

to reconsider the position with regard to the imposition of income tax. In view of the serious situation of the country as a result of the continuance of the war, the field of taxation must undoubtedly be explored by the Federal Government, and the State Governments should do everything in their power to assist the Federal authorities in that direction.

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

Ayes	13
Noes	9
Majority for	4

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday 7th November, 1939.

	PAGE
Question: Railways, Carlisle level crossing	1752
Bills: Loan, £2,137,000, 1R.	1752
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2), 3R.	1752
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, 2R., Coun. report	1752
Traffic Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	1753
Main Roads Act Amendment, 2R.	1753
War Funds Regulation, Com.	1753
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, Council's amendments....	1755
Reserves (No. 2), 2R.	1756
Annual Estimates, Votes and Items discussed	1763

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

Carlisle Level Crossing.

Mr. RAPHAEL (without notice) asked the Minister for Railways: Owing to the danger to life at the Carlisle railway crossing, as exemplified by the fact that a serious accident was recently narrowly averted, will consideration be given to the installation of a system of warning lights at that crossing?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Due consideration will be given to the request.

BILL—LOAN (£2,137,000.)

Introduced by the Acting Premier (for the Premier) and read a first time.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 2nd November.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.35]: I do not intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. I have always felt that it would be a good deal better if there were no Lotteries Commission. But when we realise

AYES.

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

NOES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. M. Macfarlane
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. T. Moore
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. S. W. Parker
Hon. E. H. H. Hall	Hon. W. R. Hall
Hon. W. H. Kitson	(Teller.)

PAIR.

AYE.	NO.
Hon. G. W. Miles	Hon. C. B. Williams

Amendment thus passed.

Schedule, as amended, put and passed.

Bill reported with an amendment, and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly requesting that the amendment be made, leave being given to sit again on receipt of a message from the Assembly.

House adjourned at 10 p.m.

that the lotteries legislation in the first place was apparently a reflection of the desire of the people of this State to indulge in some kind of legalised gambling, we have to consider whether it should be allowed to go on from year to year as is now proposed or whether we should set ourselves against it. In coming to a decision one has to recall the situation that existed before this legislation came into operation. At that time the greatest difficulty seemed to be experienced in imposing any restraint on all sorts of illegal practices such as crossword puzzles and gambling devices of that kind. The sponsor of the Act aimed at putting a period to a state of affairs which I think was much more undesirable than present conditions. This is one of those Bills that are based on the belief of the end justifying the means. The end in this instance, I presume, is to raise money for charitable purposes. Many of us believe, and I think with some justification, that it would be better for that money to be raised by some form of taxation. However, as I said at the beginning, there seems to be an innate desire in the majority of people for a continuation of this method of indirect taxation. Having reviewed the matter without prejudice, and from all angles, I do not propose to take up the time of the House any further. The measure is simply for a renewal of the Act for 12 months and on that understanding I am prepared to support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

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

BILL—TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT (No. 2).

Second Reading.

Order of the day read for the resumption from the 1st November of the debate on the second reading.

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

Ayes	19
Noes	18
					—
Majority for	1
					—

AYES.	
Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Cross	Mr. Panton
Mr. Fox	Mr. Raphael
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Styants
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Wise
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Needham	

(Teller.)

NOES.	
Mr. Berry	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Seward
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Thorn
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Varner
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Waits
Mr. North	Mr. Willmott
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Doney

(Teller.)

PAIR.	
AYE.	No.
Mr. Willcock	Mr. Latham

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Order of the day read for the resumption from the 31st October of the debate on the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

BILL—WAR FUNDS REGULATION.

In Committee.

Resumed from the 1st November. Mr. Marshall in the Chair: the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

New clause:

The CHAIRMAN: When this Bill was last discussed in Committee the member for Collie had moved to insert a new clause to stand as Clause 3, and the question now before the Chair is that Subclause (1) of the proposed new clause be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The Leader of the Opposition suggested last week that the proposed new clause should be discussed by himself, the Leader of the National Party, the member for Collie and myself, in conference. We had the conference, but did not get any further. I now desire to amend my own amendment (to substitute a new Subclause (1)), by striking out the word "two" and inserting the word "three."

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think the Minister has yet moved his amendment. When he does, he can do so in the form he wishes.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I wish to move that my amendment be amended by striking out the word "two" and inserting another word in lieu thereof.

Mr. WILSON: I would not agree to that amendment, but I would agree to the substitution of the word "four" for the word "two." Too much money and too many other things are involved for me to agree to so small a committee.

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for Collie has shown a spirit of sweet reasonableness and is prepared to meet the Minister halfway. I hope the Minister will agree to the suggestion.

The Minister for Mines: I have already gone up one.

Mr. SAMPSON: And the hon. member has come down two.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If Subclause (1) of the proposed new clause is struck out I cannot move to amend it. I wish to strike out all the words after "Chief Secretary" with a view to inserting other words. The Government would then be at liberty to nominate its own candidates for the committee, and we would not be stipulating what bodies those nominees should represent.

The CHAIRMAN: That cannot be done at the moment. I cannot accept any other amendment while the present amendment is before the Chair.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I would like your guidance, Mr. Chairman, as to what the Committee can do if the amendment is agreed to. We are only amending the proposed new clause.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will not be prevented from moving in the direction the Leader of the Opposition desires when the amendment to insert words in lieu of those struck out is moved.

Mr. WILSON: I indicated at the conference that I was prepared to take the matter a little further and to provide for a war funds council to consist of the Chief Secretary, who would be chairman, and four other members to be appointed by the Governor in Council, thereby doing away with the representation of various sections. Furthermore, I proposed to include in the provision that the four additional members were to act in an honorary capacity and that at

meetings of the council four should form a quorum.

Amendment (to strike out Subclause (1) of proposed new clause) put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I move an amendment—

That, in lieu of the subclause struck out, the following be inserted:—

(1) There is hereby established for the purposes of this Act a council to be known as "The War Funds Council of Western Australia," which shall consist of the Chief Secretary as chairman and three other members to be appointed by the Governor.

That means the council will consist of four members. I need not reiterate what I said the other night. The council will be appointed for the purpose of granting permits to organisations and others to raise funds, and will have nothing to do with the actual raising or distribution of that money.

Mr. Sampson: The number is awkward.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Why awkward?

Mr. Sampson: A council of five would be much better.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: We have 50 members in this Chamber and do not find it awkward! I desire to facilitate matters. Those to be appointed to the council will be responsible men who will not have time to devote to four or five meetings a week. A small committee is preferable.

Mr. SAMPSON: A committee of four would be very awkward. The effect would be that time after time the voting would be similar and the casting vote of the chairman necessary. That is unsatisfactory.

The Minister for Mines: The member for Collie has provided for that.

Mr. Wilson: I have not.

The Minister for Mines: Read your own amendment.

Mr. Wilson: I can read it all right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SAMPSON: I think the member for Collie would be well advised to move an amendment making provision for four members to be appointed and they, with the Chief Secretary, would constitute a council of five.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I would prefer a council of five members, including the Chief Secretary as chairman. I also think one of the four should be a woman.

The Minister for Mines: Possibly one will be a woman.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: The reason for my suggestion is that in most instances women will have to do the work and raise the money. To provide that one member shall be a woman would be an appropriate gesture.

Mr. WILSON: I move—

That the amendment be amended by striking out the word "three" in line 5 and inserting the word "four" in lieu.

If my amendment is not carried, I shall move a further amendment along the lines I previously indicated.

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

Ayes	26
Noes	9

Majority for	17
			—

AYES.

Mr. Berry	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Boyle	Mr. Sampson
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Seward
Mr. Cross	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Doney	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Fox	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Warner
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Watts
Mr. Leahy	Mr. Willmott
Mr. North	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Patrick	Mr. Withers
Mr. Raphael	Mr. Styants

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Pantou
Mr. McLarty	Mr. Wise
Mr. Millington	Mr. Hawke
Mr. Needham	

(Teller.)

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

Progress reported.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Amendments.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

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

No. 1. Clause 2—In Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 27, add after the word "State" in line 18, the following proviso:—

Provided that this subsection shall not be deemed to affect the right of property of any private owner in any artesian well con-

structed prior to or after the commencement of this section in any other manner or to any greater extent than that in or to which such right of property was affected by this Part of this Act as in force prior to the commencement of this section.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: When the Bill was transmitted to the Legislative Council, Subsection (1) of proposed new Section 27 read as follows:—

This Part of this Act shall be deemed to have applied to and to have had effect in relation to artesian wells as from the commencement of this Act, and shall continue to apply to and to have effect in relation to artesian wells throughout the State.

To that subsection the Legislative Council proposes to add the proviso that has just been read by the Chairman. The effect of the proviso is to ensure that no greater supervision is exercised over artesian wells than was exercised before the introduction of this Bill. That was understood by the draftsman; but the Council decided to make it doubly sure. I have no objection to the proviso. There was never any intention to interfere with artesian wells; but the proviso will make it positively certain that the position now existing will remain unchanged. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

No. 2. Clause 2, page 4, line 20—Delete the word "fourteen" and substitute the word "thirty."

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES: The proviso, as contained in the Bill transmitted to the Council, reads as follows:—

Provided that no such declaration, cancellation, or revocation shall be made until after the expiration of fourteen days after notice of intention to make such declaration, cancellation, or revocation has been given to the local authority or authorities in or through whose district or districts such river, stream, watercourse, lagoon, lake, swamp, or marsh run or are situate to the intent that before the making of such declaration, cancellation, or revocation any objection by such local authority or local authorities may be considered.

When explaining the measure previously, I intimated there was no objection to providing for a period longer than 14 days. The Council's amendment fixes the period at 30 days. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

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

BILL—RESERVES (No. 2).

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascayne) [5.8] in moving the second reading said: This Bill deals with Reserve A. 1149, which is part of what has been known for a hundred years as the Government Domain. The purpose of the Bill is to excise portion of the domain for Government buildings. It is necessary that we should set apart a site for future Government offices and a centre of administration, and also that we should lay down a policy in respect to future Government offices. I hope members will not entertain any preconceived notions with regard to the Bill, and that the whispered "No" that I heard while the Bill was being distributed is not an expression of opinion by members opposite, because that would show a most narrow-minded viewpoint. So far, neither members opposite nor members on this side of the House know what the Government's proposals are, nor will they for some minutes. It would be unwise for hon. members at this stage, when they have only had time to read the title of the Bill, to dig their heels in and say "No" to this proposal.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did not we have a similar Bill before us last year?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Have you a plan?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have several plans to table when the time arrives. This Bill is not a counterpart of the Bill introduced last year. As I say, it is necessary that hon. members should contemplate this measure with an open mind and with a severe sense of responsibility. The Bill proposes to excise an area from the Government Domain—not Government House Domain; it has never been Government House Domain—sufficient to accommodate certain public offices to be erected in accordance with plans and sketches that will shortly be tabled. The plans and sketches will be displayed on the wall for the infor-

mation of members, so that a correct perspective and a complete knowledge of the Government's intentions may be obtained. There is no doubt that members of both Houses agree that some effort should be made to provide public buildings. Hon. members are aware of the difficulties under which some departments work. Members also know there is great danger of destruction of title deeds and documents, and that conditions prevail which should not be tolerated longer than is unavoidable. Valuable records are in danger should there be an outbreak of fire; therefore they should be safely housed. The Bill contemplates the erection first of a building to be used by the Land Titles Office, the Agricultural Department, and other departments, according to the accommodation available.

