Bunbury, and an immediate saving of £11,666 13s. 4d. is effected per year.

That sum of £11,666, divided amongst the dairy farmers, would mean the difference between profit and loss on their operations. Although the improvements sought might not be capable of earning the full amount of interest and sinking fund, they would go a long way towards meeting those charges.

As production increases and no facilities are offered at the port of Bunbury, a tragic yearly waste to the industry is obvious. The same

economic waste will occur, more or less, to the export of frozen lambs, pork, poultry, eggs, wine, fruit, wheat, wool, coal, etc. In fact the whole of the products of the South-West province will be seriously penalised from year to year.

We all know the loss that now occurs through having to rail produce to Fremantle for shipment.

Incidentally the egg export industry is making rapid progress and the South-West is a big contributor, and its contribution is exported through Fremantle at extra cost.

Perishable goods need to be placed in cool storage as quickly as possible and then transhipped to the vessels' refrigerated chambers with the least possible delay.

Boyanup now exports wine, and the extra cost of using Fremantle averages 1d. per gallon. Prior to the establishment of the fertiliser works at Picton, supplies came from Fremantle, and the Railway Department hauled them a great distance at great expense, and with little or no profit.

The State is deriving a benefit through not having to transport the super from Perth, which often meant returning whole rakes of empty trucks.

Now, so far as the district is concerned, the Railway Department hauls shorter distances, and still it is believed at little or no profit; but the cost of doing so must be cheaper to the department than previously. What does close contact with the fertiliser supplies mean to the producer? It means a saving of railage amounting to approximately £7,500 per annum. This is based on the present output of the works and computed at an average of 4s. 6d. per ton difference between the old cost of railage ex Fremantle (North) as against the cost now ex Picton. Viewing the statement above, and bearing this fact in mind, one can readily visualise the wonderful economic saving in the transport charges if facilities are offered at the nearest port.

I hope the Government will resolve to do something without delay. With all the development taking place in the South-West, the settlers will suffer considerable loss in the shape of unnecessary freight charges if the port improvements are not provided. We have been urged to export only the choicest of produce. How is it possible for settlers at, say, Manjimup, 200 miles distant, to send their produce to Fremantle and ship it in the best condition? Facilities must be provided at Bunbury. Additional facilities at Bunbury would lead to a considerable increase in the coal trade. I was pleased to see the report by Mr. Wittenoom regarding the use of Collie coal

by the Albany Woollen Mills. Several companies have informed us that they are getting as good results from Collie coal as from Eastern States coal, in addition to which it is cheaper. It used to be said that one ton of Newcastle coal was equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons of Collie coal. That was set out in Dr. Jack's report, but since he reported the mines have been developed at depth and the quality of the coal has improved. Although the price of coal has been reduced considerably, there has been no reduction in railway freights. Many more people would use Collie coal if they could get it for 1s. 6d. or 2s. per ton less. That would be sufficient to induce them to use Collie coal as against Newcastle coal. At Kalgoorlie I believe pulverised coal machinery is being introduced, but owing to the high freights being charged in this State, it is possible to land goods at Kalgoorlie via the Trans. line cheaper than from Fremantle. There is certainly something wrong. The wages of the Collie coal miners and railway men have been reduced and the price of coal has been reduced, but no reduction has been made in railway freights. The Commissioner of Railways does not allow any reductions in the railage cost of Collie coal. That is credited to the department and debited to the mines. There is a huge extent of coal-bearing country at Collie. Even if it cost the Government a little more to use the local article, they should do so, seeing that they are always urging the use of local products. The Railway Department, however, one of the biggest spending departments of the State, is actually preaching the use of Newcastle coal. If the Commissioner had his way, he would not use a ton of Collie coal. The Government should see to it that local products are patronised and that encouragement is given to people to develop local industry. Most of us have faith in our country and are doing our best to develop it. I think I can claim credit for having had as much to do with the development of the dairying industry as anyone else. I have devoted a lot of time to it and the results are indeed satisfactory. The butter factories have done much to develop the industry to the export stage.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I suppose the factory recently opened will help the industry a lot.

Hon. E. ROSE: Yes. The South-West as a whole is progressing, but we must have the assistance for which I have asked. I repeat the hope that the Government will do something. People com-

plain bitterly of having to rail their perishable products during the heat of the day to Fremantle, whereas they could be railed into Bunbury during the night if only the harbour accommodation were provided. There has been a lot of adverse criticism of Collie coal that I consider is quite unwarranted. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co. are taking coal from the Griffin Mine; several of the breweries, and other establishments are also taking it. They say it is the best coal in Western Australia. The Midland Railway Company had a lot of it, and say it is superior to any Collie coal they have used. Notwithstanding this, the Commissioner for Railways condemns it and says he is losing money on it. Nothing will satisfy the Collie people but the holding of an inquiry into the cause of these things. It is all very well to have a Royal Commission on Collie coal, but the work of that commission was never completed. The inquiry was made only into one mine, and the evidence was very one-sided. The Griffin Mine will yet come into its own. I cannot understand the prejudice against it on the part of the Commissioner for Railways. Various enterprises I have mentioned say they can get further with Griffin coal than with any other local coal. They will guarantee that. They never have any trouble or clinking, nor have they had any bars burnt out. The Railway Department would not take one ton more of Griffin coal than they were taking when the strike was on at the Amalgamated collieries, but they rushed to another company and placed an order for 12,000 tons from Newcastle. When the Commissioner for Railways was in the Eastern States his officers should have telegraphed to him. I would point out that on every ton of coal that is imported into this State a commission of something like 2s. 6d. is paid to the agents. I should have thought the Government would have saved that money, but they neglected to do so. They determined to go in for the most expensive method. I also wish to refer to the cost of railway construction to the Griffin mine under the day labour system. Any contractor could make a fortune if he had the task of constructing 300 miles of railway at a cost of £3,000 a mile. Why should the Government have adopted this expensive system of railway construction? The Public Service List, containing particulars of the salaries paid to civil servants, has been laid upon the Table of the House. I see

no reference in it to railway officers. Members should be given a list of the railway officers and their salaries, and the wages paid in that service. We do not know what the salaries are, nor what the department is costing the country; neither do we know whether any reductions have been made in the higher salaries. I hope the Chief Secretary will lay on the Table such a list.

