

Hughes) that manganese is of no use and that someone has stolen money from the Government for the exploitation of manganese, certain people are spending a quarter of a million of money to open up the deposits, so that the hon. member's views have evidently proved no deterrent to them. Many people on the Continent realise the almost unlimited latent wealth this State possesses, wealth that if developed would make for the social and economic strength not only of Western Australia, but of Australia as a whole.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,500,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 8.58 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions : Education, scholarships offered to country children	101
Licensing Act, six per cent. levy	101
Licenses Reduction Board	101
Public Service, total of employees	101
Canning bridge	102
Address-in-reply, fourth day	102

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION.

Scholarships offered to country children.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Education: As to the 50 scholarships offered

to country children—(a) from which schools were the winners chosen? (b) which High Schools did they elect to attend?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Minister for Education) replied: The winners of the 50 scholarships on the recommendations of district inspectors are taken almost entirely from one-teacher country schools and they may elect to attend any District High School in any part of the State, or the Narrogin School of Agriculture or Government Technical School. A statement setting out the information requested will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—LICENSING ACT.

Six per cent. levy.

Mr. NORTH asked the Treasurer: What amount was received by the Treasury from the 6 per cent. levy on liquor purchased by hotels for the year ended 30th June, 1938?

The TREASURER replied: No separate record is kept for hotels only, but an amount of £44,375 11s. 10d. was collected for the year ended 30th June, 1938, for fees on liquor purchases, covering the following licenses:—Publican's general, wayside house, gallon, hotel, Australian wine, Australian wine and beer, Australian wine bottle, railway refreshment rooms, packet, spirit merchants, brewers, temporary.

QUESTION—LICENSES REDUCTION BOARD.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Justice: When was a hotel license last cancelled by the Licenses Reduction Board?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 31st December, 1930.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE.

Total of Employees.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Premier: What was the total number of males and females, of all ages, employed by the Government under the Public Service Act, 1904, on 30th June, 1938?

The PREMIER replied: Permanent staff—1,580 (1,302 males, 278 females); Temporary staff—195 (150 males, 45 females).

QUESTION—CANNING BRIDGE.

Mr. CROSS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that attention has not yet been given to the lighting of the Canning bridge? 2, Does he realise that the bridge, being unlighted at night, constitutes a public danger? 3, What action is proposed to remedy the position? 4, When will such action be taken?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, No. 2, No. 3 and 4, Lighting of the bridge is not considered to be a responsibility of the Main Roads Department.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. WATTS (Katanning) [4.38]: First of all I should like to join with other members in congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on your accession to the high office which you hold; and I wish to inform you of the respect we have for your position. I also wish you a successful term of office. Yesterday I asked a question regarding Section 7 of the Sales by Auction Act passed last year, relative to its proposed application to the sale of wool. I was glad to hear from the Minister for Lands that he proposed to give consideration to the suggestion to extend the operation of the Act to that particular article. There is ample need for some such restriction on the loss which is undoubtedly taking place at auction sales of wool. I do not suggest that the provisions of the Act are the best that could be obtained. There may be something better, but it has not yet been revealed, at least to me. I do think the Government should give early attention, either in Western Australia alone or, better still, in conjunction with the other States of the Commonwealth, to that legislation, or to some other legislation which will restrict the present practice. So far as I can gather, the auctioneers are quite willing that such legislation should be in force. We realise only too well that auction sales of wool at present are, at best, not very satisfactory. For long years the auction sales of wool have compelled acquiescence in a policy which I believe is known as meeting the market. When that market is not a fairly competitive one—as would appear to be the case when lot splitting takes place—the difficulties of

those who are the vendors, to wit, the wool-growers, in meeting this market become much greater, in that there is not fair competition and that the growers receive a lesser price for their product, so that ultimately they come even nearer disaster than they would do were they getting a fair competitive price based on the markets of the world. I trust that the Minister will not overlook the necessity to go into this question. I can assure him I approach it, not from any party point of view, but purely with a desire to see what measure can be taken to improve the position at auction sales, not only for the benefit of the growers themselves, but for that of the State generally. It will readily be realised that the better the returns from our products, the better will be the situation for us all. I would also like to thank the Minister for Works and the responsible officers under him for the activity that has been displayed since the discussion of a motion in 1936 with regard to water supplies in the Great Southern districts, having particular reference to the towns along that line. I am prepared, as I think the Minister wishes, to wait a still further reasonable time for a conclusion to be arrived at as to what should be done as a result of investigations, in the hope that some practical scheme may be evolved without undue financial difficulty and, if possible, without placing a burden on any section of the agriculturists concerned, even those who will be within the statutory limit of the pipe line that may be laid to meet the requirements of the situation. In this matter I trust the Minister will not lose sight of the possibility of obtaining some assistance from the Federal Government. I believe the Federal authorities have at least given consideration to assistance regarding somewhat similar schemes elsewhere, and I would suggest this is a scheme, or is likely to be a scheme, to which such assistance could very reasonably be given. I believe that in the present stage of the development of Western Australia and its current financial position, we shall have considerable difficulty in dealing with this problem unless we can receive some assistance from the Federal Government, and I trust that when plans and specifications are a little further advanced and the Minister has somewhat more definite information to work upon, he will not overlook that aspect of the matter. At this stage I

would like to mention that while there was a very definite problem regarding water supplies in 1936 in the district I represent, as I then explained to the House, and although it might be believed that in this year of grace there might be a considerable improvement in those conditions, I can assure the House, leaving out of the question altogether the quality of the water, which I once took the opportunity to exhibit in this Chamber, there is now less water to be found in the Katanning reservoir than there was on the 1st February last. There is not more than one month's supply at the present time, leaving out of consideration the Railway Department, which is not being supplied from that source, although it ought to be. In other centres the difficulty is much the same as it was. At Narrogin, where the position seemed to be more hopeful two years ago, the residents are now on the warpath for a satisfactory supply.

In the Lieut.-Governor's Speech there is a reference to the welcome rise in the basic wage. I am prepared to admit that that rise is welcome, if we believe in following out a policy of raising, so far as we can, the general level of contentment. But there are certain sections of the community that will receive no benefit from that increase in the basic wage. There are various sections, but I shall deal with only one of them and in that instance their case calls for sympathetic consideration in another way. An ordinary rise in the basic wage based on the cost of living conditions only, does not benefit the recipients because it merely compensates them for the rise in the cost of specified goods and services. It is certainly admitted that the recent rise was calculated on a different basis that represented some benefit in that that different basis was on a somewhat improved standard; but that rise is going to occasion an increase in costs elsewhere. For instance, building costs will undoubtedly have to rise. The cost of certain other services and of manufactured articles will, I take it, increase to some degree, for I have never yet heard of builders or manufacturers who did not—and I believe they were justified—pass on the increased cost involved in the rise of their expenditure to those to whom they had to render services. Those who will suffer are those who cannot pass on such increases. As I said, those of us who believe it is reasonable and proper to raise the general level of contentment,

believe that a rise in the standard of living, or the method of acquiring that means of living, is very satisfactory, but it is not so satisfactory when it is found that merely a fractional part of the community benefits from the move. We should make our effort as strongly as we may to extend it to as great a proportion of the people as we can. If the increased prices that I have referred to could be reflected in increased returns for our primary products such as wheat and wool, then undoubtedly there would be a considerably increased level of contentment among a large section of the community, and there would be almost general pleasure at the improvement. As it is, the net result, as I have endeavoured to explain, will probably be a decreased net return from those primary products which, unfortunately, already show signs of falling below payable values. I hope, therefore, that the Government of the State will show some enthusiasm when they send their representatives, as I understand they are about to do, to the conference in Sydney in connection with the question of a home price for wheat. I am prepared to admit that this State alone cannot deal satisfactorily with that matter, and I also recognise there may be some difficulty in arranging with all the States to have their resources pooled under an agreement for a home price for wheat, so that all producers of wheat throughout the Commonwealth will benefit equally. I recognise that difficulty because Western Australia would be in an unfortunate position were that not done, in view of the fact that a small percentage of its output only is consumed locally, which is not so noticeable, say, in New South Wales. The Premier in his observations yesterday said, I think, that the Federal Government had this matter in hand, but regarded the obvious way of dealing with it as politically inexpedient. I take it—though I do not think he actually mentioned the fact—that he referred to a sales tax on flour. I submit that the fact that the Federal Government does not seem inclined to take any action in this matter is no reason why the State Governments should not as far as possible work in harmony together with the idea of bringing matters to a head. We must recognise that the Federal Government's difficulties have increased with regard to any such proposal as this since the failure of the Federal marketing referendum. I do not know that

a sales tax on flour, while well within the powers of the Federal Government, is any more or any less objectionable than the other suggestion for a home consumption price for wheat. We have no evidence before us to show that variations in the price of wheat have to any extent caused a variation in the price of bread. If they have, as I endeavoured to point out earlier this afternoon, that increase, which in any event would be a very small one, must of necessity be passed on and occasion no loss to the recipients of the basic wage. Therefore I do not think the Government need fear that any great difficulty is going to be experienced by that section of the community that looks to the Arbitration Court for the fixation of its standard of living by the adoption of either method. It is very necessary, however, from the producer's point of view, that some definite means shall be taken to afford him a measure of assistance now; and, if practicable when prices are better, build up some kind of a reserve fund so that he may have something to fall back upon when prices fall again—which they are almost certain to do—after the suggested rise. The necessity may occur to consider whether we should not combine such action with an attempt to restrict increased production. We must recognise that, taking the world at large, Australia's production is not a very great proportion of the total. The position appears to be that on account of an absence of demand for the excess, the price of wheat fluctuates from time to time very considerably, and it does not seem to me to be right to encourage the producer in this country by increasing his returns from the product and at the same time allow him substantially to increase his production and therefore his problem. A home price for wheat should be provided without injury to any other section of the community, for the benefit of the producer, but the production of the commodity should not be increased above a reasonable amount based on past figures.