Some years ago the Government appointed a committee consisting of Mr. Munt, then Under Secretary for Works, Mr. Berkeley, then Under Treasurer, and Mr. Clare, the Principal Architect, to examine within the metropolitan area, sites that might be considered as suitable for Government offices. The committee inspected every available site and made recommendations to the Government. It must be borne in mind that a project such as this does not involve merely a policy of bricks and mortar—the Government and Parliament have a much greater responsibility. The Government must accept in a civic sense its responsibility for the future, as well as for the present, with regard to the location and the nature of the buildings to be erected. It must consider the amenities of the city in a plan so far-reaching in effect as this. The committee reported on many sites, one of which I presume will be commented upon and recommended by members opposite, and perhaps by members on this side of the House, during the debate. I refer to Parliament House grounds, which are a Class A reserve set aside for Parliamentary buildings. This particular site was mentioned last year and was suggested as a site for Government buildings. It was said by some, who do not know perhaps as much as architects and others qualified to speak, that the site was eminently suited to the Government's purpose. The committee of a few years ago, in commenting on the Parliamentary buildings reserve, made these remarks—

This area is reasonably well situated, although somewhat removed from some of

the main lines of transport. Only the portion east of Parliament House could be utilised for offices. To obtain sufficient accommodation for present needs and to allow for reasonable future extension would necessitate the erection of multi-storey buildings. This would so dwarf Parliament House as to rob it of all dignity and air of importance, and make it appear a very subsidiary structure.

Hon. C. G. Latham: This building is a disgrace.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The report continues—

This area is undoubtedly a wonderful site for a Parliament House, unique in this State and one of the finest in the Commonwealth. We feel that the development of this area, as suggested by the designers of Parliament House, i.e. gardens and approach roads, is essential to form a proper setting for the most important building in the State, and we are strongly of the opinion that the site should be entirely preserved for this purpose.

That was part of the report by the committee I have mentioned.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Did the members of the committee receive their instructions before they started?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; but that question is hardly fair.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is fair.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I hope the Leader of the Opposition will show a little more fairness in considering the proposal. I have discussed the possibility of constructing on the area surrounding Parliament House suitable buildings to meet present as well as future requirements of the Government. Members know the steep slope at the Malcolm-street end and they know that if the plans passed for the completion of Parliament House buildings are to be proceeded with at some future date, the entrance from St. George's-terrace side must be kept open. If members visualise the frontage to Harvest-terrace and the boundary of the block along Malcolm-street, they will realise what shape a building erected on that section would have to take. It would be a building that would tower above Parliament House, and would have to be peculiarly adapted to the slope, with the attendant difficulties of foundations and the necessity for providing several entrances because of the slope. The entrances, if from Malcolm-street, would present very great difficulties in the matter of parking and other conveniences necessary for public offices. These points should be carefully

considered by members. If it was possible to erect a desirable structure on that area, sloping as it does almost as much as the height of a normal building, the making of suitable approaches would be very difficult.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The same thing applies to the site you are recommending.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I have had a look at it.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I should like the hon. member to look at it again, especially after he has inspected the plan. That problem is not present in the proposed site.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have about 20 feet of sand there now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Several architects claim that the slope in Malcolm-street would not lend itself to any desirable orientation of buildings to serve as public offices. Parliament's responsibility extends far beyond actual bricks and mortar; we have a responsibility in a civic sense, and that is very important. I am sure that members, when considering the proposed site and the building plan, will be satisfied that all such aspects have been borne in mind by the Government.

Following the defeat of the proposal last year to excise an area extending to opposite the eastern side of Irwin-street, the Government appointed a public buildings committee consisting of the Public Service Commissioner (Mr. Simpson) as chairman, the Principal Architect (Mr. Clare), the Town Planning Commissioner (Mr. Davidson), the Public Lands Resumption Officer (Mr. Hall) and the Under Treasurer (Mr. Reid) to investigate the possibility of sites for public buildings. This committee considered mainly two or three sites and made a report which I will table. I will also table a report from the Town Planning Board. In connection with these reports, several plans have been drawn up showing the different alternatives that might be considered if this Bill is agreed to. I should like to read a portion of the report of the committee, which states—

In all the schemes mentioned hereafter the total excision of land from the Government House Domain would not exceed approximately four acres. The total area of Government House Domain is approximately 14 acres. This excision would not in any way interfere with the existing area of Government House grounds.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It would with Parliament House grounds.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Certainly it would. Before dealing with that point, I wish to deal in a historical way with the original survey of the area known as Government Domain, even going back to the time when the first Governor of Western Australia lived in a tent. There is considerable disagreement amongst authorities as to where the first Government House was situated, but from documents in my possession, one dated the 8th October, 1829,—110 years ago—it seems that the area then known as the Barracks Square, which is the area on which the Treasury building now stands, was the site of the quarters that Governor Stirling occupied. This is borne out by other evidence, which shows that in the applications for the first town allotments in Perth, before they were properly surveyed, Government reserve S.1, which is Government Domain as we now know it, was not the area on which the first Government House was erected. I have taken considerable trouble to investigate the records of over 100 years, including records of the Executive Council and despatches that passed between the then authority here and the Imperial authorities. There is no clear record of the original site upon which quarters or offices were erected for the first Governor.

The first plan we have of the townsite of Perth was put up by Mr. A. Hillman in 1838. I have a copy of the plan and shall make it available to the House. It is a valuable document copied from the first authentic plan of Perth, and shows that in 1838 Lord-street was the street now named Victoria-avenue, and that Government Domain finished at a point opposite the centre of Pier-street. Both Stirling Square and Government Domain at that time extended to the river. In a plan of 1845, a copy of which I shall also table, we find that Pier-street extended from Wellington-street to the river. Where Government House now stands was Pier-street in 1851. Since that time many variations have been made in an endeavour to define the boundaries of what is now and was then Government Domain. According to some of the despatches referring to the quarters occupied by Governor Stirling, it is very obvious that that area was set apart for Government purposes.

The area now occupied by the Christian Brothers, which is a piece taken out of a lot that extended from Pier-street to Lord-street, appears to have been the first subdivision—the first land excised from any block in the city of Perth. The plan of 1838 shows that that area was excised from the block that extended from Lord-street to Barrack-street before Pier-street was put through to the river. The first owner of those blocks was a person named Stone. In 1845, in a plan of the town of Perth as marked out on the ground, Pier-street had been surveyed right through to the river. Stirling Square was so named even in 1845, and although it lost its name in the intervening years, it was re-named Stirling Square in recent years. Clearly on the plans of 1845 and 1851 are shown Stirling Square and Government Domain with Pier-street between them.

Stirling Square, from 1838 to 1851, had been much smaller. The lower end of Stirling Square had been contracted and had been surveyed through a line opposite the Esplanade. The low land between there and the river, since reclaimed, was outside the area of Stirling Square as surveyed at the time. These are valuable as well as interesting documents, and they show that Government Domain has been altered in size even as recently as 40 years ago. Although Pier-street is clearly shown on the plan of 1851, there is no record of its ever having been closed, and Government House was built in 1858 to 1860 and covered an area of Pier-street. Subsequently, in 1899, when there was a desire to build a new Government House ballroom, the Minister for Lands wished to get the boundary and peg it between Government Domain and Stirling Square. At that time there was an area set apart for public buildings, and that area was set apart for public buildings 89 years ago and was shown on the 1860 plan as an area taken out of Stirling Square where the Agricultural Department's building now stands. But those boundaries were not surveyed until 1899, when a request was made that the new ballroom of Government House should not project into Stirling Square. As a matter of fact, it still does. If hon. members take the line of the survey to-day, they will find that Government House ballroom is still two or three feet within Stirling Square: or it may be said that Stirling Square boundaries

have been driven westward not only to the width of Pier-street in 1850 but encroaching on Stirling Square 114 links west of Pier-street.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, it is all Crown land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am glad the Leader of the Opposition made that interjection. It is a splendid argument for the hon. gentleman to use, because the reserve which was gazetted for public buildings takes out a portion of Stirling Square. However, without any fuss from the Opposition or other members of this House then and since, other buildings have been erected in Stirling Square—for instance, the Returned Soldiers' Institute. I was not in the State at the time, but there was then no Act of Parliament granting that power.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is no Parliamentary authority for the hotel at Yanchep.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No; and if the hon. gentleman will be fair, there is no need of an Act of Parliament for this proposal.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Just try!

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Government wants to be quite fair in this matter. However, I do not remember any fuss being made when the Returned Soldiers' Institute was erected in Stirling Square; and that building encroaches considerably on an established garden.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I can produce facts to prove that the area we desire to excise was originally a stable and a cow yard to suit Government House, servants' quarters also being erected there, and that since the Governor has no use for horses and buggies and stables, the area has remained a piece of waste land.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is still a piece of waste land.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: There is still a stable in which the Government gardener lives; but that is a part, as the plans again will show, that will not be interfered with for a very long time.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I hope it will not.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will later hope that it will be. There is no doubt whatever that Governor Stirling, when he had £300 as a yearly house allowance, decided to spend some of his own money for

the erection of quarters. First of all, Government House was not then on Government Domain; and it is a fact, too, that the area now known as Government Domain has been altered as recently as 1900. There is no clear record of the original reservation of the land, but it is very definite from the records that certain of the Governor's offices and the guard house of the military authorities were erected in Stirling Square at that time. In the minutes of a meeting of the Executive held in 1835 there is a record of a despatch which allowed Governor Stirling repayment of his part of the cost of a building to live in. The reference is to the site "of the building now in course of erection for the Governor's private residence as being adapted from every point of view to the purpose, being centrally situated in Perth and convenient to the site of the proposed public offices."

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is the Treasury Building.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No. It is the Department of Agriculture.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was Government House in those days.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, it was not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Well, just afterwards it was.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In 1855 it was decided to erect a commodious building for the Governor, and an application was made to the Home authorities for sufficient money to build it, but the reply was that the cost would have to be found from the Colonial resources and revenues. By 1858 the plans were completed, and between that year and 1860 the present Government House was built. There are various estimates of its cost. It was built by convict labour. One authority states the cost at £17,000. However, it is obvious that an appropriation eventually was made from Government funds to build a Governor's residence. The argument between the Colony and His Majesty's Government ended in favour of His Majesty's Government. As this was originally set out in a Government area as a Government Domain, I had to search most carefully for any reference implying that the Imperial Government had any authority in connection with this. I have not been able to find any such reference at all, and in an undertaking regard-

ing the future of Government Domain it was gazetted as a Class A reserve on the 15th March, 1900. It was not gazetted as a Class A reserve until that date. Previously it was referred to as Government Domain, and it is referred to in many despatches as if it were set apart as a place likely to be used for Government purposes. Although records show that there was no obligation on the part of the Colonial Government to approach the Imperial authorities, such an approach was made; and the reply relative to that approach shows that the Imperial authorities questioned whether they had any authority in the matter; but if they had authority, they had no objection.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You would not expect any other answer, would you?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No, one would not; therefore one would not expect other than a reasonable attitude on the part of anybody towards this proposal. In my opinion it is not a question of the Government having its own way, the fact being that the best possible advice available to the Government is 100 per cent. in favour of the proposal, wherefore the Government proposes to go on with the project.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In spite of the law you have quoted?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: In accordance with the law. Part of the document received from the Imperial authorities contains these words—

In the light of the information contained in your despatch I see no objection in principle to this proposal and would be prepared to give my consent, so far as such consent might be necessary, when the formal request referred to in your despatch is received. I assume that your Ministers will consult their legal advisers as to the legal procedure necessary to carry out the proposal.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is a warning to you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition is apparently in a frame of mind to interpret all sorts of things that do not appear. He seems to be upset, and not in a mood to be convinced. I have mentioned that the area stated in the Bill as proposed to be excised is smaller than the area mentioned in last year's Bill. It is 143 feet 3 inches less on the frontage than was mentioned as the frontage to which last year's Bill referred.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But then you intended to take away the entrance to Government House.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The area now proposed covers only the portion facing St. George's-terrace, land that is not devoted to Government House gardens, is not under cultivation for that purpose, and is highly unsightly.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I should think it is now.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Lieutenant-Governor can tell the Leader of the Opposition, if the Leader of the Opposition desires to have the information, just how unsightly, how unsatisfactory, how undesirable was the use some of the public made of this wilderness, which is unused except as from the rear of the lodge to the Christian Brothers' College. The whole question has been discussed with His Excellency, who not only offers no objection to, but is quite in favour of, the utilisation of the area referred to in the Bill.