Hon. H. Seddon: You can get it in the report of the Railway Department.

Hon. E. ROSE: That does not state what the salaries are.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes.

Hon. E. ROSE: I have looked through the report and have failed to find such a list. Why have the Government not separated the Electricity Supply and Tramways from the Railway Department? The Electricity Supply and Tramways should be under a board of control, just as the Government are trying to arrange in respect to sewerage and drainage. It would be better for the Railway Department, as well as for the Government, to have those two concerns treated separately. Why should it be necessary to pay such high salaries to the heads of these departments? Mr. Taylor is capable of running the two concerns. His report could be sent along direct instead of through the channels of the Railway Department. There would then be no occasion to increase the salaries of the Commissioner and the secretary to the Commissioner. A separation of these activities from the Railway Department would undoubtedly lead to the saving of expense. I hope the Government will do something for the farmers in the South-West, especially as they are now spending millions of money in that part of the State. Harbour facilities are badly needed at Bunbury, so that better opportunities may be afforded to the people of the South-West to export their produce. We are not asking for money for the provision of coal storage there. Once we know that adequate harbour facilities will be given to us, coal storage accommodation will be provided, and we shall then have a number of ships calling for our perishable goods which at present cannot be shipped from our own ports.

HON. G. FRASER (West) [6.7]: I join with the other members in congratulating you, Sir, upon your re-appointment as President, and new members upon their election to this House. The first reference I wish to

make is to the Dog Act. I do this for the purpose of drawing attention to a question I asked earlier in the session. This related to the protection of householders in view of the decision recently given in the Local Court. The reply I got to my question was that the Act was controlled by local governing bodies, and that it should be left to them to ask for an amendment. It was a strange answer to give to my question. We know the Act requires amendment, and that the householders need protection, but no move is being made by the Government in the desired direction. The whole thing is left to the local authorities. Most members will have seen a reference to the case in point. Full particulars appeared in the Press. A decision was given in the case in which, uninvited, a hawker had entered upon certain premises and was bitten by a dog. Notices had been displayed to beware of the dog, but according to the decision the notices were of no value.

Hon. J. Cornell: Surely it is not necessary in the metropolitan area to keep a dog that will bite.

Hon. G. FRASER: In many cases it is necessary. Many men work on the railways and tramways at all hours of the night, and at any period during the 24 hours. Many such people live in isolated parts of the suburbs. They keep a dog to protect the household while they are away. If any person ventures on the premises, despite the notices that are prominently displayed, and is bitten by one of these dogs, the owner is liable to prosecution.

Hon. J. Cornell: So he should be.

Hon. G. FRASER: I differ from the hon. member. According to him it does not matter whether a person is there for an unlawful purpose or not, the owner is not allowed to do anything to prevent it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The percentage of evil persons is small compared with that of good-minded people.

Hon. G. FRASER: Some protection should be given to those people who are obliged to keep these dogs.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Do you want the dog protected?

Hon. G. FRASER: I want the owner protected from prosecution by persons who enter premises uninvited. The matter is a serious one to many householders. I understand that other sections of the Act require

amending, particularly with regard to the license fee that is charged. A movement is now on foot in that direction, and I trust when the Minister concerned is approached by a deputation, he will agree to some alteration being made.

Hon. J. Cornell: If every miner working on night shift kept a dog, the goldfields would not be a good place to live in.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I hope the license fee will be put up, and that the money so received will be used to reduce the deficit.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am disappointed that the Government have not taken action in another matter. I was successful in securing the passing of a motion last session dealing with compulsory third party risk insurance. Since then nothing has been done by the Government to put that motion into effect. The only question raised at the time was on the matter of cost. I believe I was able to convince members that for the payment of £1 a year at the time the license was taken out, the whole of the cost of the third party risk would be covered. Although the Minister in conversation with me said he would give the matter careful consideration, and although we know this insurance is in force in other countries, the Government have so far made no effort to introduce it in this State.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government will probably bring it in now. They ought to do so.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is high time it was done. Already something like 40 matters are listed on the Notice Paper in another place, and if the question formed part of the Government's programme for this session, some reference would have been made to it before this.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. FRASER: At the tea adjournment, I was voicing my disappointment at the neglect of the Government to give notice of their intention to introduce legislation to deal compulsorily with third party risks. I thought that a matter of such vital importance would have received the attention of the Government, with a view to the introduction of amending legislation. It should not be necessary for a member to draw attention to the seriousness of the position. When I moved a resolution dealing with the matter last