I should like now to give attention for a moment to the question of the control of natives. The Premier said last night that this House passed the existing Act governing the administration of native affairs. I remind the Premier that many amendments to the Act were made in this Chamber, but when they reached another place, they

were summarily rejected, and, unfortunately, at a conference of managers of the two Houses, those amendments were abandoned. I venture to suggest that the Act as it stands at present is hardly in accord with the wishes of the majority of this Chamber, although we were more or less obliged to take what we could when the matter came to a final settlement between the managers. One matter that was discussed at the time, and concerning which amendments were brought forward in this House, was the question of permits being required for the employment of natives, and I would point out that natives include half-castes. It was proposed that permits should be taken out for the employment of natives, both for wages and on contract work, and certain members of this House took strong exception to that provision being included. That provision and the manner in which it has been handled are making it increasingly difficult for half-castes—who are classed as natives—to obtain employment, and I fear that the net result of the Act and its administration will be that more and more of these people will depend on the Government for rations. I am of opinion that legislation should be introduced for the purpose of endeavouring to raise the standard of half-castes so that they may be put in the position, wherever possible, of earning their own living, and so lessening the practice that appears to be developing of more and more of these people applying for rations. Certain regulations have been made under the Act that I do not propose to discuss at the moment because I think the regulations I particularly have in mind will subsequently be the subject of discussion in this Chamber. I refer to the regulations regarding missions, a number of which regulations I trust will be disallowed.

Another matter on which I consider the State Government might make active representations to the Federal authorities concerns the release of the rabbit virus that has been so much discussed in the last few months. It appears that the experiments conducted have demonstrated that the virus is satisfactory from the point of view of non-transmissibility to livestock and human beings of the disease occasioned by it. It would seem, too, that the experiments have proved the usefulness, or shall I say

the liveliness of the virus in causing the death of rabbits, and that is a reason why its distribution should not be delayed. The rabbit pest is of such dimensions in Western Australia and has been for many years past, that even if the virus has proved only partially successful, no time should be lost in introducing it into this State. So long as there was any reason to fear that it might be injurious to livestock, there was sound reason for hesitation before distributing it. Now that that doubt has been dispelled, it seems to me that a determined effort should be made to have the virus distributed at least in this State, so that we may ascertain whether it will assist us in overcoming a problem that has been a source of considerable expense not only to farmers but to every branch of industry in the State.

I am glad to see that the Government proposes to take steps to provide additions to the Perth Public Hospital. In recent years I have felt that that institution was sadly overcrowded. The reports supplied to the public from time to time gave strong evidence of that fact, and it is not to be wondered that the Government has decided to take some action to remedy the position. From the public utterances of Ministers on this subject, however, it does not seem as though there is going to be any attempt to ask metropolitan local authorities to make any contribution towards the cost. If any such intention exists in the minds of the Government, I am prepared to be corrected. As, however, I have not up to date heard any such suggestion, I must join a number of my electors in inquiring whether there is not apparently one law for the city and another for the country. For many years country centres have been obliged to contribute to the cost of hospital buildings, and in many cases the ratepayers have had to be rated in order to pay interest and sinking fund on the obligations. I am referring to general hospitals. I admit that more recently the Lotteries Commission has given assistance to hospitals in a number of country centres, thus reducing the amount which those centres would otherwise have had to raise. That relief, however, has been afforded not only to local authorities, but also to the Department of Health. The argument has been advanced that the Perth Hospital serves the sick of the whole State, and that argument of course has something in it. The Perth Hospital

in the main does serve the sick of the metropolitan area; but country hospitals also serve patients not living in the districts in which those hospitals are situated. People travelling in the country and injured in motor accidents very often receive treatment at country hospitals. If the relative costs of the building and the costs of maintenance are taken into account, I firmly believe that the proportion of such patients would be as great in country hospitals as in the Perth Hospital. In my own town, the local government has contributed as much as £6,000 to the cost of the erection of the buildings which at present comprise the Katanning district hospital. Even admitting that possibly a greater number of outside patients use the metropolitan hospital, there is still ample justification for a contribution by the metropolitan local authorities to country hospitals. Alternatively, the Government might consider relieving the country local authorities of their obligations in this respect. The Minister for Health, whom at this stage I would like to congratulate upon his appointment, reminded the members of a deputation which waited upon him with a view of obtaining assistance for some improvements to a metropolitan hospital, that they must go slow, because there were many country hospitals needing considerable attention. I quite agree with him in that. I gather some comfort from his observation, as it is evident that, to a large extent, he is in agreement with what I have told the House. Very strong feeling is prevailing in certain country districts in regard to this matter, and it should be rectified.

Much evidence was given before the Light Lands Commission during its recent visit to the lower Great Southern districts as to the necessity for establishing experimental farms in those districts. Witnesses came forward and showed that there were great variations in the classes of land and that the rainfall was not the same in the various parts of the district. If that is so, then it is doubtful whether the establishment of only one such experimental farm would be of great value. An experimental farm on one particular class of land, with a certain rainfall, would prove totally unsatisfactory in respect to land of a different class 20, 30 or 40 miles away. Very considerable expense would be incurred in the establishment of one farm for experimental purposes,

and the results achieved might prove valueless so far as other land is concerned. It seems to me, therefore, that experimentation in that class of country must be tackled in another way. Some lands now considered to be almost incapable of being worked profitably may show good results if different methods are employed for their cultivation. I was present at two centres when evidence was given to the Commission and enough was said to convince me of the truth of that statement. It is hardly fair to ask a farmer to carry out investigations and make experiments himself, although some farmers in those districts are most anxious to assist the department to find out the best method of dealing with the light lands in their district. Those farmers are prepared to set aside the land required for experimental purposes, and to provide the necessary plant and labour, provided the Government supply seed, manures and other items that might be required for the experiment. Those farmers would be content, if the Government assisted them in this way, to work under the direction of the Government's agricultural advisers. In the districts I have mentioned there are large areas of so-called light land with a more assured rainfall. I use the words "more assured" advisedly. If suitable methods can be evolved to deal with such lands, then I venture to suggest it would be better to occupy them than to occupy other land not so favourably situated. Most of the first-class land in the districts to which I have referred has been taken up; and farmers whose properties are too small to share with their sons are quite willing to assist in this experimental work in the hope that they may be able to place their sons on the light class of land if satisfactory methods can be found to make that land profitable to work. I ask the Government, and particularly the Minister for Agriculture, to give serious consideration to some such proposal as I have just put forward. The cost to the department would not be considerable. A comparatively small sum of money, wisely expended, would produce results of much greater magnitude than the expense involved. In conclusion, I trust the Minister will take some action in regard to the matter.

MR. HUGHES (East Perth) [5.10]: I wish to move an amendment as follows:—

That the Address-in-reply be amended by adding the following words:—"but we regret

that the unfortunate social alliances between the Matron of the Heathcote Mental Home and the Chief Secretary, Hon. W. H. Kitson, M.L.C., and others have destroyed the discipline, efficiency, and harmonious working of the Lunacy Department, have allowed the employment therein of non-unionists, contrary to the policy of Your Excellency's advisers, and have made conditions of employment in the aforementioned Lunacy Department intolerable, and feel that in the interests of the Public Service of the State of Western Australia and the restoration of public confidence in the integrity thereof, the aforesaid Matron and the aforesaid Chief Secretary should be relieved of their respective positions."

I propose to speak to the amendment only.