Hon. C. G. Latham: His Excellency could not offer any objection.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Leader of the Opposition certainly appears to be in an unreasonable frame of mind. The proposal to erect Government offices will in no way interfere with the full use of the domain which is at present used for Government House and its gardens. The proposal merely takes in what was the stable and what was the cow paddock, and what in subsequent years has been referred to by people, after investigation, as a wilderness, and as a possible breeding ground for mosquitoes. I would like hon. members to look, and carefully look, at the area for themselves. I am sure they will then have every objection dispelled.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I would not so advise them, if I were you.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is necessary that hon. members should act without bias and with an open mind, and with a desire to stand up to their obligation to build central Government offices in a desirable situation. There will be no detriment whatever caused to Government House by a building on this site. On the contrary, it would add to the advantages which are associated with town planning and with all the necessary responsibilities attaching to

suitable Government premises in suitable surroundings. Of two reports which I shall table, one from the Town Planning Board is highly important. I am a little concerned as to whether I should read the whole of the document now. I fear the Leader of the Opposition may not read it unless I read it out to the House.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In that case you need not lay it on the Table.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: It is necessary to lay the report on the Table. However, parts of it refer particularly to the responsibility of all citizens on the point I have mentioned, and especially when comparing that site with other sites. If I have the assurance of the Leader of the Opposition that he will not read the report to-day but wait until he is in a calmer mood, I shall not delay the House at this stage by reading it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You can have that assurance.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Public Buildings Committee in its report make some important comments and some important recommendations, and in addition to my first quotation relating to Government House, the committee has this to say—

To provide for sufficient accommodation, it has been necessary with these proposals to make the maximum use of the area available, and this has resulted in an east and west orientation for a large portion of the building. Such an orientation with our summer conditions should be avoided if at all possible. The need for the maximum use of the area available has made it impossible to provide a proper setting for such an important building. Because of the very large expenditure that will ultimately be involved in the centralisation of Government offices, we feel that an endeavour should be made to plan for a group of buildings properly arranged in a spacious setting with a view to the ultimate creation of a governmental centre which would not only centralise Government offices, but which would also be a real contribution to town planning and to the dignity and amenity of the city.

Such a development is not possible on the small area it is proposed to excise from Government House domain, but if the block at present occupied by the Christian Brothers' College could be added—

Hon. C. G. Latham: So that is the object, is it?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:

—sufficient land would then be available to allow the satisfactory planning of the governmental centre. Schemes "A" and "B"

show the type of arrangement which would be possible if this extra land were available. Development along the lines of these proposals would ultimately result in a really fine governmental centre in which it would be possible to obtain a north and south orientation for all buildings.

This quotation is from the report of the committee of which the Public Service Commissioner is the chairman. The report, together with others, will be laid on the Table. In the report will be found a very complete review and a strong recommendation for the adoption of plan "B." There will be four plans submitted and all will be displayed on the wall of the Chamber, but plan "B" is that which carries the recommendation of the committee. To permit of these offices being built to Plans "A" and "B" we propose to resume under the provisions of the Public Works Act the area at present held by the Christian Brothers. Plan "B" is submitted as a solution of the whole difficulty. The question of foundations was referred to last year. I have the assurance of the Principal Architect that for a six-storeyed structure—this, it is planned, shall be for four sections—there is no necessity for providing any additional buttress, or any foundation other than a normal one. In connection with the centre building, shown on the plan, for the nine-storeyed structure, there will be a possibility, not a likelihood, that that structure may require some piling when the time arrives for it to be built. The proposal envisaged in plan "B" will commence from the back of the fence of the present Government House lodge and will extend towards the Christian Brothers College. That will be a six-storeyed building and it is intended that it shall house not only the Titles Office and the Agricultural Department, but also minor departments. As the plan proceeds, it will be clear to follow, and not only will hon. members be able to get a perspective of the ultimate scheme, but they will also get a definite indication of the area of the land that will be excised. Members will see how comparatively small the encroachment will be on the present Government House domain. Really it will be shown that there will not be any encroachment at all on Government House gardens. At the bottom end the area will take in some trees and part of the pond, but the utilisation of that portion is not likely to be necessary for another 50 years or so. If we

have any sense of responsibility in this matter, it will be the duty of Parliament to give consideration to future needs and to the appropriate lay-out of a scheme that will be creditable to the State for all time. If members will visit the site, they will see that the proposals in plans "C" and "D" have certain definite objections. These plans will be placed on the wall of the Chamber and members will see that the structure to be erected on the area therein set out would face east and west. The inner portions of the building would be more or less screened from the prevailing winds, and generally the lay-out, particularly the western aspect in summer, would not be very favourable. So I stress the point that plan "B" will embrace all the recommendations of the members of the committee and hon. members on inspecting it will be able to see what the lay-out will be like. The plan shows just where the area on which it is proposed to erect part of the buildings is situated.

The estimated cost of the undertaking is difficult to arrive at because it is not possible to prepare definite plans until we know just what Parliament desires to have. The members of the committee in their report stress the desirableness of including part of the Christian Brothers' College area, because they say high flats or other undesirable buildings may be erected on that site. That, they contend, would be a greater reason for objection from the point of view and the outlook of Government House than would be the scheme of an attractive structure that the Government hopes to carry out. The committee makes a definite recommendation and declares that if the proposals recommended by it to the Government are accepted by Parliament, the area first planned will be sufficient to meet immediate requirements, and the whole plan will be something that should meet the needs of the Government for all time.

Members may be aware that for some of the buildings occupied by Government departments rental has to be paid. Some of those structures are entirely unsuitable for the departments by which they are occupied, and the rentals would be sufficient to provide interest on close upon £50,000. I am sure that Parliament, in the past, has shown itself to be fully cognisant of the difficulties under which certain depart-

ments are working, and members have expressed the wish that the existing unsatisfactory state of affairs should be brought to an end. Here we have a report from people qualified to speak authoritatively on the requirements of the Government departments, and those people urge the consideration of the proposals they have submitted. Every aspect has been taken into account, including the civic aspect and the responsibilities of the Government. I think I have shown to the House that the boundaries of the Government Domain have been amended, and that the site known as Reserve "B5," which was gazetted as an area for public offices, is the area on which the Agricultural Department now stands. This department adjoins Government House. There are only a few yards between one building and the other. If the proposal now submitted to the House proceeds, as it should do, and the demolition of the Agricultural Department and the adjoining institute takes place, the gardens should be extended to the land on which those buildings now stand. Many people have a wrong idea regarding the complete area of Stirling Gardens. Really it is only four acres, and if we could put back into it the land now occupied by the Agricultural Department and the adjoining institute—

Hon. C. G. Latham: Tell us by what area Stirling Gardens would then be enlarged.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I have not that information at present. I have gone very carefully into this matter and have searched all the available records. If members desire that the officers of the State should be suitably housed, that immediate needs and future requirements should be met, then they will give the Bill a speedy passage. If they accept the lay-out of the proposed structure, they will not do anything to obstruct the passage of the measure. I commend the Bill to the House and I hope hon. members will carefully examine the whole of the proposals and in doing so realise that the members of the committee in presenting their report were actuated solely by a desire to see that the requirements of the Government were filled. The report presented by the committee is authoritative and I trust hon. members will read it and then visit the site and scrutinise the plans. I am convinced that then they will

not hesitate whole-heartedly to support the Bill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1939-40.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 2nd November on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates, Mr. Withers in the Chair.

Vote—Agriculture, £103,682 (partly considered).

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [5.58]: All sections of the primary producers will be indebted to the Minister for the information he gave to the House last week when he introduced the Estimates of his department, principally because, since the declaration of war, and while various products were likely to be taken over by the Imperial Government, the greatest difficulty was experienced in obtaining information as regards the various transactions and on which the producers could place full reliance. To deal first of all with the position of the fat lamb industry as outlined by the Minister. The Minister regretted the fact that after extra provision had been made to cope with a greater number of lambs this year, the increase in the number to be treated did not come up to expectations. He was inclined to blame the producers for withholding their lambs. To a certain extent producers have not been able to market their lambs in as great numbers as was expected owing largely to the fact that the season has not been favourable to their ordinary development. I have spoken to growers who have moved around the State, particularly during show periods, and they have commented upon the number of lambs in an immature condition that they have seen in practically all districts. The lambs are poor, particularly in the Great Southern areas, because the shortage of feed during the early stages retarded their development. The result has been that many lambs in the country are now finishing-off, lambs that in an ordinary season would have been marketed before to-day. That circumstance has a lot to do with the reduced supply of lambs made available at the freezing works. But there

is another and much more important reason that has delayed the marketing of lambs, namely, the difficulty the producers have experienced in obtaining definite information as to the prospects of receiving a reasonable price for their product. The Minister submitted a list of some of the charges that the lamb-owner will have to meet. They included delivery charges to the works, processing costs, insurance, return to the exporter and delivery from the works to the ship. Unfortunately, he was not able to give a statement as to the exact amount of these charges per pound or per carcase. I sincerely hope he will be able to supply that information because it is vital to the lamb-owner in order to enable him to arrive at an accurate estimate of what he will receive for the lambs when disposing of them. Largely owing to the slowness of the lambs in maturing this year, there is a fair market in the State for lambs which, while not exactly store lambs, are not prime, and can still do with a bit of topping-off. The grower must have information as to what he will obtain if he exports as compared with what he will get in the local market.

There is another matter I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister, because it is causing great dissatisfaction. The Minister stated that under the agreement it was the wish of the Imperial Government—and quite a legitimate wish—that when arrangements were being made, or agreements entered into for the sale of wool, there should not be interference with existing marketing conditions any more than was necessary. Included in the charges mentioned by the Minister were charges to the exporter. The exporter is rendering a service to the lamb-raiser which is necessary but what the grower wants to know—and I would like the Minister to take notice of this, because it is causing no end of annoyance in the country to-day—is why he is called upon to pay a commission of 5 per cent. to the brokers. If the exporter is rendering a service, as he is doing, and the grower has to pay a farthing a pound exporter's charge, he wants to know why he must pay 5 per cent. broker's charge, when the broker is not rendering a service.

Mr. Marshall: He has to live.

MR. SEWARD: That is all very well; but he is not doing anything. I have reason to say there is an agreement between the exporter and the broker. The exporter will not export unless the broker's charges are paid,

and the broker will not pay unless the exporter's charges are being paid. That is keeping back the lambs, and I ask the Minister to investigate the matter and make a statement.

Mr. Marshall: Between them they seem to be taking all the fat off the lambs!

Mr. SEWARD: There is not the slightest doubt about that. They are taking too much of the fat in the way of profits that should go to the grower. Private buyers are going around the State and, by giving false information to the growers, are persuading them to part with lambs at a greatly reduced price. I had an instance of this given me at the week-end. A grower was visited by a buyer who inspected his lambs. After doing so, he offered the grower something between 12s. and 12s. 6d. a head. The grower would not consider this price, declaring that the lambs were worth considerably more than that. "All right," said the buyer, "you can keep them. There is no shipping available and you will not be able to ship them away. You can take the price I offer, or leave it." That placed the grower in an awkward position. Naturally, when lambs reach maturity, growers desire to dispose of them. The upshot of the conversation was that the buyer purchased the lambs at 12s. 6d. a head and sold them the next week for between 16s. and 17s. a head. Those are the experiences of the growers, and that is the kind of thing we want cleared up. We need more enlightenment about the various agreements; whether they affect fat lambs, wool, or wheat. The grower is kept in a state of ignorance as to the conditions that govern these sales, and the grower is the one man who should be given all the available information so that he can make the best possible deal.