year, I cited some distressing instances of suffering as a result of this deficiency in our legislation. Since then, further accidents have been recorded, and the innocent victims of careless motorists have been put to untold expense without the possibility of securing any redress. Particularly during the last two years, many accidents in the metropolitan area have affected people not in possession of much of the world's wealth. Some of those unfortunates, some of whom have been unemployed, will never be free of the debt incurred as a result of the carelessness of others. The Press, from time to time, have dealt with this question and recently the "Daily News" stressed the position of the medical fraternity who have rendered wonderful service in connection with the victims of accidents without securing recompense, in very many instances, for their work. On one occasion, an unemployed girl was knocked down by a motorist and for 18 months she was under the care of a doctor. Her leg will never be satisfactory again and she has been muled in medical, hospital and other expenses, without any hope of securing damages, because the person responsible for the accident was without means. Such a case is by no means isolated. Very often the motorist is possessed of nothing beyond his car, and the car is not worth seizing. I trust it is not too late even now for the Government to give attention to this matter and to introduce amending legislation. England and New Zealand have already enacted measures along those lines and, although I have not been able to secure particulars, I understand that the legislation is along the lines I suggested last year. I believe that by the payment of £1 when the car license is taken out, the motorist is covered with a third party compulsory risk. Apart from the injured persons involved in accidents, such legislation would be beneficial to the motoring fraternity themselves. The payment of £1 would represent about £50,000 a year and if legislation were enacted on that basis, the expenditure involved by the third party risk should be more than covered. It would be a cheaper way for the motorist, too, because under existing conditions, cover for a third party risk involves the payment of at least £3 or £4. During the past few months, the local governing bodies in particular have been seriously concerned regarding the cost of infectious diseases. In conversation with representa-

tives of local governing bodies, I gleaned information regarding that question and, for the life of me, I cannot understand how the Government can charge the local authorities with the cost of such cases in their districts. The Health Department rely on a section of the Health Act of 1904, but I, in common with other members of this Chamber and of another place, considered that when the hospital fund was established, all persons who contributed to it, irrespective of whether they suffered from infectious diseases or otherwise, would benefit from that scheme. If it was the Government's intention that that should not be the position, why was not the exemption of infectious diseases specified in the Hospital Fund Act, seeing that other diseases are exempt in that measure? Certainly it was not the intention of Parliament that people suffering from infectious diseases should not be covered by the Hospital Fund Act. Nevertheless, the Health Department have saddled the local authorities with the cost of treatment of infectious diseases. Under existing conditions, persons suffering from such diseases have to pay their proportion of the hospital tax and also pay a health rate to the local governing authority. If they possess some means, they are called upon to bear some part of the cost of their treatment. Thus, such persons can be hit in three ways, and I am sure no such intention was ever in the minds of members of Parliament. I hope the local authorities will secure relief as the result of their agitation. Another matter relates to the payment of the hospital tax for sustenance workers. Some local authorities, instead of requiring the men to pay the tax, make the payment on their behalf, and the amount charged has been returned to the local authorities by the Government. Recently that practice was discontinued, and some local authorities now require the sustenance workers to pay the tax, although others are paying it for the men. I understand there is a fly in the ointment. At least one ratepayers' auditor has taken exception to the local governing body paying the tax on account of sustenance workers. I understand that a Bill to amend the Road Districts Act will be before the House shortly, and I trust that the opportunity will be taken to insert a clause empowering the local governing body to make such payments should they desire to do so. I trust the Government will agree to place such payments on a legal footing.

When speaking on the Appropriation Bill last year, I drew attention to the indefiniteness of the decisions of the Unemployment Board with reference to the employment of sustenance workers. I referred to permanent employees being dismissed by local authorities and the work they were formerly carrying out, being undertaken by sustenance workers. I thought the Government would have given consideration to that matter because it affected the cost to the Government in unemployment relief. Although I drew attention to the position 12 months ago, it was only recently that the Government dealt with the matter. Owing to the lax methods adopted by the Unemployment Board, the local authorities were doing something that added to the difficulties of the unemployment problem. At that time, few people listened to me, probably being under the impression that I did not know what I was talking about. I would like the Minister to provide me with particulars of the number of persons permanently employed by local authorities on manual labour two years ago, and the number employed by them to-day. I do not want information to cover town clerks and office staffs but I want particulars regarding the men employed on outside manual work. When I was a member of the select committee that dealt with the City of Perth Superannuation Fund Bill, I was informed by the Town Clerk of Perth that all persons other than those on the list of officials, were casual employees. I was able to draw his attention to one man who had been employed for 40 years, but the Town Clerk informed me that he was still a casual employee. I should like to have the figures supplied. I have also drawn the attention of the department to this particular question and have had several arguments with them. Through lax methods adopted in the handling of this matter, we find that at the present time most of the local governing bodies are in a much healthier position financially than they were in 12 months or two years ago. I am not blaming them for taking advantage of the position, but I do blame the Government for allowing themselves to be saddled with an expense that should be borne by someone else. I notice that one local body finished up its year with a credit balance of £5,900. Does anyone mean to tell me that with a falling revenue—and without exception every local body has suffered from falling revenue in the way of rates—they

have been able to build up credit balances of such dimensions under existing conditions?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Which body had a credit of £5,900?

Hon. G. FRASER: The Claremont Municipality. Not only that local authority, but if the hon. member cares to go through the annual reports of all the local governing bodies in the metropolitan area, he will find that very few finished up without improving their finances by at least £1,000. How has all that been accomplished? Only in one way, and that is by their having been relieved by the Government of the payment of wages to their employees. I have argued this question with the Unemployment Board and their reply was, "What are the men to do; are they to go and pick grass in the streets?" Surely there is more work than picking grass in the streets that can be done without interfering with the work of the permanent employees of the local bodies. I have told the Unemployment Board that my interpretation of the sustenance work is work of a character that will be in the interests of the community, work that would not be done out of ordinary revenue. Hon. members will find that there is any amount of work to be done in every suburb, and that work will not be carried out with the aid of the finances of local bodies for perhaps 10 or 15 years. The unemployed men could be engaged in works of that description, and while they were doing some good for the community, they would not be giving the local bodies the opportunity to displace their own permanent employees. I know that permanent truck drivers have been sacked and their work done by sustenance men. It has taken the Government over 12 months to wake up to the position and now action has been taken which will not result in the benefit that they expect. The only sufferers will be the men themselves. It will make no difference to the local bodies, because they will have done for them all the work they require carried out. The Unemployment Board has issued instructions that no more men are to be engaged on work by local bodies unless approved by the board. The local bodies, however, are not afraid of that new order because they have as many men working for them on sustenance as they require. The people who will be injured will be those on sustenance and not the local bodies. Another matter with which I want to deal and which