MR. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member proceeds any further, I think he will surely appreciate that on an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, he would be distinctly out of order to attempt to cast any reflections upon a member of Parliament. The hon. member must realise that there is no substantive motion before the House. The motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply is purely a matter of ordinary procedure. To attempt, by moving an amendment, to reflect upon an hon. member, as he proposes to do, cannot be justified by any of the Standing Orders, and the hon. member will understand that the course he desires to take cannot be approved of. Therefore I hope the hon. member will not attempt to persevere in moving an amendment of that kind to the Address-in-reply.

MR. HUGHES: I am sorry to have to disagree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, at this early stage of your occupancy of the Chair. If you rule that the amendment is out of order, I shall have to move to disagree with your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no hesitation in ruling the amendment out of order.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.

MR. HUGHES: Then I regret at this early stage having to move—

That the House dissents from the Speaker's ruling.

I take it that you require notice of my dissent put in writing.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. The hon. member has moved to disagree with the Chairman's ruling—the hon. member means the Speaker's ruling—in declaring the amendment out of order.

Mr. Hughes: I regret that before I have had an opportunity to congratulate you upon your appointment as Speaker, which I now do, I should be forced into the position of moving to disagree with your ruling. I do so with a good deal of reluctance because I am sure that you are making history in procedure. When a motion is tendered in reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor or the Lieut.-Governor, it is within the competence of any member to move an amendment to it. That has been done in this House. I myself did it last session or the session before, and nobody took any objection to it. I venture to say there is no record of any member having been precluded from moving an amendment to the Address-in-reply. The Address-in-reply debate is one of the occasions when all matters of public business are open for discussion, and that is why members speaking on the Address-in-reply are allowed to deal with an unlimited number of topics. The House, by means of the Address-in-reply, gives its answer to His Excellency's Speech. There is no obligation on the House merely to adopt the stereotyped reply thanking His Excellency for the Speech. Anything that the House considers desirable may be tacked on to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. Your attempt to stifle discussion by stretching the Standing Orders, as you have done, Sir, and by ruling that a member may not move any amendment that reflects upon another hon. member, seems to me to be without foundation and without substance. In the discussion of public business, it is inevitable that the Ministers in control of the various departments must be criticised. As a matter of fact, the whole basis of what we term Responsible Government—and what, in effect, is often very irresponsible government—is that for every department under the Crown there is a particular Minister who is responsible, and that, of course, indicates the very meaning of the constitutional term "Responsible Government." Therefore it is impossible to indulge in criticism of public administration without criticising the Minister in charge of the particular department. In my opinion, it would be unfortunate if this matter were stifled by any means whatever. It has been stifled for about eight years and the breaking point is being reached.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must not encroach upon the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. Hughes: I think it deplorable that you should have given such a ruling without one tittle of a Standing Order to support you. There is no Standing Order that limits the discussion on the Address-in-reply. With all respect to you and your high office, Sir, I think you will have set a very bad precedent if you succeed by your ruling in curtailing the scope of discussion on the Address-in-reply. I think you will be depriving members of a long-established right enjoyed in all English-speaking Legislatures to utilise the one occasion when any matter of public business is open for discussion. I submit, with great regret, that your ruling is contrary to the Standing Orders and contrary to our procedure.

Mr. North: I second the motion.

Mr. Speaker: The member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) has moved to dissent from my ruling. I point out to him that I have never stated that an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply could not be moved. Neither have I indicated that there is any limit to the discussion upon such a motion. The Standing Orders are definite on the point at issue. It is not for me to tell the hon. member what he may do, but it is for me to direct him as to what he may not do. I say that he may not under the Standing Orders move an amendment that casts a reflection upon a member of Parliament. The reason why I ruled against the hon. member is not that he wished to move an amendment to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. That would be perfectly in order. I have ruled his amendment out of order because by that amendment he reflects upon a member of Parliament. The hon. member knows, and all members know, that they may not, unless by a substantive motion, reflect upon any member of Parliament. The hon. member's amendment is not a substantive motion; it is part of the ordinary procedure connected with the Address-in-reply debate. To the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, amendments are permissible, but the Standing Orders make it very clear that under an amendment to such a motion a member is not permitted to reflect upon another member of Parliament. That

is my ruling. It is not that an amendment may not be made to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, but that by such amendment the hon. member must not reflect upon any member of Parliament. I submit that the ruling is definitely sound.

Motion (dissent) put and negatived.

Mr. Hughes: I call for a division.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot permit a division to take place, as there were no voices for the "ayes." Does the member for East Perth propose to proceed? If not, I will put the question that the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply be agreed to.

Debate Resumed.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [5.23]: I move—
That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand there is no limit to the matters that may be discussed on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. With others, I regret that the Minister for Agriculture has, because of the knowledge overseas of the prevalence of fruit fly in this State, been obliged to leave these shores in order, if possible, to protect our shipments of fruit abroad. I have on different occasions expressed my regret that the advice of the Fruit Fly Advisory Board has not received that consideration from the Government to which it is entitled. The board was established following a meeting held to consider the ravages of the pest, and the difficulties which threatened the fruit-growing industry. Those difficulties have existed for over a quarter of a century. Unfortunately the department has not given such effective consideration to the control of the fly as would bring about the desired result. This country is very similar to California in respect to its fruit-growing qualities, and like California, is subject to a large number of fruit diseases. We must, if we are to enjoy any portion of the markets of the world, take effective steps to ensure that the fruit fly menace is brought under control. Apart from this, the great need for a citriculturist has been expressed by growers from time to time. In Western Australia there is, so far as certain parts are concerned, no better country for the production of citrus fruits. I suppose there are in Western Australia no fewer than 800 citrus fruit producers, but I regret to say the department possesses no citriculturist.

We are also in difficulties with respect to a fruit pathologist. Already we have lost a good man, who was carrying out important work in the department. I wonder how his place is going to be filled. He is a most capable officer and will be difficult to replace. The great importance of expert advice in these matters cannot be overstated. Mr. Pittman, the officer in question, is a man of outstanding qualifications which have been recognised and acknowledged by authorities in the Eastern States. Unfortunately for us, it has been possible to tempt him away. There is more money in the Eastern States, and it has been possible to offer Mr. Pittman a higher salary. I believe his salary in his new position will be nearly double what he was receiving here. Naturally, he accepted such an offer.

From the fruit growing standpoint there are many matters which call for consideration. I have been asked whether the department could recommend the adoption of a policy of sterilisation of fruit cases. This is an excellent project, and one that is of importance in respect to the control of certain pests. Unfortunately, so far as I have been able to learn, such a project has not been adopted. The principle has been accepted whereby a fruit case shall be used only once, and may then be used possibly for the carriage of vegetables or other purpose, but never again for the conveyance of fruit unless the fruit is being forwarded to a factory. We cannot over-emphasise the importance of exercising the utmost vigilance to prevent the spread of disease in fruit-growing areas. I pay a cordial tribute to the department for the manner in which it has dealt with the occasional outbreaks of codlin moth. There is no doubt that both producers and the officers of the department deserve praise for the thoroughness with which this problem has been handled. Reverting to the importance of giving consideration to the question of the sterilisation of fruit cases, I may say that Mr. G. A. Helson and Mr. W. J. Tanner recently put up a very interesting statement. They said that if the sterilisation of fruit cases was to be of any practical value, it was essential that the pest be killed, that the method employed be economical, and that it must not damage the cases or warp the wood, and further that the mechanical process must be completely automatic to ensure each case receiving the same treat-

ment. Again, the process must be capable of treating a sufficient number of cases as to render it a workable proposition.

You, Mr. Speaker, as a private member, displayed considerable interest in the question of marketing, and I could not but admire your persistence in the efforts you made to help the men on the land. I recall what you did with regard to egg marketing; I recall also the efforts of the Minister who now occupies the position of Minister for Lands when, in 1925, he brought down a Bill to ensure, by means of stabilisation, an improvement in the price of certain fruit products. The Minister was very thorough in what he did at that time. I remember that the Bill came down, and in my warm idealism I looked forward to the time when the fruit-grower and the small producer would no longer be dependent on others for the price he would obtain for his products, but that he himself would have some say in the price he would receive. Although the years have gone by without anything having been done, my heart has lost none of its fervour in the desire to see an improvement in the conditions brought about. Unfortunately, the growers are in the same position to-day as they were in when the present Minister for Lands brought down that Bill. They were serfs then, they are serfs to-day, and the Minister has not since that time, as far as I have been able to ascertain, expressed one word of encouragement whereby there might be brought about a change in the outlook. In spite of it all, I have not lost any of my enthusiasm, nor the ideals of youth which prompted me to believe in the sincerity of the Minister for Lands when he brought forward the Bill in 1925. It is important that those who are engaged in primary production should receive that consideration that will enable them to have some voice in the fixing of minimum prices at which their products can be sold. When that time arrives, there will come with it a new era in the State, and there will be a greater opportunity for the man on the land, and a steadying up of what must be regarded as unfortunate—the influx of primary producers to the cities and the larger towns of the State. Until there is a possibility of improving the status of the growers, the position that now prevails will continue. Time after time I have been told that there are many growers who are not

concerned about the price at which their products are sold. I do not believe that. It is right that every person should have a say in the sale of the produce for which he has been responsible, just as it is right for any other person to state a figure at which he shall sell his labour. We have not heard from the Minister for Lands, but please God some day there may be a recurrence of that warm enthusiasm that prompted him to bring down the Bill to which I have referred. You, Mr. Speaker, were one of those who advocated the appointment of a committee of direction modelled on the lines of that which was new in Queensland then, and which is now so well established there.