I wish now to deal briefly with the position of the wool-growers. Unfortunately what I have to say largely concerns the action of the Federal authorities. That action is having a serious effect on the primary producers of this State, and it behoves Parliament or the Minister to make the strongest representations to the Federal Government on the matter. Since last Thursday, when the first wool appraisements appeared, the country has been fairly seething with discontent and disappointment. When we were informed about the wool agreement entered into between the British Government and the Commonwealth Government, we were told that the price was to be 10³/₄d. sterling,

or 13⁴⁵/₁₀₀d. Australian, and approximately 30 per cent. above last year's selling rates. When the appraisements appeared last Thursday morning, they seemed to me to be considerably below what I had anticipated. Consequently I took out a list of 120 of the prices—that is, for fleece wools—from the various brokers, and they averaged 14d. per lb., that is for top-line stuff, and 14d. for top-line would not give anything like an average of 13⁴⁵/₁₀₀d., but more likely 11¹/₂d. To obtain a comparison, I took out 120 lines from the Victorian appraisement, and they averaged 16¹/₄d. Our highest top-line figure was 17¹/₂d. I had a talk with the grower who received that sum, and he told me his average will be a little over 13d. If the man who has received a top price of 17¹/₂d. will average only 13¹/₂d., I leave it to members to work out what will be the position of the man whose top price is 14d. or 13¹/₂d., which is what the majority of the growers will receive. They have no hope of realising much more than 11¹/₂d. average. I was shown a station clip on which the sale prices last year were greater than those received under the appraisement this year. That being so, I have no hesitation in saying that the growers are being grossly misled when they are told that the price will be 30 per cent. higher than that of last year. They are naturally demanding to know the true position, and I think they have every right to be told.

The Minister for Mines: What proportion would receive 17d. in this State?

Mr. SEWARD: I could not say from memory; but very few. There were very few clips that reached 17d. in the last sale, though many clips in Victoria brought from 17d. to 22d. If Victoria averaged 16¹/₄d.—I am not speaking of the whole of the appraisement but of those 120 clips I mentioned—it does not need much proof to demonstrate that some other clips will have to be somewhere about 11d. to bring the Australian average to 13¹/₂d. That is the fear of the Western Australian grower. There has been—as I will demonstrate directly—gross neglect of Western Australia by the Central Wool Board, and that neglect has been due to the fact that there is no Western Australian representative on the board.

Mr. Patrick: It has been very disappointing to Queensland, too.

Mr. SEWARD: That is so. I have not seen the New South Wales figures nor the Victorian figures. If the prices there are higher, ours must be at a low level in order to bring the Australian average to 13½d. under the terms of the agreement. The Western Australian grower feels that he is being sacrificed in the interests of growers in the Eastern States. I do not say that is so, but that is the belief. I attended a meeting in my electorate on Sunday, and was requested by several growers to ascertain whether they could withdraw their wool from the next appraisalment. I strongly urged them to do so until we could get some definite information as to the terms of this agreement. We are not in possession of those terms.

I wish to refer to an item mentioned by the Minister, namely the allowance of ¾d. per lb. made to cover brokers' charges. When the amount first appeared, it was said that the allowance of ¾d. per lb. had been made to cover charges from store to ship-board. Ordinarily speaking that means, at the conclusion of the sale, the cost of packing the wool, dumping and putting it on board. I happened to draw attention to the matter in a letter to the Press and was assured by the chairman of the State Wool Committee that that was not so, but that it also included the cost of the Central and State Wool Committees.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SEWARD: I was complaining about the difficulty experienced by producers in obtaining definite and reliable information concerning many of the contracts that are being made for the disposal of their produce, or information dealing with allowances made in the wool agreement for the payment of the ¾d. a lb. to cover the expenses that will be incurred by the brokers. I stated that every time this matter was raised certain additional information was forthcoming. When I first queried the matter I pointed out that the agreement stated the cost was to cover expenses from store to ship. The Chairman of the State Wool Committee in his reply to me said that in addition the amount was intended to cover the cost of the State and the Central Wool Committees, and that additional stores would be required that would also be covered by this cost. The Minister said the charge was to cover the

appraisalment cost as well. The further we go the more information we get. We have been led to believe that when the grower sends his wool for appraisalment he will be charged with expenses that are usually incurred such as railway freights, insurance up to the date of sale, brokers' charges and commission. If the payment of ¾d. has to go towards defraying some of these charges, and if the only other charge the grower will have to meet, in the appraisalment of his wool, is the railway charge, he is entitled to receive a detailed and specific statement of all the charges he will have to pay, so that he can determine whether the price he will receive will be sufficient to enable him to meet his obligations. In asking for that information the wool growers are not asking too much. No man in this State, whether a wool producer, a lamb raiser, or anything of the kind, desires to make a profit out of the war. Many newspapers have stated that high salaries are being paid to appraisers. No doubt the appraisers are capable men, and as such are worthy of their hire. When they are given salaries considerably above what they have previously earned, the producer is entitled to ask whether there is any equality of sacrifice, and whether he is entitled to believe statements made in the Press that the appraised value of the wool will be about 30 per cent. better than it was last year. Since the wool agreement has been made public, the question whether appraisements can be made at other centres, notably Albany and Geraldton, in addition to Fremantle, has been engaging the attention of the producers, particularly those who, if appraisements took place at Geraldton, for instance, would send their wool to that centre. With the object of having that brought about a motion was passed in this House, and the matter has been taken up by the Premier with the Prime Minister. Other members on this side of the Chamber have also been actively engaged in the matter. When I took it up with the Federal Minister he said that in the past economic reasons had prevented the sale of wool at Albany and Geraldton, and that consequently sales had been held only at Fremantle. It was considered that that practice should continue during the war period.

The point immediately taken up was that it was not due to economic reasons that sales were confined to Fremantle, but to the fact that buyers had refused to go to Geraldton

or Albany if sales were held there. I do not say that at the time that was not a reasonable attitude to take up. It might not have been reasonable to compel buyers to go to other centres. Certain arrangements would have to be made for wool sales there, and the buyers themselves had to attend sales in other States. It was considered that the matter would be difficult to arrange. That state of affairs does not exist under the appraisement scheme. Only two or three appraisers would have to visit any appraising centre. The staff required would be on the spot, and the sheds would already be there. The ports (particularly Albany) are already exporting wool and frozen lambs and fruit, and in addition Albany itself is in the track of shipping. It was not unreasonable to ask the Central Wool Committee that an appraisement centre should be established at Albany. We could not get any reason for the refusal. When the Minister put up one reason it was beaten down, and we were met with the statement that the appraisements could not be made at those places.

Something has arisen in the last day or two, and I wish to refer to it. We notice that one broker has asked for a site at Leighton on which to stack wool in the open. No doubt the wool would be properly protected there, but I would point out that stores are lying idle both at Albany and Geraldton. The stores at Fremantle are all full, and the difficulty of handling wool there is becoming more pronounced every day. Probably due to the fact that there is no Western Australian representative on the Central Wool Committee, the legitimate claims of this State are overlooked. In the case of the Albany centre, wool producers will have to pay about £9,000 in additional freight by reason of having to send their wool to Fremantle. These questions are seriously concerning them. No matter to what extent we seek information we do not seem able to get it. On Sunday last I attended a mass meeting in my electorate. A feeling of intense dissatisfaction and great unrest was displayed. Unless producers can get more information about the matters to which I have referred, there may be trouble ahead. It is right that the people concerned should ask for the information. At the meeting it was stated that some of the settlers, who were working very hard night and day, had been told

that unless they could make other financial arrangements, they must get off their properties at the end of the year. The situation is so desperate that these people will not go on much longer without some alleviation of their troubles. Wheat has been acquired by the Wheat Board, and Great Britain will purchase a certain amount of it. The point I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister for his earnest consideration is that some definite terms should be adopted when dealing with wheat so that the grower may know what is being talked about. In the newspaper of last Thursday or Friday it was stated that millers' requirements of bagged wheat from this season's crop would be sold at 2s. 11d. a bushel at terminal ports. That statement could be submitted to six wheat-growers in this State, and it would be possible to get six different answers as to its meaning. There are such terms as "2s. 11d. terminal ports," "2s. 11d. at port," "2s. 11d. at siding," "2s. 11d. f.o.r.," and so on. It may be that 2s. 11d. is the price at which the wheat will be bought, but the grower does not know from the term used whether the price means 2s. 11d. f.o.r., f.o.b., at siding, or at terminal port. He does not know what charges have to be deducted, or what the expression really means. In this State when referring to wheat we use a general term—"such and such a price at a 4d. siding." The grower then knows what has been talked about.

Mr. Patrick: That applies only in Western Australia.

Mr. SEWARD: Yes. If the Minister could get the ear of the Press before these terms were published, and some intelligible expression were used, the wheatgrower would know to what the price referred and where he stood in the matter. I am glad to know that the services of Mr. John Thomson have been acquired as manager of the Wheat Board. I do not think that it would have been possible to obtain a man who knows as much about wheat marketing and wheat problems as Mr. Thomson does to take charge of the operations of the board. Mr. Thomson's record in this State, as manager of the Wheat Pool, will stand comparison with the record of any other man in Australia. The board is exceedingly fortunate in being able to acquire his services. I must say, however, I was amazed to read that the salary paid to him was £5,000 a year. I read that in the paper last week.

A conference of country hospital authorities was recently held in Dalwallinu. I have here a report of the meeting. The association, according to this report, decided to urge upon the Minister for Health (Hon. A. H. Panton) the need for establishing transmission blocks at selected centres. The conference viewed with alarm the increasing number of primary producers who were coming in classed as indigent patients, and the increasing claims upon the hospital fund resulting therefrom.

The Minister for Health: That is quite right.

Mr. SEWARD: The unfortunate grower is classed as an indigent hospital patient, and yet the Australian Wheat Board is able to pay Mr. Thomson a salary of £5,000 a year.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: He is not paid a salary of £5,000 a year.

Mr. SEWARD: I took that from the Press, and in two issues the statement was not repudiated.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is definitely wrong.

Mr. SEWARD: The money would, of course, be paid by the Wheat Board. If I am wrong, I want the statement publicly corrected. There was a feeling of intense resentment in the wheat belt when the statement appeared in the Press.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is wrong.

Mr. SEWARD: I hope those in authority will see that the statement is corrected. If it is wrong it will do Mr. Thomson's reputation a good deal of harm.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: A mistake was made in adding the expenses allowed to Mr. Thomson when he moved his family. Those expenses are only temporary.

Mr. SEWARD: The hon. member has a knowledge of these matters, and I hope he will see that the statement is contradicted. It was made at the mass meeting to which I have referred. There was intense annoyance at the thought that growers who cannot afford even to pay for their groceries, and whose produce is being controlled and sold at below the cost of production, should be referred to as indigents. Such a statement does not create a pleasant atmosphere in the country.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I have never heard that statement made.

Mr. SEWARD: I can show the hon. member reports that appeared in three issues of a paper that circulates throughout Australia, and I shall indeed be glad if the statement is contradicted.

Mr. Thorn: There are a few people who like to make use of such a statement.

Mr. SEWARD: Another matter is also beyond the comprehension of the wheat-grower. He has been told that one acquiring agent was to be appointed in Western Australia, namely, the Co-operative Wheat Pool. Despite that fact, representatives of wheat merchants are going throughout the country areas canvassing for wheat from the coming crop. If the farmer is to receive only a certain amount per bushel for his wheat, the purchases should be made by the sole acquiring agents, whereas if the merchants are to acquire wheat as well, they will have to receive a commission. If the farmer is able to do business through the sole acquiring agent only, that will avoid charges that he will otherwise have to bear. If there is to be a sole acquiring agent, there is no necessity for the wheat merchants to canvass wheat orders and for storage wheat. The crop should be delivered to the acquiring agency and dealt with by the Australian Wheat Board through its selling organisation, at a minimum cost to the producer. I hope that matter will be taken up, for I cannot see any possible reason for the multiplicity of activities in the acquiring of wheat. This also applies to the fat lamb industry and the acquisition of wool. Acquiring agents are going round the country asserting that no shipping will be available to lift the produce, and so are able to effect purchases at prices below the real value of the commodity. That means so much loss to the primary producers. I appeal to the Minister to go into these matters as thoroughly as possible, and provide a fuller explanation of the position than he has made available so far. Should he do so, he will remove doubts and misunderstandings that are so rife to-day, and are troubling the producers to so great an extent. I am aware that they cannot be told exactly what price they will receive for the wheat because the crop has not yet been sold; but if they could be furnished with some more accurate information as to the approximate price they are likely to receive, that will prove helpful. I

appeal to the Minister to give the fullest attention to these matters, and, if necessary, to convene a conference of the various sections interested with a view to adopting some uniform method so that when a statement is issued to the producers, they will know what price they may expect and what the charges against them will be.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [7.47]: I shall not unduly delay the passage of the Vote. After listening to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward), I felt it would be worth while drawing attention to the position of other producers of wool not so favourably circumstanced as those to whom the hon. member made reference. The producers in the southern parts have enjoyed particularly good seasons and have operated in a part of the State where they can easily add to or reduce their herds as may be deemed necessary. In the main, if I may say so without being offensive, they have received assistance at the expense of the taxpayers through the medium of the Agricultural Bank. That has not been the experience of the producers in the outer goldfields districts, those parts of the State that could be more aptly referred to as the pastoral areas. The producers there have experienced particularly adverse seasons for the past five or six years, during which no really good rainfalls have been registered. Their herds have been depleted materially, so much so that it is doubtful whether they will be able to secure sufficient finance with which to re-stock their holdings. That is the position in the Murchison, and I am pleased to know that the Minister is watching it very closely.