has a bearing on the question of unemployment is the treatment meted out to that body known as the Frankland River men. I hope it will not be considered that I am referring to this subject for political purposes. Irrespective of the Government in power, I would have made similar reference to the subject. Whilst I believe that those men have a genuine complaint, I regret that they allowed themselves to get into the hands of a section who have been using them as tools. At the same time, if the charges made by the Frankland River men are correct and if it could be found that they are correct, somebody should get his walking ticket. The only way to learn whether the men are telling the truth is by way of an inquiry. The charges made by them appear to me to be grave and to warrant the holding of an investigation. It is openly stated by some of the men that when they arrived at the Frankland River the conditions were such that no Government could expect men to work under them. They were sent away with a piece of bread and butter or bread and jam to tackle the journey from Perth to the Frankland River and after getting out 40 or 45 miles from Mt. Barker, it was found that no provision had been made for their accommodation.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: That is not right.

Hon. G. FRASER: It is what I have been informed.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: I saw the accommodation myself.

Hon. G. FRASER: I am informed by some of the men that several of them had to walk back five miles to the store to obtain provisions. On arriving at the store they found that very few provisions had reached the district, and they had to go back with practically nothing, and to exist for another 24 hours or so.

Hon. T. Moore: That is just what happened at Pithara to the men on sustenance jobs.

Hon. G. FRASER: If such things are happening, is it any wonder that men are discontented? Personally I think the Frankland River men made a mistake in leaving that district. If I had had anything to do with those men, they would never have left Frankland River to be swallowed up in the capital city and forgotten. They would have stayed there and the Government would have been made to keep them until their grievances had been redressed. It seems hard that men should be forced to go into the bush

45 miles from civilisation to encounter conditions such as those that these men were sent to. Accusations have been made, but of course I am not in a position to say whether they are right or not. If what the men say is true, the charges are a condemnation of those who sent the men to Frankland River. There is only one way in which the truth can be ascertained and that is by public inquiry. We know that most of the unemployed bodies in the metropolitan area have carried resolutions that they will refuse to go to the bush on the rates offered. We know that the Government are hard hit, but I believe they are overstepping the position when they say to the unemployed, "You must go to the country on the conditions set out or starve." If the conditions were such as to enable the men to live decently, one would not object, but to ask married men to work in the country at the rate of £1 above sustenance and to expect them to keep two homes, is asking the men to do an absolute impossibility. I know a number of men who prefer to starve rather than go to the country on such conditions. There are instances where the Government have taken up the attitude of informing men that unless they go to, say Brookton, or Boyup Brook, there will be no sustenance for them. I should like to say that I have no complaint to make against any of the officials handling this particular department. The Government are fortunate in having such men to occupy these difficult posts. The men understand their duties and the position of the unemployed, and are prepared to extend every consideration wherever it is necessary. They are carrying out their duties to the best of their ability. I have, however, something to say of those who are responsible for framing regulations that tie right down the hands of the officers. Many instances have come under my notice showing that the regulations laid down by the Government are harsh. One is that no person with a block of land on which he can produce anything shall receive above £1 a week sustenance. Whilst that regulation may be all right as far as the country districts are concerned, it should not apply in the metropolitan area. I have in mind the cases of men in the Hamilton Hill and Spearwood districts. Some years ago we recommended to the casual workers at Fremantle, those who are engaged in seasonal occupations in the wool or the oil stores, that they should take up blocks of land in those districts and cultivate them in the time at

their disposal. It was shown that what they produced would help them over their seasonal difficulties. Many men accepted the advice and took up areas and now they are in the unfortunate position that because they have attempted to improve their lot they are not permitted to receive more than a pound a week by way of sustenance. The districts in which these men have their small plots will grow anything if there is an adequate supply of water and super. Unfortunately these men have not the means with which to purchase super, or even to carry out necessary improvements. And yet we find the Government imposing a restriction on these men, allowing them no more than £1 per week sustenance.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Were the Government approached and asked for super supplies or anything like that?

Hon. G. FRASER: That is a matter which would come within the scope of the Agricultural Bank. We know that the bank officials are not too favourably disposed towards this particular district.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They ought to give help to men who are desirous of advancing settlement.

Hon. G. FRASER: They ought to; but there is also this consideration, that the little extra assistance which would enable the men to produce something would not justify us in asking them to tie another load around their necks in the shape of further indebtedness to the Agricultural Bank. They should receive the same treatment as is received by other men, only two miles away. I put it to one of the departmental officials, "If these men shut down on their blocks altogether and came into Fremantle, which is only a couple of miles away, and lived there, no question would arise as to their receiving the full sustenance, right up to £2 9s., according to the size of the family; but because they have been out there, attempting to improve their condition and to improve the district, they are restricted by the Government to £1 per week sustenance." Such a position is neither fair nor reasonable, although the Government, I admit, have to protect themselves one way or another. Still, the Government should not do that by laying down a hard and fast rule to cover the metropolitan area and the country districts. Only last week a man with eight children came to see me. He is a man in the market gardening line. Being restricted to

£1 per week, he had no money with which to improve his block. A little produce is likely to come along in two or three months; but how is the man to keep his wife and eight children on £1 per week during the winter months, when he can earn nothing at all? Such a position is ridiculous. Whilst I know that the Government have been hard hit and must protect themselves, still it is harsh of them to lay down one regulation covering the whole of the State, instead of examining conditions existing in various parts and introducing various regulations to cover those different sets of conditions.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Each case should be weighed on its merits.