The Minister for Mines: What happened to the Bill?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Bill passed this House. It was brought down by the Minister, who was then a member of the Government; but what I regret is that in all the years that have passed since 1925 there has been no attempt to bring about any form of control, nor has an opportunity been given to members of the House to consider it. The Minister was good enough to acknowledge that I stuck to him right through, and I assure him that should he bring forward a similar measure, he will have my support. I want to see the man on the land secure sufficient return to enable him and his wife and children to enjoy a reasonable standard of living.

The Minister for Mines: What happened to the Bill?

Mr. SAMPSON: It was defeated in another place. That is not a subject for mirth, but for deep regret. I say again, if the Minister will introduce another Bill he will learn that the whirly-gig of time has brought about a great change. I challenge the Minister to sponsor another Bill now. I do not think for a moment that it would meet with a reverse. I believe it would have a short and successful course through both this House and another place and be on the statute-book by the end of the session.

The Minister for Mines: You are only guessing now.

Mr. SAMPSON: I challenge any member to question the reasonableness of the view I am expressing.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The Minister has become conservative since then.

Mr. SAMPSON: Surely not! The Minister has either changed or he is easily discouraged.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He slipped on that occasion.

Mr. SAMPSON: And still this silence is maintained! It would be some satisfaction to me to know that the Minister has regretted the non-acceptance of opportunities that have occurred since 1925. From 1925 to 1938 is 13 years, nearly a third of a man's working life, the best period of a man's existence. The position has altered, but I do hope the Minister will agree with me that the time is opportune. I promise him that success will follow. What a wonderful change there has been! Why, in the House of Commons the Conservatives of all Conservatives have brought in a measure to make the marketing of farm produce possible, to determine prices. What is done in other countries? In Canada they are always striving to do this, and a good deal of success has been achieved there. In the United States fruit and market gardening are such wonderful enterprises that the products from them are treated with the utmost consideration. But not so in Western Australia, the most backward of all countries regarded as civilised. New Zealand has a measure which provides for the proper export of fruit. If we go to South Australia—the Minister for Employment will endorse this—we find that the fruit-growers and market-gardeners have some say.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: The Minister comes from South Australia. He does not go there.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not blame the hon. gentleman for coming from there. Let us hope that the same principles of progressiveness that animate the growers of South Australia will be transmitted by him to this State, and that we shall take advantage of them. But whatever we do, there will always be in my mind a measure of regret owing to the lack of action by the Minister for Lands. The poultry-farmers of this State face a continual problem. They have no fixed prices. They have not the advantage of a board such as exists in New South Wales, and in certain other States; nor have we made any real progress in that matter. You, Mr. Speaker, brought down a Bill; but unfortunately, as members are aware, it is not competent for a private

member to bring down a measure such as would ensure the desired effect. I regret that not one occupant of the Ministerial Bench was found willing to make possible the passing of legislation on this matter. Your Bill, Sir, was everything that a private member could bring forward. I give you all credit for that, Mr. Speaker. But the Bill involved certain levies; and, as hon. members know, the powers of a private member do not extend to that point. Viewing for a moment the difficulties which poultry-farmers have to face in dragging a living out of their holdings, I may refer to the variations which exist in prices of offal of wheat between this State and South Australia. What are Ministers doing in regard to that matter? Are any steps being taken whereby bran and pollard and other requirements of the poultry-farmer may be purchased here at the same prices as in South Australia? In the "Western Mail" of the 4th August are given prices of bran and pollard. The local price of bran is £7 per ton, less 5s. per ton discount for truck loads. That of pollard is given as £7 5s., less the same discount. In Adelaide, as disclosed by the "Adelaide Chronicle" of the 4th August, the price of bran is £5 17s. 6d. per ton at the mill-door, Port Adelaide, compared with £7 less 5s. per ton discount here. Again, pollard is £6 5s. per ton at the mill-door, Port Adelaide, as compared with £7 5s. less 5s. here. Both the South Australian prices are less 2s. 6d. per ton for cash with order. There is a plain story. Why should the offal of wheat cost the poultry people and the dairy people of this State more than the cost in South Australia? It is time we looked into the matter and endeavoured to give our primary producers the same consideration as is extended in South Australia. There is no doubt about these figures. The position has remained like that for some time. Why? The cost of production is not greater here than in South Australia, and yet this position continues. I was indeed pleased on Tuesday last to be one of those who took part in the opening of the Road Board Conference by the Minister for Works. I can quite appreciate the glow of satisfaction and appreciation which the Minister felt because of the presence of that most representative body of men—men who are engaged in honorary work, men who are caring for roads and similar matters throughout the State. I envy the Minister

because I should say that of all the departmental officers in Western Australia none give greater satisfaction than the officers of the Public Works Department, those associated with local government. The conference was attended by representatives from as far north as Port Hedland and Broome, and from the uttermost parts of the south. However, I will leave that subject for a while and also matters relating to road boards and egg production, but merely temporarily, because I am quite sure that if this country is to progress, those on the land must receive greater consideration. I believe Ministers are keenly interested and sympathetic, but we must do more than that. Sympathy is not enough. We must give consideration to effective improvements in marketing. If that can be done, then I hope members will believe me when I say that Western Australia will have a brighter and better future.

The Minister for Lands: Your enthusiasm is most inspiring.

Mr. SAMPSON: If my enthusiasm can inspire the Minister after this long hiatus, then indeed am I deserving of some praise.

Mr. Patrick: He has been asleep for 13 years.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have great regard for the Minister for Lands, and I have asked myself a thousand times why he has failed in the task of providing the small producers with a more adequate return for their work. There was a time when the Minister brought that subject forward and spoke very eloquently and convincingly. His utterances carried everyone on that side of the House.

Mr. Patrick: When was that?

Mr. SAMPSON: Back in 1925, or 13 years ago. "The early dew of morn had passed away at noon." Is it noon? I hope not. I want the Minister to resuscitate his endeavours and introduce another Bill. If he does so, I shall be very grateful indeed, and it will be some satisfaction to me to know that, during the period I have been in this Chamber, I have done a little towards helping those who have honoured me by permitting me to represent them. Another matter on which the future very greatly depends as regards the outer suburban districts is involved in the extension of electric current to centres in the hills. I thank the Minister for Railways for his courtesy—I may say, his more than courtesy and refer to his practical interest—in visiting the Swan electorate and

inspecting many centres there, during the course of which he ascertained just what the district offered.

The Minister for Mines: In America they are getting two eggs a day by electric light. That is a good scheme.

Mr. SAMPSON: That may be so, but I am afraid the Minister has been reading "Puck."

The Minister for Mines: Not "Pop-eye."

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister should read "The Pacific Rural Press" and learn to know something about the small farmer and his requirements. I hope he will pardon my mentioning that. However, the Minister for Railways visited the Swan electorate and while I have the honour of being the member for Swan for the time being, I do not know that I ever felt more proud than when I had the great privilege of taking the Minister, in company with the chairmen of a number of road boards in the district, on a tour of the electorate. I know the Minister returned from that visit convinced that the outer-suburban areas justified consideration, that they are wonderfully fertile, and that the population there has been rapidly increasing. All that is perfectly true. In passing, I may refer briefly to a recent Bill that reached this House. That unfortunate measure seemed to have for its one object the deletion of the Swan electorate from the electoral districts of the State.

The Minister for Mines: You had a narrow escape.

Mr. SAMPSON: It was shown in the report of the Electoral Commissioners that there were two districts mostly affected, Greenough and Swan. I mention the Swan electorate second because of my modesty. However, it was shown in the report that the population of those two electorates had increased to such an extent, particularly the Swan district, that it was recommended by the Commissioners that the Swan electorate should no longer exist. The idea was to slice the electorate in twain and to give a big portion to Murray-Wellington and the remainder to Toodyay. I know I must not reflect upon the Commissioners, but the reason put forward was that because of the larger population in the Swan district, it might be considered wise to delete "Swan" as the name for the augmented Toodyay district, thereby deleting the name "Swan" from the list altogether. Those concerned

know that there is in the Toodyay district a large area of light land that, I understand, is quite unsuitable for cultivation, and because it was proposed to include that large area in the Toodyay electorate, it was decided that the name "Toodyay" should be retained and "Swan" thrown to the wolves of the Government Party.