The real stranglehold upon the primary producers of all classes is seldom referred to. Continually we plead with the Government to take advantage of its position to assist in stabilising industry at the expense of the general taxpayer, but no earnest endeavour is made to force some of the institutions that cling like a leech to the primary producers, to disgorge portion of the profits they have made and thus help to relieve the growers of their anxieties. Continually we ask, and receive, small favours in the interests of the pastoralists, particularly in the remission of land rents. That has materially assisted the woolgrowers of the Murchison and other outer parts of the State, but I respectfully suggest that the interest

bill far exceeds the liabilities that the pastoralists have had to shoulder by way of land rents. I know of no request to the institutions to which I refer to assist the industry to carry on, by way of a review of the obligations of the pastoralists to them. We have no right to continue asking the general taxpayer to accept the financial responsibility of stabilising the industry, without also requesting the private institutions to conform to that policy. To do that would be merely fair and reasonable. I submit to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) and to other members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, that that course could be adopted with advantage regarding the pastoralists. How can they be expected to build up their herds? The stock on the holdings are too old to expect from them any rapid natural increase. Such a result is not physically possible. In consequence, further money must be raised to enable the properties to be re-stocked. That is the deplorable position in which the Murchison pastoralists find themselves. I hope the Minister will continue to prosecute the ideas he holds and call upon those institutions to afford some relief to primary industry.

Mr. Watts: Hear, hear!

Mr. MARSHALL: By that means the growers will be able to build up their herds, and the money provided by the private institutions will be used in a manner that will ultimately be of benefit to themselves. As it is, the pastoralists are merely acting as shepherds for those institutions, which hold the growers in the hollow of their hands. To such an extent is that so that all business transactions must be sanctioned by those concerns, which dictate to the pastoralists what they shall do. I understand that lists of requirements to enable them to live on their properties have to be submitted by the pastoralists, and these have to be endorsed before purchases can be made of those requirements. I trust the Minister will proceed with what he has in mind and negotiate peacefully with those institutions. If he is not successful, then the Legislature should be asked to step in.

Mr. Seward: What about the Bill to amend the Rural Relief Act?

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not think that assistance can be provided for the people I have in mind by that means.

Mr. Seward: Of course it could.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know that much relief could be afforded the pastoralists by that means because the amount available is so limited. Then again, if I can judge from the discussions that have taken place in this Chamber, not much will be left for the pastoralists after the wheat-growers and the men with mixed farming propositions have had their requirements satisfied. If the Minister could supply figures showing the amount available for distribution under that heading, the details would be interesting, particularly to a section of the community that is becoming enslaved to institutions that should be called upon to render material assistance to the primary producers.

Mr. Warner: An amendment in the Rural Relief Act Amendment Bill includes the writing down of secured debts.

The Minister for Lands: That is a different proposition.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, entirely different. Action should be taken in this matter. All sections of the community were called upon to make sacrifices during the depression, and the institutions I refer to have been left untouched to carry on at their own free will. If the pastoral industry is regarded as of national importance—I consider it is in that category—we should not call continually upon the Government to foster and stabilise it in piecemeal fashion by granting small concessions here and other concessions there. Such actions afford no real relief to those concerned. As I have already stated, I trust the Minister will continue with what he has in mind, and, if necessary, submit legislation to achieve his ends. If the institutions to which I have referred are prepared to assist the producers by accepting more of the financial responsibility, thereby relieving the producers who have to accept all the worries and troubles associated with the management of their holdings, the pastoralists will have some hope for the future and will be relieved to some degree.

MR. BERRY (Irwin-Moore) [7.57]: One of the main points that appealed to me in the Minister's speech was his statement that the export market available to Nestlé's condensed milk manufactured in Western Australia in the Far East had developed in so remarkable a manner. I was hope-

ful he would have told us that the same result had been achieved regarding the export of apples. I have heard members stress the predicament of the apple growers, but I assure the Committee that, with proper organisation and with definite care in the matter of grading and packing, no reason exists why the market in the Far East should not provide an opportunity to alleviate many of the problems in connection with the disposal of the State's apple crop. I returned to the Federated Malay States in 1917 during the last war, and found to my amazement that only with the utmost difficulty was it possible to procure all sorts of commodities that the people there had previously been in the habit of securing. As I had knowledge of what was available in the Eastern States of Australia, I decided to open a shop in Malacca in the Straits Settlements, where I was in charge of a rubber plantation. I imported from the Eastern States—I did not know of Western Australia at the time—supplies of those commodities which, owing to the war, were not available from elsewhere. These products were purchased with avidity, and the various lines were readily accepted by the people. One that was particularly easy to dispose of was raisins, but difficulty was experienced because the Australian merchants were not prepared to realise that the people in the Far East who had plenty of money required goods to be properly packed and delivered. I found that raisins were sent in 7 or 10-lb. tins, on the outside of which was the intimation that the contents should be eaten as soon as the tins were opened. It is quite impossible for a person to eat 7 lbs. or 10 lbs. of raisins at once. The demand for the raisins was, however, so great that I wrote to my agent in Sydney suggesting that the raisins should be packed in smaller tins. To my amazement, I was told by the agent that the tins suited the Eastern States and therefore should be good enough for anybody else. I am sorry to say that that particular line of business slumped. Another item was cheese. We were fairly successful with that; but unfortunately one or two cheeses blew up, and that rather cramped our style. We could dispose of as many hams as we imported. The same remark applies to milk, eggs and butter, so I am not surprised

at the Minister's remarks. We also traded in bottled preserves—in fact anything that could be imported from Australia. I feel quite sure if we were to attempt to foster that trade it would mean a great deal for the State. There are the questions of shipping space and refrigeration to be considered; there is also the question of sending the right men to look after the selling part of the business. I feel quite certain that we have such men in Western Australia and that if we sent them there they could open up a market which would greatly alleviate many of the troubles confronting our primary producers. Java and Singapore offer us tremendous scope. As far as distance is concerned, Java is certainly closer to Perth than is Sydney. As far as I can remember, there is a matter of nine or ten miles difference in the distance to Singapore, but which way I cannot recollect. The point remains that we have this opportunity if we are prepared to take it. If we do, I am sure many of our problems will be solved.

With regard to flour, there was the same increase in consumption in the Far East before 1932 as there was in many other directions, so much so that I personally considered establishing a flour mill in Singapore and actually raised money for the purpose. The decision was arrived at purely on the figures showing the expansion of the flour trade in that country. Both Chinese and Malay are definitely becoming more westernised each day, and we can profit thereby. I see the Minister is writing figures. I hope he will tell me that trade in other products has increased out of bounds, like the trade in milk. I shall not say more about that. We have exactly the same chance now as we had in 1917, because the selfsame facts are operating. War has again broken out and the people in that country will to-day be facing exactly the same problem with regard to imports as they faced in 1914-18. That in itself gives us the opportunity.

Passing from that subject to wheat and wool, I do not intend to repeat what has already been said. Time is not available. I assure you Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time I have been associated with an industry in which I have been asked to grow a product that is commandeered by a Government, without telling me what the price of

the commandeered product is to be. The member for Murchison stressed the financial side of production troubles; we all know that pernicious aspect. I was under the impression that our financial system was not quite safe. Recently I came to the conclusion that the whole system should be sent to Claremont and securely locked up forever. I trust the Government will do all it can to persuade the Federal Government to inform our primary producers at once how much they are to receive for their wheat and wool, the primary products which are the economic sinews of the State. We have been asked to produce these commodities. The Imperial Prime Minister asked all parts of the Empire to continue to produce the necessary sinews of war. As wheat and wool are classed as such, the Federal Government should wake up and tell the producers what they will receive for those same sinews. It is ridiculous to insist on patriotism and at the same time ask patriotism to walk hand-in-hand with poverty. That cannot be done. If we are to maintain the spirit of patriotism which we are prepared to offer to the Empire, it is up to the Federal Government to inform the people on the land how much they are to receive for their wool and wheat, and to ensure that the price will give them a margin of profit and an opportunity to change from a state of serfdom to one of respectability and self-respect.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [8.6]: The Department of Agriculture has, under successive Ministers, been of the utmost use to the primary producers of the State. In anything I have to say with regard to it, there is the underlying desire that the department should become yet more useful. This I believe it is steadily becoming. The problems it has had to tackle in the past will no doubt be greatly multiplied as the years pass; because, from the observations of the Minister himself the other night, it is obvious that more and more items of interest to primary producers are being dealt with by the department. There can be no complaint against the expenditure of the department, except to say that in some directions it might be more. Nor do I think any complaint—at least of a serious nature—can be lodged against the administration of the department over successive years. But, unfortunately, those for whom

the department has to act, namely the primary producers of the State, are not satisfied—shall we say—that the same efficiency is being shown in regard to the present position of their products, and the result has been indicated by the member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) a few moments ago. He said that in the pastoral section of his electorate a number of pastoralists were obliged to draw up a list and submit it to their financial institutions before they were allowed to obtain necessities to carry on their stations. He appeared to believe that that process was peculiar to the pastoral areas in his district. I would remind him that it is a common practice in all agricultural areas. Not only does it exist when dealings are with the financial institutions to which he referred, but it also exists in connection with the Agricultural Bank, towards which he appeared to have such kindly feelings. My intention is not to dwell on these points, but I would remind that hon. member that those conditions do prevail in other than pastoral areas. They are to be found among a large number of extremely decent people in the agricultural districts as well.

I therefore propose to deal with this matter as far as possible having regard to all those engaged in primary production, whether pastoral or otherwise. The producers are largely on the same basis so far as their financial difficulties are concerned. I would not be over-stating the case in saying that there exists in country districts to-day the gravest dissatisfaction with the Government's acquisition of wool and with the method being employed to appraise wool. As the member for Pingelly (Mr. Seward) observed, it is extremely difficult—if not impossible in some cases—to obtain authentic information. It seems to me that for some reason or other the whole business, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, has been wrapped in secrecy. On looking through the National Security Regulations the other day, I noticed that the wool appraisers are sworn to secrecy, not only as to the result of their appraisal, but also as to their dealings with the clips of individual growers and the methods adopted for appraisal. Notwithstanding that we are at war, I fail to see the necessity for so much secrecy in a matter of this kind. Some 1,600 types and grades of wool are, it appears, provided for the ap-
 praisers to work on. These are sup-

posed in the net result to return an average price of 13 and 7/16ths pence per lb. for the whole Australian clip. The grower, however, is not to be acquainted with the methods employed to arrive at that valuation; he is obliged to adopt the policy of "wait and see." From the date of the appointment of the Central Wool Committee up to the present time, I think the interests of the growers have been lost sight of. We find that the Central Wool Committee is comprised of 10 members, of whom three represent the growers—three out of ten. The growers are therefore in a hopeless minority. I believe that the greater part of the agitation which was referred to by the Minister the other evening under the heading of orderly marketing has been occasioned by the primary producers' desire to have a substantial voice in the marketing of their products. I do not propose for one moment to go into the question of this so-called orderly marketing now; but I do most heartily agree that the underlying desire of the grower is to have substantial authority in the disposition and sale of his products. The grower is entitled to that privilege. He should have at least equal representation on any board or committee appointed to handle his products. Dealing with the Central Wool Committee, presumably its advice is accepted by the department of the Federal Government which is controlling this particular matter. Of the other seven members of the committee, three are brokers. While I admit the necessity for some representation of that section of the community—the Minister said that there should be as little disturbance of the trade as possible—I cannot find sufficient justification for the brokers having the same representation as have the growers. That is not the worst. There are representatives of the buyers and the manufacturers which also, as one can see, loads the voting on any controversial point very largely against the producer. The remaining two members are appointed by the Commonwealth Government as representing the point of view of that Government. One of them is a merchant and another is an accountant, and so there is no compensation so far as the growers' interests are concerned in that section of the committee. Why the necessity for a buyer on the committee, I cannot quite understand. The sale of wool has been replaced by appraisal, and in those circumstances I do not

see the necessity for having a buyer on the committee.