Hon. G. FRASER: Yes, but how can a case be weighed on its merits if the Government lay down a hard and fast rule, giving no chance to the officials, to whom I wish to pay a compliment. In such circumstances, the officials have no opportunity of treating any case on its merits. A few months ago a deputation to the Minister for Unemployment asked that individual consideration should be given. Up to date I have not heard the result of the representations made by the deputation. Meantime cases have been cropping up, and we have been seeing the officials about them. If a man wins a pound or two in a competition, his sustenance is immediately shut down. While it may be necessary that people should expend money properly, is it right that when a man has been on sustenance for 18 months or two years and then obtains a pound or two, whether earned or won or given, he should be told by the officials that his sustenance has been cut down or reduced for two or three weeks? How can the Government expect people who for 18 months or two years have received nothing but meal or dole tickets, handling no money at all, either to pay rent or purchase clothing? They have been so long out of work that the clothing they had when they first fell into their present unfortunate position is worn out. Certainly, if people produce receipts for money expended in clothing, household linen, or rent, they receive consideration. That is all right for those who know of it; but in many cases the people are not aware of the arrangement. They walk into a shop and make purchases, knowing nothing about the risk of having their sustenance stopped or decreased until they again go to the department. Then they are told, "Produce

your receipts and we will give you consideration." But the receipts have been destroyed or lost or burnt. I trust that the Government will give more serious thought to the unemployment question, and that they will at least withdraw some of the present harsh regulations which the officials are compelled to administer. The unemployed are of various phases, as we know. Many of the unemployed will, if given the chance, defraud the Government; but the dishonest are in a very small minority.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: And the Government penalise all the rest because of that small minority.

Hon. G. FRASER: That is the trouble. Some of the unemployed are dishonest, and omit to notify the Government of any money they happen to receive; but the great majority of honest unemployed are made to suffer for that. It is not right. The Government should issue other instructions in that respect. I had not intended to speak this evening, but rose merely to fill a gap. I trust that the few remarks I have made to-night will receive more consideration than the remarks I made on the Appropriation Bill last year. Had those observations received consideration, the Government would not have had to take the measures they have since been compelled to adopt, and other public bodies would have had to carry their own responsibilities instead of the Government's carrying them.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [8.10]: Before making the few remarks I have to offer on the Address-in-reply, I wish to associate myself with other members' expressions of pleasure at your re-election, Sir, to the Presidency of the Chamber. I also join in the welcome extended to new members. At the same time I desire to express my mood of regret at the passing of various excellent members of this House during the period of recess. In perusing the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, one feels that those responsible for its compilation have in a very mild way expressed a few, if not exactly platitudes, mere vague thoughts, rather than laid before the country any definite programme of work. Only a few items are mentioned, and these are simply in the nature of record. Consequently one need make but slight reference to those items, though in passing one may offer some little comment. Before proceeding to do that, however, I wish to say that I am with those mem-

bers who believe that Western Australia has entered upon, if not a very bright phase of prosperity, yet a condition of things which, in spite of the jocular references made to turning the corner, means at least an arrest of the terrible drift that was taking place, and also means that we have set our faces in a forward direction and are making towards better things.

Hon. T. Moore: Does the last deficit disclose that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: The hon. member will bear in mind that the last deficit was composed almost entirely of two items, and that those items were of such a character that the Government could hardly be excused from making the expenditure. Therefore that phase does not materially enter into the question. The "Dismal Jimmy" character going round the country and pretending to tell what some people call truth, but what is only just a gloomy retrospect, does not cut much ice. If we as a community cannot look ahead with a better spirit of anticipation, then the sooner we are replaced by other people, the better. To suppose that it is beyond the wit of man to devise a system by which the productive and consumption capacities of a people shall be regulated is utterly absurd. We have to get some system of that nature. All else is more or less claptrap and side issues that do not matter very much. That is the goal we have to seek. So far as I see, the more we shelve party differences and act together, facing the position as it is to-day with a determination to work unitedly for better conditions, the sooner will this country accelerate its rate of progress. It is a fact that millions of people are living below starvation level—I speak for the moment in a world sense. There are millions more unemployed or on part-time eking out a meagre existence—selling goods on commission, adopting all sorts of ways and means to get a few shillings or even a crust. We see to-day, any day in the week, a more or less degrading sight—though I am not speaking derogatorily of the unemployed—men and boys selling solutions to puzzles and that kind of thing, with the object of getting food and a little money to carry them on. That kind of thing is getting us nowhere; instead of putting us in the ascendancy it is taking us in the other direction. There is nothing that stands between the productive and consumptive capacity except price fix-

ation, and that is based on credit. We have to see to it that we utilise to the best possible advantage what credit we can get. I believe the Government have made a very honest and reasonable endeavour to protect the public purse. Savings that have been effected and reductions that have been made are perhaps somewhat disappointing and difficult for some people, but many of them were justified, and I believe that the Government have done good work in that direction. If we are honestly of opinion that we can assist to raise the morale of the people at a time like this, it is our duty to do so. I believe that, given reasonable assistance, the Government of the day, whether National or Labour, will do their best for the people; that if the people's representatives in Parliament rally round the Government and refrain from raising artificial difficulties, it will be to the benefit of the people as a whole. I would refer to the steadily growing Federal encroachment on our State rights. I was an ardent Federalist and voted for Federation, but after 30 years' experience I am disappointed. I regret that the Federal spirit which we young Australians thought was going to guide our national footsteps to great things has not materialised, at all events not in Western Australia, and I feel grieved to think that to-day what little there is of it is a diminishing quantity. That, of course, is open to debate, but I feel that if the steadily encroaching policy of the Federal Government is allowed to continue, a good many of us who in the past have been supporters of the Federal system will be found amongst those who cry for secession or something akin to it. I am told that in Kalgoorlie and on the Eastern Goldfields the shops and stores are practically stocked with South Australian products as the result of the differential treatment given to traders on the Trans railway. Had any suggestion of that been made in the early days of Federation, it would have been regarded as impossible. It is a crying shame, most unfair to this State and utterly unfederal. We should raise our protest against it to the very utmost.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It is hitting below the belt.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, and it is like hitting a person who is unable to retaliate. The same may be said of the proposal to do away with the gold bonus. There again