The Minister for Mines: I think the representation had something to do with it.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope it did not but, of course, there is always that possibility.

The Premier: It was the threatened erosion of the Swan.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is another way of expressing it. It contemplated the swan song of the member for Swan, and I hated to contemplate any such thing. I realised that if the Swan electorate were to be eliminated, there was only one thing for me to do, in view of my liking for the waters of our noble river, and that was to stand for the Canning seat.

Mr. Cross: Then you woke up!

Mr. SAMPSON: As the Bill did not pass, the friendly feeling that exists between the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) and myself has continued without any interruption.

The Minister for Employment: Did the Royal Commission make any suggestion as to what should be done with the member for Swan in the event of the electorate being wiped out?

Mr. SAMPSON: No, but I have some idea what could be done to some members of this House, and if the Minister has no objection, I will supply him with that information privately. Reverting to the question of the supply of electric current—

The Minister for Mines: Yes, you got away from that subject.

Mr. SAMPSON: I was mentioning briefly the pride I felt when I was able to give the Minister for Railways an opportunity to view the fertile areas of the Swan district. It is truly a wonderful portion of the State, and the amazing way in which the population has increased is very gratifying indeed.

The Minister for Employment: They have a good member!

Mr. SAMPSON: That member is not sufficiently immodest to claim any virtue in respect to the increase in population, and I am surprised at the Minister turning my thoughts into such a channel.

I say in all seriousness that if the electricity extensions sought were made, the population of the Swan electorate would greatly increase. Already the district has far more than its electoral quota, notwithstanding the fact that at the time of the previous redistribution of seats five or six townships were cut off from the Swan electorate. But if the electrical power required for the pumping of water can be provided, there will be a further increase in population and the Minister for Railways will be more than merely a seller of electric current; he will be a collector of railway freights and fares, because all those people depend more or less upon the railway system. I trust that my hopes and the hopes of hundreds of people in the Swan district will be realised. I thank the Minister for the interest he has shown in this matter and I believe that, if it is possible to obtain funds, extensions will be made. I am emboldened to think along those lines because the Premier, previous to his appointment to his present high office, was himself Minister for Railways and he knows the importance of electric current. On account of his interest in the subject I believe that, if he is given an opportunity to provide the necessary funds, those extensions will be made. Members will be surprised to hear that the actual amount of money required is not large. A sum of £25,000 will pay for the whole of the extensions.

Mr. Cross: We want them at Riverton. That is nearer the city.

Mr. SAMPSON: I think there would be sufficient left over to give the member for Canning some of the extensions he requires, but I hope that on this occasion the Swan will be given consideration before the Canning district.

Mr. Cross: I will get in before you if I can.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member's difficulties are as great as my own. His electors have more to put up with than have mine.

Mr. Cross: They have not you to put up with.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am not going to say anything that will discourage the extension of electric current to the Canning area because I know the producers of the Canning have many problems to meet.

The Minister for Employment: I think you would be much more effective on the broad national problem.

Mr. SAMPSON: In addition to the extension of electric current, there is need for an extension of water supplies in my electorate. I desire to take this opportunity to thank the Premier for having approved of an extension to Parkerville. As far back as 1924 the Hon. J. Cunningham promised that extension, but it has remained for the Premier to give effect to the promise and we thank the Premier for the water supply that has been provided. A good water supply is important. It is strange that the people of the hills, although very close to the source of the water supply, have to pay more for water than if they lived in Perth. I have some matter here that I would like to read to the House. Members will probably be surprised to learn of the very high price that has to be paid for water in the hills districts. Recently a meeting of residents was held at Mundaring at which the matters of the charge for water and of bus transport were discussed. Following the discussion a motion was carried that the rate for water in the district should be reduced to the level of the metropolitan rate and that meter rents should be abolished. Perhaps my statement about the charge for water in the hills being higher than the charge in Perth may seem extraordinary, but it is a fact that for water delivered within rifle shot of the Mundaring Reservoir, the charge is greater than in the city.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It has to be taken up the hill.

Mr. SAMPSON: This higher charge is a great discouragement to the people of the district, and the only explanation I can suggest is that the Premier is unaware that the disability exists.

Mr. Cross: Have you no complaints about the railway service? Have you got a five-minute service now?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have no complaints to make. I am drawing attention to certain matters which, if altered, would greatly improve conditions. God forbid that I should bring to this House a mass of complaints! People do not want to hear complaints. Another small matter to which I might refer is the beekeeping or honey-producing industry. One of the most gratifying features of this industry is its rapid increase during the past few years. A number of enthusiasts banded together and established Honey Week, with the result that the sale of honey has increased almost

beyond belief. A fact that must not be forgotten is that the regular eating of honey makes a person neither unduly fat nor unduly thin. Honey should therefore always be on one's table.

Mr. Marshall: Suppose a person had honey on the floor?

Mr. SAMPSON: The regular eating of honey makes for equalisation, as it were. It is a nutriment that has the effect of reducing the weight of the very fat and increasing the weight of the very thin.

The Premier: It builds up.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. It does not build up mere adipose tissue; it helps in every way. A person who eats honey regularly is enabled to throw off the years; he is younger in his ways, more vigorous physically, and has younger ideas.

The Premier: Have you been eating honey, then?

Mr. SAMPSON: I desire to pay a tribute to the Government Apiculturist, Mr. Willoughby Lance. I know of no man who works harder than does Mr. Lance. He displays more enthusiasm in his work than any other man I know. Some time ago he started his long service leave. What did he do? He took his car, or utility truck, and travelled over the State. He went to Norseman, Eucla and through to Port Augusta. On his way, he visited every beekeeper he knew of. He made sure that the Bees Act was being complied with, and did everything possible to help the industry. I was so fortunate as to meet him in Coolgardie on his return from the Eastern States. He told me of his experiences in those States, and what he had been able to learn about the industry there. The beekeepers of Western Australia have Mr. Willoughby Lance to thank for much of the excellent progress of this industry. Honey produced in Western Australia can no longer be adversely criticised; it will compare with the best honey in the world.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. SAMPSON: There is a regular market for our honey, not only in New York, but in London; better than all, there is a market for it here. Honey of an inferior quality from South Australia and the other Eastern States is no longer being unloaded in this State.

Mr. Marshall: Why is it that there is such a big difference between the imported and the local product?

Mr. SAMPSON: Because in Western Australia we have the karri and the marri. Karri, in particular, produces nectar that goes to make the very best honey. No wonder the Premier is looking so well. He can feel satisfaction at being the head of a State which, in so many ways, takes the lead. I repeat that our honey is equal to any honey in the world. It is, in the opinion of a friend of mine who claims to be an expert in the industry, better than the honey produced in Italy or Austria, both of which countries spare no effort in encouraging and assisting those engaged in the industry. The success of the industry here, as I said, is largely due to Mr. Willoughby Lance. I much appreciate a man who loves his job, and Mr. Willoughby Lance makes a hobby of his work. He himself keeps bees. When not at home, he associates only with people concerned with bees. His work at Rottneest, for instance, is outstanding. It is a monument to what one man can achieve. Some time ago vandals destroyed a number of queen bees which Mr. Willoughby Lance himself had raised. Queen bees are raised by expert beekeepers. Mr. Lance was broken-hearted over that vandalism.

Mr. Marshall: He is a lover of royalty.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Carniolian queen bee is the bee upon which the beekeepers of Western Australia place their greatest dependence, and that is the class of queen bee that is raised at Rottneest.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. SAMPSON: No speech on the Address-in-reply would be complete if reference were not made to employment and the importance of the Government's providing work for those in need of it. I look forward to the time when payment will no longer take the form of rations and sustenance. Unfortunately, there are so many labourers in excess of needs that one can appreciate the difficulties with which the Government is faced, but it is a bad policy that requires men to sacrifice some of their self-reliance before they are permitted to have Government work. I am hopeful that before long men who are given labouring work, such as that on road or railway construction, will be able to get it without the necessity of its being brought under the heading of relief work. In order to achieve advance in that direction consideration must be

given to the recommendations contained in the report of the Royal Commissioner, Mr. A. A. Wolff, now Mr. Justice Wolff. His report is a colossal work that reflects great credit upon him. I hope that some good will result from the efforts that are being made to grapple with this problem.