My point of view is that it is because the growers' representative has been in so hopeless a minority on the Central Wool Committee that the result of negotiations and arrangements to date is regarded as unsatisfactory. The acquisition of wool at 10¾d. sterling which, with the 25 per cent. exchange added, works out at 13d. odd Australian and which is quoted as the average Australian price, is not a figure which, in any circumstances at the present time, can profit growers, even if it were realised on the average clip. In addition to that fact, we find that 90 per cent. of the amount is to be paid within 14 days of the appraisalment, and the remaining 10 per cent. is to be paid after an interval of probably six or seven months—I understand during the month of June next. If there is any profit in the disposal of wool at the average price for the individual grower, I venture to say it will not exceed 10 per cent. of the full amount of the clip. Yet that 10 per cent. is to be withheld for a period ranging from six to seven months from the time of the appraisalment. Obviously the grower will be paying interest on that money and will be losing again in that direction. Under the selling system, sales were effected on the first of the month and the settlement to the grower took place 14 days after that time. I know that I am in agreement with a large number of growers when I say I can see no justification for financing 90 per cent. on the transaction within 14 days, when it was previously practicable to finance the whole of it within that period. I contend that if there is any profit for the grower, the 10 per cent. represents the profit.

Dealing with the average price, let us consider for a moment whether the best advice was taken by the powers that be. The Australian Woolgrowers' Council, according to a press report, recommended 15½d. as the average price for one year, with a review each June, or, alternatively, 17½d. as the average price for the duration of the war and one year thereafter if there was to be no review. In 1937 I attended a conference of the Australian Woolgrowers' Council held in Sydney. I found its members, by a very large majority, to be a most conservative body of men, far more inclined to under-estimate

the growers' needs than the reverse. According to a Press report, the secretary of the council, Mr. Allen, in commenting on the position recently, said that the council was not consulted by the Government and so was in no position to take a hand in any of the negotiations. This appears to be the more surprising as hitherto the Federal Government has contended that the Australian Woolgrowers' Council was the proper representative of the growers in Australia and that its advice should be taken wherever their point of view was desired to be ascertained.

I have no doubt that the council, as of yore, in this matter kept in close touch with the wool brokers, and was able to keep in touch also with the general trend of market values, and I am convinced that had its recommendation been carried out, we should have found no condition of dissatisfaction existing, as it undoubtedly does exist, throughout the countryside to-day. The point of view of the growers was borne out by the comments published in the local Press by the chairman of the Bradford Manufacturers' Association, in which he expressed himself as frankly delighted and not a little surprised, and even incredulous, at being able to secure Australian wool so cheaply. To me it is surprising that no better arrangement should have been made. I deprecate the suggested accusation that growers who complain in this matter may be desirous of making a profit out of the country's adversity. I am perfectly convinced there is no such desire in the mind of any man who is engaged in any of the primary industries of this State. At the same time, the producer wants to know why his product is going to be commandeered—I think that is the word that was used by the member for Irwin-Moore—and why his point of view should not receive more mature consideration.

I do not find that the Union of South Africa has entered into a contract of this nature, nor that the Government of that country is unable to recognise its responsibilities to the Empire, of which it, like Australia, forms a part. I have mentioned the proposal of the Australian Woolgrowers' Council that there should be a review of the price to be paid annually. In fairness to the Prime Minister and the Federal Government generally, we have been told that the agreement was not without a provision in that direction. That again brings me to the point

that the producers of this country have not been given all the information they are entitled to have. In this article, fluctuations in the rate of exchange are given as the most likely reason for a review of the price. The article went on to say that these fluctuations might as easily be downward as upward, because apparently a substantial trade balance would be built up in London and there would be some restriction on importation, with a result that Australia's position would probably improve in relation to sterling rather than the reverse. If it is limited, as suggested in the article, to a review in the event of fluctuations in the exchange, then the position does not appear to be very hopeful.

The woolgrower naturally inquires whether there is any proposal for a review of the price in the event of increased costs. There may be, and I hope there is such a proposal in the agreement, but at the present time no public statement has been made to give any indication that that is so. If there is such a clause in the agreement, then undoubtedly it would be regarded by many of the woolgrowers as quite satisfactory, but if there is not—and we have no knowledge of it—then there is every justification for one being inserted as early as possible. Clearly the present average price of 13 and seven-sixteenths pence, even supposing it could be realised by the individual grower—as pointed out by the member for Pingelly, there is the gravest doubt of that; there is every indication that a number of clips will realise on an average less than 1s. on the appraisement figures mentioned—is not above the average cost of production at the commencement of the war. Since then various items have increased in cost—I could quote woolpacks, petrol, fuel oil and railway freights—and there is every indication that those increases will continue in future. The cost of living will probably rise also and the cost of production will rise with it. I can only say I hope every effort will be made to ensure that there is a term in this contract, or that there soon will be, to enable the Government to arrange for an increase of the average price to cover those increased costs.

I think I have said enough to indicate that the price being paid to-day, on the evidence of the well-informed Woolgrowers' Council and on the evidence of the chair-

man of the Bradford Manufacturers' Association, as reported in the local Press, is by no means parable, or as great as might have been expected by those interested parties. I have no doubt the Minister has already taken these matters into consideration. I certainly hope he has and that he will so far as he is able—I freely realise the difficulty of the State Government's situation—make strong representations for the Federal Government to have these matters taken into consideration. For my part I feel it my duty to let the Committee and the people of the State understand the reasons for the dissatisfaction existing amongst the woolgrowers, and the underlying causes for that dissatisfaction, so that there may not get abroad the idea that these men, who for years have been conducting their woolgrowing at a loss, are seeking to make a profit out of a national catastrophe when they are merely asking to be able to continue to make a living.

I desire now to refer to a local matter affecting my own electorate. Approximately ten farms in my district, in common with other places I do not propose to refer to, have suffered as a result of a heavy thunderstorm, and an area of some 35 to 40 square miles has been hit by a severe hailstorm. Over that area, quite a number of exceptionally promising crops, estimated to yield 15 to 25 bushels to the acre—far more promising at this period of the year than for many years past—were either entirely or very substantially ruined by the hail. The position of some of the farmers concerned was that they were not covered by any insurance. I point out to the Committee that the last week in October is fairly early for hail insurance in those districts, and therefore there was no insurance on a number of the farms affected, and the losses have in consequence been very substantial. Last year there was an expenditure from the moneys provided under the Federal Wheat Industries Assistance Act of almost the whole of the £100,000 allocated to this State under the provision for drought relief. So far as I can gather, there is no possibility of drought relief being required in the wheat industry in this State, during the present year, which industry, of course, is all that the Act applies to in this State.

According to Section 7 of the Act the Minister is apparently at liberty to request

permission of the Federal Government to allocate portion of the fund to the relief of distressed wheatgrowers. It is evident to me that some of the men to whom I have referred, men who have suffered these losses by hail, will undoubtedly be in the category of distressed wheatgrowers. They are in a position almost worse than that of the farmers who have grown no crop at all, because they have seen an excellent crop ruined by an act of God. There are other districts where similar occurrences have taken place, and I should like to suggest to the Minister that, in regard to all such places, he should have an investigation made to ascertain what the situation is and whether those farmers are entitled to assistance as distressed wheatgrowers, as I believe they are, and whether he should not take advantage of the provisions of the Act and make application for some of the funds to be used for their assistance. Those people are doubly unfortunate in their position. Had their crops come to harvest, as would normally be expected, the farmers would have taken substantial sums from the flour tax fund, by way of bonus or as otherwise it might be expressed, on the wheat they would have produced. They had brought their crops within three weeks or a month of harvesting, when hail destroyed them, the lack of insurance not being the fault of the farmers. The Minister should agree to have the proposal which has been made considered with a view to coming to their assistance.

Lastly, I would like to say a few words about the wheat industry generally. With other members I realise that at present no information is being received by wheatgrowers in Western Australia. Here we have passed a resolution expressing our opinion that nothing less than 3s. 4d. per bushel at sidings, with payment within one month of delivery, would be satisfactory. There is no guarantee before us that such a payment will be received. If it were, the unhappiness now existing in the wheat areas would be dispelled. Once again, however, we have not been afforded information. I do not suppose that any agreement can be made at the present time; but surely it is not impossible for the powers that be elsewhere than within this State to inform us what they are striving to do, what efforts they are making in order to

ensure, if possible, that a payable price will be given so as to relieve the despondency and uncertainty now existing in country districts. It seems to me that the time has arrived when we are regarded much as children, who are not told anything in connection with their affairs. Similarly, we are without information in regard to national affairs. By "national" affairs I mean affairs concerning our internal local position: I leave it to other authorities to attend to matters that are happening outside Western Australia. I recommend the Federal Government to issue at the earliest possible moment a statement as to what it is striving to do, even if it cannot achieve its object. I commend to our Ministers the need for trying to induce the Federal authorities to make such a statement, so that the producers of this State and of Australia generally may have some idea of the efforts being made. We are reduced to searching through the daily Press and finding practically no information given. That does not make life any easier for members representing country constituencies, who are continually being asked questions which they cannot answer and with regard to which they cannot obtain any information, quite apart from the fact that the grower himself is unable to decide from day to day what attitude he shall adopt in regard to his liabilities and his future. I have not intended my remarks to be in any way a criticism of the activities of the Agricultural Department of Western Australia. I have put them forward for what they are worth to-day, in the hope of securing the closer co-operation of the Minister with respect to various matters in the same way as other members have done this evening.

MR. WILLMOTT (Sussex) [8.35]: After listening to the very instructive introduction given by the Minister for Agriculture on Thursday evening, I consider it proper to offer a few remarks on this Vote. There are one or two points the hon. gentleman did not touch on; and as they affect my electorate seriously, I desire to bring them under his notice. One of them is the rabbit question. In a large portion of my electorate the rabbit is causing much hardship and expense. I have been in touch with the Agricultural Bank on the subject

for assistance; but, unfortunately, owing to our agreement with the Federal Government applying to the cheap rate for wire netting it is essential that the whole boundary of a property must be fenced. As regards the areas I have in view, I agree with our local governing bodies that it is not advisable to fence the whole boundary, though I do consider that certain portions of the areas should be fenced. From personal observation I can state that last year settlers struggling for a living could not cut one blade of hay. The rabbits practically cleaned out the hay. I can prove that statement. Accordingly I do hope that the Minister will use his utmost efforts to alter the arrangement with the Commonwealth Government so that portion of an area may be fenced, instead of the whole of the outside boundary.

The other matter especially affecting my district the Minister did just mention, and that is the falling disease. Fortunately the loss from that cause has not been great this year, but last year it was considerable indeed. The district did have a veterinary surgeon—I shall touch on the subject of veterinary surgeons a little later—but as a larger salary had been offered him he left Western Australia for the Eastern States. The Minister for Agriculture will probably recollect the interview I had with him on the matter. The hon. gentleman pointed out that it was impossible for Western Australia to increase the salaries of its veterinary surgeons. I feel that we must do something, because several of our best veterinary surgeons have left to take positions in the East—proving that we have had good men in Western Australia. Perhaps we shall have to increase the salaries of our veterinary surgeons in order to retain their services.