there may be some ground for debate, in view of the high price of gold; but the Federal Government definitely made a promise to this State, and on that promise men have put their little capital into prospecting ventures and are now out prospecting in the back country. Possibly those men were not wholly induced to take that action as a result of the bonus, but certainly the promise of the bonus weighed with them in deciding upon their action. The withdrawal of the gold bonus is to me an unfederal act, one that is quite wrong. Then there is a matter that has been discussed in this Chamber. I refer to the action of the Federal Government in imposing restrictions upon our spending of money granted to us. I was not present to hear Sir Charles Nathan speak the other evening, and I have not yet read his remarks, so I do not know whether he referred to the question; but I have heard it said that to take such a view of that Federal action is to have a distorted mind. I am afraid that my mind must be distorted, because I am quite unable to see in that action very much more than an act of mistrust on the part of the Federal authorities against our State authorities. I take it that in making a grant to Western Australia the Federal Government are handing back some of the money they have taken from us. But it is being returned to us with the suggestion that it shall be spent as the Commonwealth tells us, although I understand we are permitted to submit a schedule of works for which we want the money, and the Federal authority will have a look over the works and say whether they are justified. I have not so much admiration for the Federal Government or the Federal Parliament as to think they can tell us better than we know what is good for the State. So, as I say, I look upon their action as one of mistrust, and to be deplored. Another thing I would refer to is the growth of the gambling evil in Western Australia. I spoke on this question during last session and aroused some controversy by saying the Government should attempt to regulate the evil. For the benefit of members who were not in the House on that occasion I want to repeat that occasionally I have a little bet, and that I enjoy going to race meetings two or three times a year, for I think horseracing is quite a good sport. But I do hold it to be the height of hypocrisy when we see every day in the week certain of our streets almost given

up to men lounging about in order to take part in starting-price betting. I say the time is ripe when the Government should get in and control those people as they control the liquor traffic.

Hon. E. Rose: They do, in Perth.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Only by action on the part of the police, who turn themselves into a sort of revenue-producing concern. I do not know whether they previously calculate the amount they expect to collect each week, but I do notice that it is nearly the same sum week after week. It is not unlike the cross-word puzzles from which the Government are benefiting at present. This gambling is a growing evil and I want to see it controlled by the Government. Personally I would allow betting shops to be established on the same lines as hotels; their books to be kept open, a bond put up and the shops remain open only during certain hours. Then if people wanted to bet, they could go and do it in a legitimate way. If that were done, I am sure betting would be curtailed rather than increased. If we were to do away with licenses for hotels we should find hotels springing up all over the place and the drink traffic growing enormously. So I say that if we wish to curtail betting we should legalise and strictly control it. Only to-day I was approached in regard to the newspaper competitions and asked to speak against them. But to ask me to speak unkindly of newspapers would be to ask of me something that I could not do. But I do see danger in some of these newspaper competitions, unless some method of control be not adopted. Even the present competitions are being run in an unsatisfactory way. I am not referring either to the proprietors or to the men conducting the competitions, for I know them all and am satisfied as to their integrity. But they are doing something at which the law is merely winking. Instead of being able to conduct their competitions openly, they have to resort to subterfuge. Since the whole community is participating in these competitions, why should we not be honest and say, "Very well, we will see to it that the thing is done properly"? To-day a man went so far as to infer that it would be possible for the person responsible for the drawing to pick out one particular solution and, though not knowing the person who had submitted it, put it aside and select another. I do not believe that that is taking place. I also

heard of a widow who is alleged to have purchased 15 copies of one newspaper and sent in a large number of solutions. She had three children and two of them were out of work. The woman was represented to me as being of the type who could ill-afford the money, as she was living from hand to mouth. If that sort of thing is permitted to grow, the sooner we assume some control the better. At the same time I believe that the competitions which for the moment have taken the public fancy and are quite fashionable amongst the young people, as they were originally instituted, are not very harmful. What I desire is that they be controlled and conducted openly if they are to be conducted at all. Rather than adopt the attitude of more or less winking at the gambling element, and to ensure that the Treasury obtains some quota for the revenue, we should institute something better. I would welcome the re-introduction of the Premium Bonds Bill, to get down to something concrete. A Bill of that kind was introduced last session, but it was stifled when Parliament prorogued. I suggest to the Government that, when considering the gambling evil, they should decide to introduce a Premium Bonds Bill.

Member: It would be too slow.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps so for those sports who patronise whippets, but for the quiet, easy-going people, they would do. My colleague, Mr. Rose, efficiently and exhaustively dealt with the South-West Province. I wish to supplement a few of his remarks and make clear that while there has been some criticism of the expenditure in the South-West, it has been justified. Despite some mal-administration, from which no Government during the last 10 years has been free of blame, there is definite evidence of progress.

Hon. E. Rose: What is justified, the criticism?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I intended to say that the policy of opening up the South-West had been fully justified. One item in the Speech is worth emphasising—

The supplies provided by the dairying industry have at last almost overtaken local demand. Last year exporters sent 25,000 boxes of butter overseas. During the year 10¼ million pounds of butter were manufactured. This constitutes almost two and a half times the quantity produced in 1927.

I sometimes think the dairying industry does not get quite the credit due to it in the publicly expressed views of Australia's primary products. People are inclined to regard wool and wheat as our great staple industries. We are pleased that they are, and we have every sympathy for the people engaged in them.