I congratulate the Commissioner of Railways, who certainly has achieved vastly improved results. To show a loss of £19,951 last year in comparison with a loss of £166,610 in the previous year represented a tremendous improvement. The Minister in charge of the Government electricity supply must be gratified at this department's showing a profit of £31,810. There should be no misgivings about the justification for extending the electrical mains. Every extension made will assist the Government and that, of course, is synonymous with assisting the State.

When I referred to the Government Apiculturist, Mr. Willoughby Lance, I omitted to mention a fear prevailing amongst people engaged in the bee-keeping industry that this expert may shortly be called upon to retire. So far no definite announcement has been made, but sometimes the policy of retirement is enforced. As president of the Beekeepers' Section of the Primary Producers' Association, I appeal to the Government not to insist upon the retirement of a man who has shown such enthusiasm and has rendered such assistance to the beekeepers. He has done a vast amount of good work, and I am convinced that the retention of his services would be fully justified. That he should be continued in office is important if the progress of the industry is to be maintained.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [7.35]: In adding my congratulations to those already expressed to you, Sir, by various members, may I say that I regard the large attendance in the public galleries to-night as a compliment to you and evidence of an interest in the doings of this House that I have not noticed before. Thus, Mr. Speaker, you are honoured in many ways. From the Premier we have had an expression of optimism that was not, in the words of an ex-Premier, one of restrained optimism; it was one of complete optimism in the future of the State and its financial position. I wish that all sections of the community could be included in that state of well-being and in that alleged pros-

perity, but I regret to say that the people comprising the producing section are in little or no better condition than they were several years ago.

Mr. Marshall: The condition of the agriculturists is common the world over.

Mr. BOYLE: It is not world-wide. The condition of the agriculturists in Britain is one of comparative prosperity. I can give the reason for that.

Mr. Doney: That applies to other European countries.

Mr. BOYLE: Yes, and in the United States of America and Canada the conditions are infinitely better because those countries have Governments that do protect the agriculturists.

Mr. Cross: Alberta, for instance.

Mr. BOYLE: The hon. member had better address that remark to the member for Claremont (Mr. North), as I am not acquainted with the conditions there. The low prices that have prevailed over the last eight years have been responsible for the unsatisfactory condition of our agriculturists. Even in the one good year we had—the year before last—when the price of wheat for two days was 5s. 4d. per bushel, though the farmers had a considerable amount of capital at their disposal, it really benefited their creditors. The money earned in that year was largely absorbed by the renewal of obsolete machinery. Thus the effect of one satisfactory year achieved no greater good than that of paying creditors a little more and of renewing the working tools of trade. Little or no relief from secured debts has been obtained. That, I think will be admitted. The trustees of the Rural Relief Fund have done very good work in the matter of unsecured debts. They have been approachable, and have been willing at all times to make the best use of the money placed at their disposal. When it is considered that the unsecured debts of the farmers are only 10 per cent. of the whole, it can readily be understood that relief is given only on the 10 per cent., still leaving the farmers, with few exceptions, to carry the burden of the 90 per cent. of secured debts. Stabilisation of the price of wheat is essential. The member for Murchison (Mr. Marshall) interjected that the condition of the agriculturist was common all over the world. I join issue with him. I mentioned the English farmer.

Mr. Marshall: We can account for that by the £3,000,000 of Government money that was distributed in 12 months.

Mr. BOYLE: Great Britain is the only real market we have for our wheat.

Mr. Marshall: The Imperial Government assisted the farmers there to the extent of £3,000,000 in 12 months.

Mr. BOYLE: The price of wheat on the English market is 45s. a quarter, or 5s. 7½d. a bushel. Before one bushel of foreign wheat, which includes Australian, Canadian and Argentine wheat, can be sold on the English market, the whole of the English crop is taken and paid for at the price of 5s. 7½d. a bushel. Great Britain has an immense industrial population; the agricultural population numbers 1¼ millions. She produces over 50,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. It became necessary, even with the price at 45s. a quarter, for the Imperial Government to place a limit on wheat production in England. Of the wheat produced in this country, 75 per cent. is exported. We are a dumping agricultural community. In 1929-30 Australia dumped wheat into China, and under-sold the rice grown by the Chinese coolie. We received in China for Australian wheat—one of the best wheats in the world—the equivalent of £4 10s. per ton, while the Chinese coolie's rice was produced and sold at £6 10s. per ton. That is one of the basic reasons for the economic difficulties confronting us to-day.

As a wheat-growing community, we are compelled to accept what is known as London parity for our wheat. London parity is the cheapest price at which the English market can be supplied. We sold our wheat in that particular year for 1s. 8¼d. per bushel. A referendum was taken on the 6th March, 1936. Its purpose was to give the Federal Government the right to introduce and pass through the Commonwealth Parliament what are known as marketing Acts. Members will recollect the James case, in which private buying interests fought the Commonwealth Government and secured a decision that rendered null and void any attempt on the part of that Government to legislate for marketing. The desire of the Federal Government was, by means of the referendum, to obtain from the people of Australia authority to amend the Constitution. An extraordinary attitude was adopted by the Government of this State on

that occasion. Without any apparent reason, it urged the people of Western Australia to vote "No." The Trades Hall officials were not so blind—I would not accuse the Government of blindness. At all events they had some political acumen, for they issued a manifesto, descended upon the Esplanade, and advised the people to vote "Yes." That was a most extraordinary example of giving a lead to the people. The result of the referendum was defeat for the agrarian element in Australia, which in the matter of marketing-control is now back to where it started. The Premier, when reference was made to him for joint legislation to govern the home price of wheat, said the matter was one entirely for the Federal Government. As the State Government had assisted in depriving the Federal Government of any power to act, it seemed extraordinary that it should then shelter behind lack of action on the part of the Federal Government. I must say for the Premier, who is eminently straightforward in these matters, that when speaking on the Address-in-reply, he stated that his Government would do everything possible to afford relief to farmers of Western Australia. That is like being sorry after the deed has been done. The agriculturists of this State would have been better pleased to have the weight of the State Government behind them when asking the people of the Commonwealth to grant producers the right to set up their own marketing boards.

The Minister for Lands: Had not you the Federal Country Party with you?

Mr. BOYLE: The Federal Country Party, to a man, asked for the passage of the amending legislation. It is difficult to understand the objections that have been raised. I do not say they have been raised particularly from the other side of the House, but objections have been raised to marketing Acts. Already there are States in the Commonwealth with marketing Acts functioning. In Queensland—I anticipate the interjection—there is a Labour Government, a good Government from the point of view of the primary producer.

Mr. Sleeman: All Labour Governments are.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not say that.

Mr. Cross: You said so at one time or another.

Mr. BOYLE: If I did, which I doubt, possibly I had some reason. If the other side of the House will do what I want now, I

will acknowledge it. However, there seems to be a lack of enthusiasm, and my own enthusiasm has waned accordingly. In Queensland there are 17 branches of the primary industries that are working under a marketing Act, one of the best Acts of its kind in the world. That legislation has been made the model for the Victorian Marketing Act. Victoria has a Country Party Government. I do not think I have ever heard that Government criticised by members on the other side of this House. It has been kept in power by a very sensible Labour Party. In that State we have an example of the best government in the Commonwealth—government by the Country Party.

The Minister for Mines: Have we not a similar example here?

Mr. BOYLE: The New South Wales Government also is making a decisive effort to secure the passage of marketing legislation.

The Minister for Lands: Do you believe in the Queensland Marketing Act?

Mr. BOYLE: I do.

The Minister for Lands: Do you know that that measure was introduced here and that your party defeated it?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know very well we did not. You never interject but you put your foot in your mouth!

Mr. BOYLE: If ever a political historian is wanted for this State, I would ask the present Minister for Lands to take the job. The member for Canning (Mr. Cross) is nothing compared with the Minister. On one occasion the member for Canning went back 500 years in dealing with the housing problem and housing laws. We all remember the magnificent speech he delivered on that subject. I bow to the knowledge of the Minister for Lands concerning things that happened in the past, but I wish he would bring himself up to date.

Mr. Patrick: He has been asleep ever since.