I agree with the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) as to the value of the calf clubs to be found throughout the South-West, where the young generation is taking a keen interest in dairy products. Possibly arrangements could be made whereby young boys in those clubs might be given some veterinary advice and be trained up to become veterinary surgeons in Western Australia. At least they could be taught sufficient to assist in the districts where they live. That would be of immense benefit to the State.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They must have a university education to qualify as veterinary surgeons.

Mr. WILLMOTT: I fully admit that. As the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) dealt with the matter on a recent evening, I merely touch on it. Again, contagious abortion causes great loss to South-Western dairy farmers. In my opinion the Minister for Agriculture should do something to secure veterinary surgeons, who could be associated with the South-Western areas, where, as we all know, during the last few years the stock has increased greatly. Not many years ago there were comparatively few stock to be attended to, and we then had veterinary surgeons. Since then the numbers of stock have increased by 30 or 40 per cent., as compared with say five or six years ago. Thus it is essential to have additional veterinary surgeons to deal with these matters. I notice the Minister for Agriculture smiling pleasantly. This is a sore point with him. Nevertheless, I do hope that he will give the subject his serious consideration and see what can be done. The hon. gentleman stated that the Denmark wasting disease had been overcome at the small expense of—I think he said—2d. per cow per annum. That was for something added to the Denmark lick then existing. I presume that is where the small amount of 2d. per cow per annum comes in. I trust something will be discovered that will cure the falling disease at the same low figure. The farmers concerned would be prepared to pay considerably more for having the disease wiped out definitely.

Then there is that old South-Western question, an agricultural college. I know the Minister recently said in reply to the member for Murray-Wellington that an agricultural college costs money. I quite agree that it does; but in the South-West, where the living is purely and solely gained from dairying and pig-raising, we are entitled to an agricultural college to instruct our growing lads in the right methods to be adopted. Undoubtedly it would be a good move for the Government to establish an agricultural college in the South-West. Last session I advocated its establishment in my electorate on a property then owned by the Government and still owned by the Government though at present leased to a farmer who is doing very well—at

least I hope he is. Every member who has spoken has touched on various items affecting his district, and therefore I would like to refer briefly to others. The South-West produces good butter, and also very good cheese. I hope the Dairy Act Amendment Bill will overcome all the difficulties to which the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) has made reference. I hope it will also affect the cheese, so that we shall have a choice article to send overseas. Under our present agreement with the Imperial Government we shall receive 136s. 4½d. for choice butter; but as the butter grades down, so the price comes down. Therefore it is essential that we do everything to improve our article so as to obtain the best possible price.

In conclusion I hope the Minister will think carefully over the matters I have mentioned—especially the rabbit question, which is one of our sore points. Local government bodies and the settlers themselves are striving to combat the pest, some of them going to very considerable expense.

MR. HILL (Albany) [8.44]: I listened with great interest to the Minister's introduction of this Vote. May I be permitted to say that it is something like 30 years since I first became acquainted with the Agricultural Department, and I can give an assurance that the Minister in no way exaggerates the good work done by its officers and the benefit that work represents to the State. I know that any man who comes to my home and introduces himself as an officer of the Agricultural Department is certain of a very hearty welcome. The Minister and the member for Sussex (Mr. Willmott) have referred to Denmark wasting disease. The work in relation to that disease is some of the most wonderful work the department has done. Once I went into the Denmark area and saw feed that appeared marvellous. I asked the man running the farm, an experienced dairyman: "Surely you have no wasting disease?" He replied: "I have never yet reared a cow." The cause of that disease is deficiency in cobalt, and it seems that one ounce of cobalt is sufficient for 40 cows over a period of 12 months.

I hope that the time is not far distant when the Agricultural Department will have offices and buildings worthy of the capable officers it employs. Those gentlemen

have done and are still doing wonderful work. I should like to pay a tribute to two of the officers of that department, one of whom I regret to say has crossed the Great Divide. I refer to the late Mr. L. J. Newman. It would be absolutely impossible to assess what his value has been to the State. To mention only one matter: he was responsible for introducing a parasite that was worth thousands of pounds a year to the fruitgrowers of the State. His work also in connection with the grasshopper pest was simply wonderful; and I can safely say that Mr. Newman died in harness, working for the people of the State and the State itself. The next man to whom I wish to refer is our old friend Mr. George Wickens. Twenty-seven years ago a strange man came to my place, but I was soon able to show how pleased I was to welcome him. His reputation had gone before him. He, too, rendered valuable assistance to the orchardists of the State. A few weeks ago I had the privilege of occupying the chair at a dinner at which function he found it exceedingly difficult to express himself as he was saying good-bye to us as Superintendent of Horticulture. A presentation of 50 guineas was made to him, a sum which represented only a fraction of the debt owed to him by the fruitgrowers of the State. I am proud to be able to call Mr. Wickens a friend and in expressing myself thus I am merely saying what every other fruitgrower would say had he the opportunity publicly to do so. It is difficult indeed to express our gratitude to Mr. Wickens for his work in stamping out pests, and the assistance generally he so willingly gave to all. We are pleased that the department has appointed as Mr. Wickens's successor one of its own officers. I refer to Mr. Harley Powell. This officer has been in close touch with me during the last few years, but we all regret that he was not appointed assistant about 12 months before Mr. Wickens's retirement. Mr. Powell now has a tremendous job in front of him following in the footsteps of Mr. Wickens. If he had been appointed an assistant earlier and had remained in close contact with Mr. Wickens, that, I am sure, would have been of great assistance to him. Anyway, there will be strong co-operation between Mr. Powell and the fruitgrowers, just as strong as that which existed between his predecessor and the fruitgrowers. Reference has been made to the Commonwealth proposals

for the purchase of fruit. No industry has done so much to help itself as has the fruit industry. The fruitgrowers have taxed themselves, and they have been fortunate in having men of ability in control of their affairs. In Mr. Martin we have a gentleman who simply lives for the industry. On the Apple and Pear Board there is Mr. Soothill who though not a fruit-grower is entirely wrapped up in everything that is associated with the industry. The other member of the board is Mr. G. Parke, who is also a very able gentleman. The Commonwealth scheme is the only way in which to deal with the problem during the period of the war. In the course of the previous war it was no easy matter to keep the orchards going. On this occasion I hope that means will be found by which the prices to be obtained will be above the cost of production.

I should like to avail myself of this opportunity of thanking the Minister for Agriculture for the assistance given to the Albany Freezing Works. I do not want his colleagues to try to make out that they have done a wonderful lot in this direction. The cool stores were a white elephant until it was decided that the freezing of lambs should be carried out. At that time about four hands were employed, while to-day 20 are engaged at normal times, and 100 during the killing season, to say nothing of the work associated with the raising of lambs and the encouragement being given to the producers along the Great Southern areas. I can assure the Minister that every penny put into that work by the Government will be returned many times over. Reference has been made to the wool appraisement proposals, and disappointment expressed that this work is to be confined to Fremantle only. Twenty-five years ago the authorities did not adopt the same narrow view that is being followed to-day. Before the last war there were no wool sales in Western Australia, and had the authorities at that time carried out all the appraisement in the Eastern States, it would have been a very serious matter for Western Australia. I hope that the Commonwealth will reconsider its decision and not confine the appraisement to Fremantle but will carry it out at the outports as well. As far as Albany is concerned, not one sound argument can be advanced against appraisement at that port. On this subject I should like to thank the

Premier for the staunch support he has given to the agitation for appraisement at the outports.

MR. DONEY (Williams-Narrogin) [8.53]: If there was one weakness in the very interesting address submitted by the Minister when speaking to his Estimates it was that he did not afford the House an opportunity to understand the relationship between the farmers on the one hand and the British Government and the Commonwealth and State Boards on the other hand in respect of the conditions and prices for the purchase of wool, wheat and fat lambs. The Minister, I hope, has taken a note of the fact that every member on this side of the House who has spoken has shown that this problem has been uppermost in his mind. It must clearly be an annoyance to farmers and country members of Parliament to find the Press reports on this question always so contradictory, and all capable of being interpreted in a variety of ways. We want the Minister to give us a statement that can be interpreted in one way and one way only. Other than that the only question to which I desire to refer is that of soil erosion. This is likely to be a big question in the future, but no one so far has made mention of it. This is a problem that might be said to have started nine or ten years ago, but that only in the last four or five years has been serious enough to attract general notice. The erosion has now got down to the subsoil and it stands to reason that the danger will increase, particularly having regard to the wet winter we have gone through. It will tend to become a big national question. At the present rate of erosion, in another half a dozen years or so, provided those years include an average number of rainy periods, there will be little soil left on some of our best slopes on which wheat is now grown, though of course the lower levels may benefit. I want the Minister to tell the House, if he does not mind, just exactly what expert advice is available and whether he has taken any steps to combat the danger; if not, whether he does intend very shortly to take such steps.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [8.56]: A good deal has been said with regard to the acquisition by the Commonwealth Government under a National

Security Act of numerous commodities produced in Australia. This is a matter over which the State Parliament has no control and we cannot exercise any influence on the subject.

Mr. Doney: But we can make a clear statement of fact.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is true, and we can have recorded what is said, but where action should be taken is in that Parliament in which results can be obtained. Therefore it is no use taking up time here on a matter that is absolutely beyond the influence of this Chamber. True, the Minister can make reports, but he cannot do any more than can any hon. member. Members themselves can make representations to members in the Federal Parliament just as the Minister can make representations to the Federal Minister concerned. Again, a good deal of time is occupied in asking for growers' control, but growers' control has not the slightest effect in connection with the situation concerning wool and wheat which have been acquired by the Commonwealth Government. But the cause for complaint that we as producers have is against the price at which our commodities have been disposed of. Wheat was acquired at a low rate and the price paid to the producer was justified on the basis that the world was saturated with wheat, that there was not a shortage, but a surplus. The British Government did not require Australian wheat because it could have obtained wheat at prices nearer to Britain and from which the transport would have been easier. Therefore it was claimed that as our commodity was so difficult to sell, the Commonwealth had done a service to the growers of Australia by inducing the British Government to purchase the crop, even though it was secured at a low price. The deal at a low rate was justified, it was claimed, because of the competitive value of the commodity. But when it came to wool all the arguments that were advanced to justify the low price paid for wheat were forgotten, and the fact was also forgotten that there was a scarcity of wool: that Australia had a commanding position in regard to the supply of wool; that the eyes of the consuming world were on Australia; and that all consuming countries were interested in the production of Australia and the possibility of acquiring some of that production.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was not indicated by last year's sales.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am giving the position as it is to-day.

Hon. N. Keenan: You know the price the South African grower is getting?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, I do not know.

Hon. N. Keenan: And he is not selling under any acquisition scheme.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not know that anybody is aware of exactly what he is getting.

Hon. N. Keenan: Yes, it is known.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is more than I know. I am not prepared to say exactly what the grower in South Africa is securing for his wool, but I do say that the price of our wool is definitely below its real competitive value. We cannot argue about wheat but we can argue about wool. The price of wool to-day is definitely below its value, and we have a grievance against the Menzies Government for accepting a comparatively low price. To say that the average price of the Australian clip is somewhere about 13½d. when we realise the desire of so many parts of the world to acquire our wool, is of course to discount the commodity considerably and to do a very grave injustice to the producers of wool. But it is no good to say that we can improve the position by growers' control. We cannot improve it at all. It is the politician who is responsible; the political representatives in the Federal Parliament have tolerated the situation. I want members to appreciate that further than ventilating the matter we can do nothing to rectify it here.

Hon members have dwelt a great deal on the question of production. I have said here before and I want to repeat that production is not a problem in Western Australia. We can expand production by our own efforts. Producers can organise and help one another and by mutual assistance can obtain better results than they are receiving to-day. The real problem is marketing. The outstanding weakness is that we cannot market all our commodities on a profitable basis. That is due to the lack of organisation. We do not want growers' control in the sense that we want growers represented on boards or anything of that kind; though that might help. What we need is to see to it that we prevent competitive marketing of our products. The great

trouble is that the producers will employ a multitude of sellers. When one studies the buying of commodities, it becomes clear that there is no competition in that direction. Take wool, which has been the subject of discussion to-day. The wool buyers do not compete in the manner we generally think. The wool buyers purchase in what is called a wool buyers' pie, and in that pie they arrive at understandings to depreciate the value of the growers' product simply because the growers employ a multitude of sellers. If they employed only one seller the pie could not operate, but the pie operates because there is a number of sellers or brokers submitting the growers' wool. The growers here could do the same as is done in Denmark, Sweden, California and other places where growers are organised.