Hon. T. Moore: They need it.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: They need a little more than sympathy.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Sympathy is the first stage; it is necessary before help is forthcoming. If sympathy is lacking, help is not likely to be forthcoming. We will express sympathy in the hope that the Government will give the help. I wish to quote a few remarks made recently by Mr. P. J. Carroll, superintendent of Commonwealth Dairy Exports, who visited this State. It was my pleasure to attend a dinner given him by the butter factory managers, and he gave an address that I regret was not given full publicity in the Press. It was a statement of a man well qualified to speak, a statement full of common sense, and containing useful information. He said—

More than 600,000 persons, or more than one-tenth of the population of the Commonwealth, are on dairy farms. This does not take into account those engaged in the manufacture of butter and other by-products Public men are in the habit, when mentioning our great primary industries, and their importance to the country, of confining their remarks to wheat and wool, two very valuable industries, rarely mentioning dairy products, although from the point of finance, together with the employment it provides, dairying is really of greater importance to the economic life of Australia than either of the industries mentioned. It is estimated that this season Australia will export overseas upwards of 90,000 tons of butter, upwards of 3,300 tons of cheese, and large quantities of other dairy products, approximating in value £13,000,000. In 1930-31 our export of butter provided a record, increasing by 51 per cent. over the preceding year. This season will provide another record with a further increase of 22 per cent. over 1930-31. The average export for the past two years (86,424 tons) therefore exceeds the average for the previous five years (45,685 tons) by 77 per cent. ¼

Seeing that we have overtaken the local demand and have become an exporting community of some tonnage, we have every reason to be pleased with the progress that dairying has made. We are very proud of the progress made in the South-West. In

the last few years something like 14 butter factories have been established, two condensed milk factories have been opened, a cheese factory has been started, and we have every hope that before long there will be established in our midst bacon factories as well. Consequently, production in that quarter of the State will steadily increase. I am pleased that the Government have expressed the intention of introducing a Bill to deal with the whole-milk trade. The competition has been causing great anxiety and the sooner the State takes a hand and ensures a fair deal to the producer and the consumer, the better. So far as I can see, the producer is being robbed by the mere pittance he is receiving for the milk, and the consumer is being slugged by the price he is called upon to pay. I leave it to members to say who is getting the difference. One matter of which the people have not heard much lately but which still requires considerable attention, is group settlement. We have had two Royal Commissions on group settlement. The first was unproductive of anything except some controversy. It is a pity it was not productive of a good deal of action. Had action been taken on the lines indicated by the Commission, much of the trouble, expense and heart-burning that have since occurred would have been saved. However, we have recently had another Royal Commission, who have furnished a report, and we are waiting to hear what action the Government propose to take. I do not intend to offer any criticism of the report. I may be prepared to do that on some future occasion. There is a spirit of unrest and anxiety prevailing amongst group settlers who, by reason of their being late comers, unsuccessful, or something else, are not measuring up to standard, and consequently some of them are being evicted. I divide the group settlers into three classes. First there are those who are getting along steadily, some even doing well.

Hon. T. Moore: Are many paying their interest?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Some have paid all their interest; some have paid quite a lot. Quite a number are doing reasonably well. When I refer to their doing reasonably well I wish members to recollect that the price of butter fat has reached a lower level than has been known in this State for many years. It is very much lower than was anticipated when the people were put there. I am convinced that had butter fat remained at about

1s. 3d. per lb., there would have been quite a different story to tell. The price used to be round about 1s. 5d. and 1s. 6d. The difference of these few pence has been the difference between success and failure.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: What is the price today?

Hon. W. J. MANN: About 1s. It is much the same with the wheatgrower. When he got a certain price, he could carry on, but when the price fell below that, his was a losing proposition. I do not want unduly to criticise the trustees of the Agricultural Bank. They are estimable men, and are doing their job to the best of their ability. One can say that, too, of most of the subordinate officers. The policy of the institution is that if a man does not pay, he must get out. We have some reason to expect greater leniency to be extended to settlers by this Government institution. I admit there are still some misfits on the groups, settlers who will have to go. There are others, however, who are estimable people, whom it would be a sin to turn out. They may not yet be successful and may not be in the top grade, but they are good settlers, are bringing up their families, and most of them are happy. If the bank evict people of that sort, it will mean throwing them upon a glutted labour market. I see no prospect for them beyond Government relief. Last Saturday I was visited by a settler. He had no complaints against the bank. He had been in business before and knew something about the policy of banks. He joined the groups some five years ago with his wife and family. He thought he could get through, but ultimately found that the work was beyond him. He loves the life, and his wife and he have never been in better health, but they have expended all their capital and have reached the end of their tether. The bank inspector said to this man, "Do you think you can carry on?" He replied, "I can see that the business is beyond me." The inspector then said he could find him sustenance work at Yarloop if he wanted to leave his holding. The man asked for a couple of days in which to consider the matter, and came to me for advice. What advice can I give such a man? He is not fit for pick and shovel work. His wife has never lived in a tent and it will be very hard for both of them. It would be better in such circumstances if the bank allowed people like this to carry on instead of worrying them

as they do. There are many such cases. I hope the Government will take the matter up with the bank and see what can be done for these good people, who eventually will return something to the country. Mr. Rose referred to the necessity for improved berthing accommodation at the Bunbury harbour. I agree with his remarks on the subject. The trade in that portion of the State is growing and improved harbour facilities are long overdue. The Government should also provide cool storage facilities at Bunbury. Mr. Rose said the cost of carrying butter and other products from Bunbury to Fremantle was £2 6s. 8d. per ton. That is a big charge against primary producers, when all that is necessary is to effect a few improvements at Bunbury itself. Fruit for export is at a disadvantage through having to be kept in heated trucks and conveyed 100 miles to Fremantle. Fruit loaded at Bridgetown has to spend the day in the sun and may spend another day in the truck at Fremantle before it is put into the refrigerator. I have made investigations into cool storage accommodation in other parts of the world, and I know how necessary for successful export such facilities are. The product must be marketed under the best of conditions. South Africa is making a bold bid for the fruit trade. Except that we have the advantage over that country of a few days, they are exporting their fruit under excellent conditions. The fruit is well wrapped and attractive printed labels are used. Canadian boxes are utilised and the growers are very lavish in respect to their coloured labels. A stack of South African fruit presents a bright and enticing appearance.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You do not advocate changing our jarrah cases?