Mr. BOYLE: New Zealand furnishes another example of a Marketing Act in force. Certainly New Zealand differs from Australia in this regard, that her main export product is butter. In passing I may mention that I keep in fairly constant touch with Mr. Savage, and I wish to make acknowledgment of the courtesy I have at all times received from the Prime Minister of New Zea-

land. The Dominion's marketing legislation is sound, with this major objection which I would offer to such a Marketing Act as exists in New Zealand—that the producer is entirely ignored once he has produced. When he has produced butter, it is acquired by the New Zealand Government Export Board. The price given is 12¾d. per lb. The Act entirely excludes the producer from any further participation in the disposal of his product. That is fundamentally wrong. In Queensland, and especially in Victoria, the producers themselves are offered the right to ballot, though no one is forced to vote; and a 60 to 40 majority is necessary to carry a proposal. The Act also provides for a consumers' board. We on this side would not object to that. To those of our friends who are a trifle diffident about giving the farmer the right to place a price on his product we would point out that the labourer who has his work to sell goes to an Arbitration Court, and that the Arbitration Court, to the best of its ability, weighs up the value of his services as compared with his cost of living and endeavours to give him a proper standard of living. But the producer of foodstuffs, the primary producer, enjoys no such right. In fact, he has no right to a standard of living. I am engaged at present in trying to secure workers' homes for Merredin. Workers' homes are veritable palaces compared with the houses in which farmers have to live. I know of applicants for workers' homes objecting to a house costing £500 and wanting one that will cost £700. Undoubtedly the applicant is entitled to the best he can get; but the majority of our farmers are living in houses whose condition is absolutely appalling, and no effort is made to provide reasonable accommodation for them.

A great deal has been said about the fixation of prices for primary industries. Let us contrast their position with that of secondary industries. Take the case of Australian manufacturers. Under one of the highest protective tariffs in the world, on which is super-imposed a rate of exchange of 25 per cent. which represents additional protection, those manufacturers, according to the Commonwealth Year Book for 1937, succeeded as follows: Manufacturing industries produced goods to the value of £415,000,000. The value of materials used was £239,000,000, leaving a surplus for

labour and profit of £176,000,000, or about 56 per cent. on cost of the manufactured article. The position we have to face to-day is that in this Commonwealth scheme there is no protection whatever for the primary producer. He is compelled to sell his goods mostly abroad, on a dumping market, whereas the manufacturing centres can allot to themselves out of a sale of £415,000,000 worth of manufactured goods a gross profit of £176,000,000, part of which goes in its turn to the worker, and also to the manufacturer, who perhaps is not so well entitled to it. However, the fact remains that for services abroad, for payment of interest on the war debt and on moneys loaned to Western Australia, it is only the primary producer that can be called upon. Every penny of overseas services for interest; and for goods bought in foreign countries, comes from the two staple industries of Australia—wheat and wool. There are, of course, other important industries.

The Premier: There is £18,000,000 worth of gold, you know.

Mr. BOYLE: I would call goldmining a primary industry.

The Premier: You were talking of two industries.

Mr. BOYLE: I am glad of the suggestion. Goldmining, so far as we are concerned, is an important industry. I fully agree that any industry employing 17,000 men on good wages is a valuable consuming industry for the agriculture of the State. But there again, why should the producer of gold be protected by the Arbitration Court as regards his wages? Or why should he not be? He has a perfect right to be protected. There will be no trouble about wages for agricultural workers if the farmer gets a fair deal. Now, talking about mining and agriculture—

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: While mining and agriculture are being compared, let me give a good illustration of the difference between conditions on the goldfields and those in the agricultural areas. At a meeting which I attended, one man suggested that the wheat belt was a state or place of punishment where farmers' sons were kept until such time as they were able to go to the goldfields. While on the job regarding the importance of the wheat industry, let me point out that the Railways report before us gives the tonnage of wheat carried for last year as

738,000 tons against 438,000 tons the year before, with an increase of £189,000 in railway freights during the period. And yet the people who produced this tonnage are not allowed a standard of living at all comparable with what they are called upon to do.

Mr. Cross: You cannot blame the Government for the low prices.

The Premier: Some of the farmers were a bit too greedy. They should have sold when they could get a good price.

Mr. BOYLE: The question of education for country children is one that will have to be dealt with comprehensively in the near future. The lack of educational facilities for children in country areas is one of the main factors causing people to leave the land to-day. I know what I speak of, because when engaged in another sphere I made it my rule always to stay with farmers—not in first-class hotels, or even second-class hotels.

Mr. Raphael: Were you boarding with the farmers?

Mr. BOYLE: I made it a rule to get the opinions of farmers—from Yuna and Ajana in the north to Esperance in the south. That was an education of which I am proud to-day. It was one of the finest graduations that any man could pass through, for I saw life in the raw in those particular areas. One of the main things that the wheat farmer and his wife are worried about is the lack of the most elementary educational facilities for their children. We find that even in a settled district like Avon, which is practically the hub of the wheat-belt with no marginal areas to speak of, the circumstances are such that—and I hope the Acting Minister for Education is listening—I am preparing a scheme to submit to him to bring in 20 children from an area north of Merredin to that centre in order to afford them an opportunity to have some schooling. There are children there up to 12 years of age who have never seen the inside of a school. One hears references to correspondence courses, and I do not desire to decry their usefulness. But what time has a mother with eight children to deal with school matters? With two men in the field and eight children to look after, what time has she to devote to such duties? In one instance I know of where there is a family of eight children, not one of them has attended a school.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: A place of punishment, all right.

Mr. BOYLE: I doubt whether one child of 14 years of age can either read or write. Any one of us who is content to sit back in the face of such a state of affairs is lacking in common decency. The same position arises in connection with hospital matters. We have to wage a continuous fight in that respect. With the advent of the new Minister for Health, we find that the Perth Hospital is to receive £765,000 for a rebuilding scheme.

The Minister for Lands: Spread over five years.

Mr. BOYLE: Yes, with £445,000 to be provided in the first three years. I compliment the Minister for Health upon his influence with the Government. There can be no doubt on that score. While we have that provision on one hand, we find that in country districts campaigns have to be waged for the provision of even maternity wards. As soon as the Perth Hospital becomes overcrowded, the Government quickly finds money for a rebuilding scheme, but when we apply for some funds for a maternity ward in Kellerberrin, it is a very different tale. It is a most extraordinary position. The Government declares it will provide £1 for every pound that the country people raise. If £800 is raised, then the Government will provide an additional £800. I say: Thank God that the Lotteries Commission came to light with a donation of £750 that enabled us to have some hope of securing a much-needed hospital in a country centre. When we approach the Health Department regarding such a question, we are told that it has been the policy of Governments for a long time that assistance will be rendered only on the pound for pound basis. That is all the assistance we can get when we require facilities to help in the populating of a State like Western Australia.

Mr. Warner: Yes, outside the metropolitan area.

Mr. BOYLE: We have not yet got a maternity ward at Kellerberrin. The local road board has allocated £400 out of its general revenue, and the residents of the district are required to raise a further £400. That shows that this pound for pound business is far-reaching in its effects. So the people have to go through the painful process of holding balls and dances and even

fights at Kellerberrin. As the result of one of the last-mentioned efforts, an amount of £5 2s. was raised, and duly accounted for through the local Press. All this is very humiliating, but it is necessary in order that funds may be raised to secure a maternity ward at the local hospital. The Government has promised £800, provided the Kellerberrin people raise an equal amount, and the Lotteries Commission, with the aid of the McKay Trust, has made a substantial donation. The Kellerberrin people are still short of their £800, and I appeal to the Minister to end this unsatisfactory position and so enable this absolute essential to be provided. Between Merredin and Northam, apart from Cunderdin, there is no maternity ward. At the Merredin Hospital there is no children's ward. On the occasion of a recent visit I paid to that hospital, I found a woman in a ward, and she was dying of heart disease. There were two children in the same ward, and they were squalling their heads off. It shocked my every sense of humanity, and this poor woman pleaded that the two children might be taken away so that she might die in peace. That is what country members see when they visit hospitals in their districts.

Mr. Cross: What is the average number of cases in the Merredin hospital?

Mr. BOYLE: The average number of beds occupied daily is about 33.

Mr. Thorn: Ask him how many monkeys there are in the Zoo.

Mr. BOYLE: He would not know. I appeal to the Minister to lend us his assistance. We had a wonderful Minister in the late Hon. S. W. Munsie.

Mr. Patrick: But he thought that the city should be prepared to shoulder its proportion.

The Minister for Health: He followed your Government in that respect.