Mr. Warner: Then why not organise them?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have played my part in that regard. When I heard the discussion on the Bill to amend the Dairy Industry Act, I was depressed because it made me feel that the producers' representatives did not fully appreciate what was needed to secure a higher price for the commodity then under discussion.

Mr. Doney: What you mean is that they did not share your view-point.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am replying to the hon. member's interjection. He wanted to know what I was doing. I replied that I have played my part. I have been in the South-West on many occasions.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Generally for a holiday.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, on lecturing tours, to try to get the producers to realise that they are not getting value for their commodities, and the value of their commodities is not being obtained because they have a multitude of sellers. Their commodities are being depreciated by the competition of the multitude that is battenning on the producers to-day. I had the privilege of going to London recently and it was sad to see exactly how our commodities are landed and displayed. Our butter is definitely below standard and the standard is becoming lower. It is not improving as time rolls on. Hon. members know exactly what improvement has taken place in the pastures of the South-West. Consider the expansion that is taking place in clearing,

irrigation and the spreading of subterranean clover. What a wonderful asset that has been! Unfortunately, just as we have improved in that regard, the commodity has declined in standard. Today choice butter is difficult of production, not because we cannot produce it but because we are marketing it and submitting it through those who are not interested in the improvement of the standard of butter sent overseas but are exploiting the industry today and depreciating the value of the commodity by operations within the State. I do not want to go into detail but the time will arrive when one will be forced to expose exactly what is going on. The men who are depreciating the value of this product can go to the Legislative Council and lobby. They are doing so to-night, and have it done before, and they have lobbied for the purpose of maintaining their grip. Unfortunately, another place does not seem to be interested in the welfare of the producers to the extent one would expect.

The CHAIRMAN: I remind the hon. member that he must not reflect on another place.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not reflecting on another place but on individual personalities and I do not mention any names. The time has arrived when we should do more in the South-West to improve the quality of butter produced. Otherwise we shall lose not only the low market we have today but we shall lose altogether. Competition in the sale of butter on the English market is very keen. Members can readily understand that when there is a commodity which is sold as choice and which has compared favourably with butter produced in other parts of Australia, and the quality of that commodity definitely and regularly depreciates, the buyers at the other side wonder what will happen ultimately. For that reason I ask hon. members, and particularly those from the South-West, to realise that we are slipping badly, and the reason is that we did not have some years ago the Bill introduced by the Minister for Agriculture the other night. I went into the question of other commodities when I was having a holiday at the seat of consuming thousands and I discovered that many of those commodities are easy of sale because of their competitive attractiveness. They are not only good at the source but they are put up and prepared on a successfully competi-

tive basis from the point of view of appearance. That applies to our fruit, which sells readily. But again I want to warn producers, this time about the fruit fly, which is expanding and becoming a greater menace every year. Just as the value of butter has decreased because of carelessness, so the value of fruit will decrease unless something more drastic is done to control the fruit fly.

Another commodity I would like to refer to is dried fruits. They are not commanding the respect and not selling as freely as the quality of the fruit justifies. The reason is that they are not properly prepared. I had samples submitted to me by a big seller in London of the Victorian dried fruits—raisins and lemons—and the Western Australian products. The local products were superior. They were admitted by the buyers to be better, but the curing was definitely deficient. The preparation for the market was not as correct and scientific as was that of the Eastern States products. This again is a case of a multitude of handlers, of preparers. The reason for there being a multitude of packing sheds competing and constantly reducing the value of the commodity by only partially curing and preparing is that, because of the competition that exists, that is the only way by which the industry can be made to pay. The reason that is being perpetuated is that we are limiting the control of the board from one to three or four years. If we had given the board sufficient control, without the limitation imposed by another place, it could have organised the industry and made it competitive. The difference in the price of the Victorian product at the time I viewed it was £5 per ton in favour of the Victorian commodity compared with the Western Australian product, the price for the Victorian article being £42, and that for the Western Australian superior but badly presented and badly cured fruits being £37. Just as our butter is low in competitive price, so it is with our dried fruits. This is our own fault. Organisation would, however, put the matter right. Unfortunately we have passed the Bill that would have given us the opportunity to place this commodity on a competitive basis, for we have limited the life of that measure.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must not reflect upon any vote given by this Chamber.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I deplore the action of the Chamber in limiting the life of the measure, which should have been prolonged indefinitely. I was not reflecting upon the Chamber, but upon its lack of common-sense. I could speak of other commodities, such as eggs, honey, barley and so forth. All are competitive, most of them are superior, and yet, for lack of organisation, we are not getting for them the prices their quality demands. The people who create this type of organisation are the producers. They can improve their own standard of living. They could get a higher price for their commodities if they would reduce competitive selling, and combine with a view to placing all their commodities on the world's markets. That already is done by the producers of Denmark, Sweden, California, and the system is being expanded generally by producers in various parts of the world.

What I am interested in is the expansion of Western Australia. I commend the Minister for Industrial Development for his efforts to create additional secondary industries, but I fear we cannot make much progress in that direction with a population of only 470,000 people. Our object should be to use our lands for the production of a better type of primary products. I am satisfied that all our products are competitive provided they are properly organised and marketed. I commend the Minister for Agriculture for what he has tried to do in connection with butter. A good deal remains to be done with respect to our timber and our wool, and big improvements could be effected with regard to our wheat. The people who have to take the initiative in putting the matter right are the producers, and the Minister can be of great help in that direction. I regret that producers should patronise individual marketers who are reducing their standard of living. It is not a question of growers' control but of growers' combination, to see that they market their commodities just as trade unionists market their labour. Why do we talk of preference to unionists? We do so to maintain the standard so that the incompetent man, who has no regard for the maintenance of efficiency, may not bring about a reduction in the standard. The reason why we are in difficulties with our producers is that there is no organisation on that basis. If they would collectively bargain and sell,

most of their difficulties would be overcome. I appeal to members who are interested in the welfare of Western Australia to encourage organisation amongst the producers on Labour lines. Labour has expanded and strengthened itself by means of collective bargaining, and producers could do the same if they had the will.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [9.20]: I wish to express my appreciation of the work of the Agricultural Department. I look upon it as the principal department concerned in the progress of Western Australia. This is a primary producing country. The department has done wonderful work in developing not only our wheat and wool industries, but our dairy products and others of great importance in the South-West. We have already dealt with the butter question, but a good deal has yet to be learned by producers. For some time there has been an agitation for the establishment of a dairy agricultural college in the South-West. I congratulate the Government upon its foresight in purchasing an estate that could be adapted for the purpose of a college. Demonstrations could be given there, both on the subject of dry farming and farming under irrigation.

Mr. Patrick: Are you referring to an experimental farm?

Mr. WITHERS: No. We have had experience of them and we know their value. We want something that will enable the dairy farmer, who is already experienced in the growth of pastures, etc., to learn something about the manufacture of his product. The member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick), the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styants) and I had the pleasure of visiting Muresk the week before last at the invitation of the Minister for Agriculture. Those of us who have seen that college are satisfied concerning the extent of the knowledge imparted to those who intend to take up farming pursuits. I do not suggest that a college should be established at Bunbury on the lines of the Muresk institution.

The Minister for Mines: Are you talking about an institution for the benevolent insane?

Mr. WITHERS: I hope all the students at that college will be sane. We hope that some day that which we have been looking for over a long period will come to fruition. The farmer will then have an opportunity

to learn how to treat his commodities before the manufacturing stage is reached, and will indeed gain many valuable lessons from the instruction imparted to him. As a member representing the South-West, and having a knowledge of the conditions appertaining to and the possibilities of that part of the State I consider we have yet a lot to learn. We are thankful to the Agricultural Department for what has already been imparted to us, but are looking forward to learning even more in the near future. I ask members to visualise what is likely to happen in the areas around Bunbury. Although I represent that town, I look upon the whole of the South-West and its supporting interests as contributors to the development of Bunbury itself. I look to the Murray-Wellington, the Forrest and other electorates to ascertain what development is going on. When the Stirling weir and the Waroona weir are completed, great volumes of water will be available and will be in much demand. We can imagine what development will then occur in our dairying industry, and in connection with other products in the South-West.

I was pleased to hear the member for Sussex refer to rabbits. There was a time when South-West members listened half-heartedly to what was being said about the invasion of rabbits in the wheat belt. We had not much experience of that pest at that time, and were perhaps not as sympathetic as we might have been towards members opposite. To-day rabbits are with us, and we realise what the menace means. At the end of last summer I was astounded, when visiting some of the older settlements, to hear farmers—who represented perhaps the third generation of families—say that if the pest in forest areas adjoining their holdings was not controlled by the Government, they would have to walk off their properties. I could not believe they were telling the truth when they said that they would poison their land so that it would be freed of rabbits, but in two or three weeks' time others would come in from the forest country and the same process would be carried out again. I am speaking of people who have gone in for cattle and sheep. There are some cases where the rabbits have not left sufficient feed for the pasturing of the stock. A Government official said to me recently that at Boyup Brook he was passing through a small paddock where

rabbits had been poisoned overnight, and it was possible to walk from carcass to carcass over the entire four acres.

Mr. Warner: We had all that in the wheat-belt ten years ago.

Mr. WITHERS: Some consideration should be given to those settlers when they make application for assistance to have the boundaries of their holdings, abutting on forest country, wire-netted.

We know the wonderful improvement that has followed upon grade herd testing. The amount provided on this year's Estimates is only £181, and, if the Federal grant is not continued, the testing of herds in the future will be detrimentally affected. The grade herd testing that has been carried out in the past has been of considerable educational value to the farmer. At the Bunbury Show recently the cup presented for the best herd was again won by Mr. T. Jamieson, of Capel, who had been successful on several former occasions. He is a young farmer who took advantage of the grade herd testing, with the result that he has won the cup year after year. He now possesses a herd that would be a credit to any farmer in Western Australia. The question arises as to whether we cannot extend the system so that other farmers may secure a corresponding advantage, which would tend further to help the industry.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—College of Agriculture, £15,460—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.32 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 8th November, 1939.

	PAGE
Questions: Red Cross Society, sheds on the Esplanade	1782
Trolley Buses, barn on the Esplanade	1782
Bills: Death Duties (Taxing) Act Amendment, 3R., passed	1782
Administration Act Amendment, report	1782
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, returned	1782
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R., Com. report	1783
Dried Fruits Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	1783
Transfer of Land Act Amendment, 2R.	1784
Land Act Amendment, 2R.	1785
Dairy Industry Act Amendment, 2R.	1788
Factories and Shops Act Amendment (No. 2), 2R.	1791
Dentists, 2R.	1797
Supreme Court Act Amendment, 2R.	1804
State Forests Access, 2R., Com. report	1807
State Government Insurance Office Act Amendment, 2R.	1807
Noxious Weeds Act Amendment, Com.	1808
Tramways Purchase Act Amendment, 2R.	1811

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

QUESTION—RED CROSS SOCIETY.

Sheds on the Esplanade.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (for Hon. L. B. Bolton) asked the Chief Secretary: Is the Government aware that, under instructions from the Premier's Department, refusal has been given of the use of portion of the Swan River Shipping Company's sheds on the Esplanade for the receiving and packing of parcels for the Red Cross Society?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: No.

QUESTION—TROLLEY BUSES.

Barn on the Esplanade.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER (for Hon. L. B. Bolton) asked the Chief Secretary: Is it the intention of the Government to build a trolley bus barn on the Esplanade site between William and Mill streets, south of Bazaar Terrace, and the water's edge?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The matter is under consideration but no decision has yet been arrived at.

BILL—DEATH DUTIES (TAXING) ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—ADMINISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Assembly with an amendment.