Hon. W. J. MANN: No, but they can be made more attractive. Growers at Bridgetown last season put labels on their cases, which presented a very much better appearance. In order that we may compete successfully with other countries, the Government should consider the provision of cool storage at Bunbury. That will be necessary for butter as well as other products. We are only asking for something that will fill the requirement, and be of sufficient magnitude to carry the crop of a normal season. Cave House used to be a show place, but now it is a positive disgrace to any Government. We all know what a delightful place it used to be before the fire. I was very proud of it, but I now hesitate to take anyone there.

There is only a ramshackle building left. What the Government did with the insurance money I do not know. Very soon the tourist traffic will be a thing of the past. A big traffic had been built up. The sooner the Government get a tourist conscience, and realise what this traffic means to that part of the State, the better will it be for Western Australia.

The Chief Secretary: They have the conscience, but are very short of money.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am pleased to know the Government have a conscience; perhaps they will shortly get the money. When finances are available for the reconstruction of Cave House, I hope they will not spoil the ship for a ha'porth of tar. I believe plans have been prepared, but if what I hear is correct and the building will cost £14,000, I hope it will never be constructed. There are places in other parts of the world where the expenditure of that amount of money would provide a palatial building that would be the joy of those visiting it. I have in mind a magnificent building at the Waitomo Caves in New Zealand. The building is a comparatively inexpensive one, but the charm of it appeals to one because it so harmonises with its surroundings. If the Government Architect cannot provide a design that will be in keeping with the beauty of the caves and the inheritance of the surrounding country, then I hope the Government will call for designs from other architects and offer a small premium in order to secure a building worthy of the State. I shall not deal at length with Collie coal matters because I shall have a further opportunity to do so. I am sorry that Mr. Holmes is not present. The everlasting comparison between Newcastle and Collie coal does not concern me very much. I agree that we are paying money out on one hand, but the fact remains that that money is being circulated among our own people. As was said of one Premier's deficit, "It is in the people's pockets." I would ask those members who make such a fuss about the money paid away for coal, whether they would be prepared to adopt the same attitude with regard to sugar. Would they propose that we should dispense with Australian white-grown sugar and be content with Manila-grown sugar produced by natives at 1s. a day? Would they be content to let the Queensland industry pass out of existence? I do not think so. I do not want the members to think that I hold any

brief for the sugar people of Queensland. I have not yet been able to square their protests regarding losses on working with their balance sheets. Yesterday I looked up an old balance sheet which disclosed that for the half-year the profits of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company amounted to about £54,000. Certainly that was four years ago, but their profits have been continued ever since. At any rate, we know that such firms show the least possible profits they can. I cannot quite believe that the sugar industry is in as bad a condition as we have been led to believe.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do not the Collie mines show any profit?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Possibly, but those profits go into circulation. With regard to reserves throughout the South-West, there are quite a number of Class "A" and other reserves that were gazetted many years ago when people travelled their stock by road and wells were necessary on camping areas. That was before the railways were constructed. Those reserves are no longer necessary.

Hon. E. Rose: They are breeding grounds for vermin.

Hon. W. J. MANN: That is so. Settlement has gradually surrounded some of the reserves and there is a movement on foot to induce the Government to throw some of them open so that the land can be put to reasonable use. Two miles outside Bunbury there is a large reserve that is merely a breeding ground for vermin to-day. It comprises quite good country—some of it is moist—and many lumpers and others in Bunbury would be glad to secure a five-acre block there. They would be able to ride to and fro on their bicycles and when there were no boats in port, they would be able to work on their holdings. I suggest that wherever there is any demand for land on reserves, those reserves should be thrown open for selection. I wish to refer briefly to the railway system. Quite recently the department have made a successful attempt to popularise the railways in the metropolitan area. Apparently the public have been helped to realise that it is in their own interests to patronise the railways that they themselves own. The department have provided an accelerated service with more trains and have made other satisfactory provisions. I ask the Commissioner, through the Government, to make inquiries

with a view to according the country districts similar consideration. I do not mind the metropolitan area having what Mr. Williams describes as "plums," but I would like the country districts to have a little of them as well. In the first place, the Commissioner should provide accelerated services. If I were not provided with a gold pass, I would not make use of the trains to travel between my home town and the city. I have to travel a distance of 160 miles and I can do the journey comfortably in my motor in $4\frac{1}{2}$ hours without speeding at all. On the other hand, I have to spend eight or nine hours in the train to cover the same distance. I picked a few trips at random in a railway time table and I find that from Perth to Pemberton is a distance of 216 miles. It takes a train 15 hours to do the trip, which works out at about $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles per hour. A member cannot entbuse over the Government railways under such conditions. The trip from Perth to Flinders Bay is 216 miles, and it takes the train 17 hours to do the journey. A passenger desiring to go to Flinders Bay has to board the train at 11.30 on Sunday or Wednesday, and does not reach his destination until the next afternoon. That journey averages $12\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. From Perth to Nannup is 181 miles, and it takes the train 12 hours. These trips have just been picked at random, but they demonstrate the justice of a request to the Commissioner of Railways to provide the country districts with an accelerated service. That is necessary if road transport competition is to be checked. If existing conditions continue, we cannot blame people if they get into their motor cars with their wives and three or four youngsters to enjoy a run to the city in four or five hours at the cost of one first-class train ticket.

On motion by Hon. G. W. Miles, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.13 p.m.