Mr. BOYLE: I appeal to the Minister to take action that will provide facilities that are lacking now. It is useless to say we have not the money. We can get £43,000,000 in Australia to prepare for war. Britain said that her £1,500,000,000 was not enough. It all goes to show that we can get plenty of money to enable us to destroy life, but we are told there is no money available when it becomes a question of helping those who are propagating our species. The transport question in country districts is always a source of considerable trouble, and in that

regard I desire to pay a tribute to Mr. R. L. Millen, the Chairman of the Transport Board. He has made the position in country districts much easier without—and I can regard the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Styauts) without any misgivings—impinging on the railways in any way. In fact, he has rather assisted the railways in that direction. I was somewhat amused to-day at a deputation to the Minister for Lands. The Minister told us that road boards, now that main roads were running through their districts, and in view of the manner in which money had been lavished in their districts, would have nothing to do. I suggested to him that they still had the 3 per cent. funds to administer. However, the Minister's suggestion was far from the facts of the case. Road boards to-day are faced with a harder task than ever before in carrying on. Rates are more difficult to collect in most districts. The application of the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act has brought a little money into those areas, and the Minister mentioned that one hall had been built out of farmers' debts adjustment money. If that is so, then I am pleased to think that the Federal authorities have done that much for Western Australia. It is quite a mistake to convey the impression that the work of road boards is finished, because fresh problems arise every day. In my district, we have only 36 miles of the main goldfields road, but there are many hundreds of miles of feeder and parallel roads that have to receive attention. Touching on water supplies in my electorate, I wish to thank the Minister for Works for the consideration he has extended to the requirements of the agricultural districts. Whatever our party politics or feelings may be, to be discourteous regarding the work of a Minister in one's electorate would be quite wrong, and I shall not be a party to that. In the area to the north-east of Tammin about 40 farmers are receiving water supplies which enable them to carry on, whereas without that convenience they would have been forced off their holdings. A new method of reconditioning pipes has reached an advanced stage at Kellerberrin, where condemned pipes are turned out in better shape than they were originally at half the cost of new pipes. Anyone who can in this way make two blades of grass grow where one grew before is doing something of advantage to the State, and should receive

every encouragement. The contract price for 30in. pipes is £1, but through the genius of Mr. Frank Mather pipes quite equal to new are being supplied by him at 8s. each, or 46 per cent. of the cost of a new pipe. I hope the Minister will continue that policy of decentralisation of industries of this kind. Last year we imported into Western Australia £3,500,000 worth of manufactured heavy steel; that is, girders, pipes and so forth. So there is ample scope in this State for a local industry of that type.

I want to tell the Minister that the agricultural land of this State cannot afford to pay more than 3d. per acre for any water scheme instituted. The Premier has fore-shadowed a water supply scheme to be taken through the Great Southern districts with its northern extremity at Merredin. I heard that the scheme would probably entail an expenditure of £3,500,000. I would not like to see a scheme of that magnitude undertaken unless the Government guaranteed that the cost to the people for the supply would not exceed 3d. per acre. To charge more would not be an economic proposition. I do not want to see elsewhere what I now see in portions of my district where water is supplied on one side of a fence at 3d. an acre, and on the other side at 6d. an acre. The Government, through its Water Supply Department, is demanding 10 per cent. on all new water supply work. That is far too high. It cannot be alleged that the life of the pipes is short, because there are pipes in the district north of Tammin that were put down 28 years ago and are still giving good service. So there is no great depreciation in that direction.

The allegation has been made that members on this side of the House have very little time for metropolitan enterprises. That is incorrect. A prosperous countryside will make a prosperous city, and a city cannot continue to be prosperous without a prosperous countryside. A good deal of work is being undertaken in the metropolitan area that is not very heartening to those that come from the outback areas of the State. But it has to be admitted that we shall continue to see an increasing proportion of the population situated in urban centres. We must regard that as fundamental; it is impossible for everyone to go on the land. Commodities are produced with such facility that the different

markets are speedily stocked. However, I do not think there are many members on this side of the House that are anxious to take anything from the metropolitan area, which is entitled to all it can get. I shall always support the plea for good living conditions for the workers. For many years I was associated with one of the greatest organisations in the State, and I experienced the joys and the sorrows that are the lot of the average worker. We on this side of the House have no desire to level down wages, but we appeal for a levelling up and ask that a fair and square deal be given to everybody.

I wish to refer to the position of the relief workers and to ask the Premier or the Minister for Employment to give attention to a complaint that is being voiced in the sustenance camps. Of the men in the relief camps, 80 per cent. are residents of the metropolitan area. I was speaking to one of the men only a few days ago. He is a married man with a wife and four children, and he told me that for four years he had gone from pillar to post working on country jobs, while favoured individuals in like case to himself were not required to leave the metropolitan area. Thousands of relief workers are sent out of the city to jobs in country areas, often many hundreds of miles away from their homes, while others are living all the time within ten miles of the Perth Town Hall. I would like the Minister to give attention to the matter and inquire whether it is not possible to afford those men a chance to be with their families and to help their wives to supervise the upbringing of the children.

Mr. Cross: We will support that idea.

Mr. BOYLE: What is the good of supporting it if it is not being brought about? The hon. member has the authority on his side of the House.

The Minister for Mines: Of about 7,000 on relief work, there are only 500 in the metropolitan area.

Mr. BOYLE: I think they are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. Cross: Can you suggest any job that can be put in hand in the metropolitan area?

Mr. BOYLE: The Heathcote Reception Home is a subject that doubtless is responsible for the presence of such a large attendance of the public in the galleries to-night.

The Minister for Mines: Why speak about it?

Mr. BOYLE: Hearing what I have heard, I would be a very peculiar man and sadly lacking in a sense of public duty if I refrained from speaking about it. We know that all is not well in mental homes in this State. I do not refer to the unfortunate patients, of whom I think there are 1,284 males alone at the Claremont Hospital for the Insane. The reception home at Heathcote is fulfilling a great function. It is more or less, I understand, a preliminary reception home for those that are mentally afflicted. Mental ill-health is a dreadful thing; far worse, in my opinion, than death. But there is hope to-day for those received at Heathcote. At one time Heathcote was more or less a passage to Claremont, and life there was one of misery for the patient and his relatives.

The Premier: It was not as bad as that.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not know of many that recovered.

Mr. Cross: Nearly all that go to Heathcote recover.

Mr. BOYLE: I am afraid the member for Canning does not read very widely. He should have read the "Western Australian Clinical Reports." I am not concerned about the rumours that are so often circulated in the metropolitan area and also in the country; but one question on which I wish to touch is the wonderful success that has attended the work of Dr. Webster of the Heathcote Home, a work that is now threatened with interruption. In the "Western Australian Clinical Reports" appears an account of a paper read by Dr. Webster before the British Medical Association in April, 1938, dealing with cases that had been under his care. He has treated 150 cases of mental infirmity in various stages, and in the majority of cases has met with success.

The Premier: Why is that?

Mr. BOYLE: On account of the treatment patients received from him.

The Premier: That is the new cardiazol treatment for which Dr. Webster is not responsible.

Mr. BOYLE: But he is responsible for studying and administering it.

The Premier: And there are other doctors of mental hospitals who are studying and administering it.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not think so.

The Premier: I know.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not say that he originated the treatment. The "Western Australian Clinical Reports" says:—

The treatment of certain forms of insanity by therapeutic epilepsy was introduced by Dr. Ladislaus von Meduna, of the Royal Hungarian State Mental Hospital, Budapest.

Mr. Raphael: It was in operation in the other States before it was tried here.

Mr. BOYLE: I now wish to inform the House that no success can be achieved in a business or in an institution if warring factions are at work. If the doctor is at war with the matron, or the matron is at war with the nurses, that not only affects the carrying on of the hospital, but also communicates uneasiness to the public. This happening at Heathcote may result not only in Dr. Webster's fine work being interrupted, but perhaps also in its being finished.

The Premier: Dr. Webster is not the only doctor who understands cardiazol treatment.

Mr. BOYLE: I am not alleging he is. He did not introduce the treatment, but I say that he has been very successful in using it at Point Heathcote, so why was he removed to the Claremont hospital?

The Premier: Every psychiatrist in the world is studying cardiazol treatment. It is something new. Dr. Webster is not the only doctor using that treatment.

Mr. BOYLE: And Dr. Webster's reward for his good work, without any charge being made against him, is his removal to the Claremont hospital.

The Premier: Other doctors are using the same treatment.

Mr. BOYLE: Let the Premier inform the House why Dr. Webster was removed from the Heathcote institution. Apparently, Dr. Webster is a man of high character and possessed of great skill. He has delivered a lecture on this treatment before the British Medical Association.

The Premier: He was not giving information about an entirely new treatment.

Mr. BOYLE: He mentioned several cases in his lecture. Later on I shall ask for a select committee of inquiry into the administration of the hospitals for the insane. If there is nothing to be feared, why worry? I want to point out that apparently the victim to-day is Dr. Webster.

The Premier: No.

Mr. BOYLE: If he has done anything to warrant victimisation—

The Premier: He is not being victimised.

Mr. BOYLE: I would like to know what it is. He is under a cloud.

The Premier: He is not under a cloud, nor is he being victimised. What ridiculous ideas the hon. member has about that.

Mr. BOYLE: As a reader of the daily Press—

Member: The hon. member would not take notice of the Press!

Mr. BOYLE: It is no use to say not to take notice of the Press, because 75,000 copies of the "West Australian" are distributed daily, and it does have an effect. The sooner this matter is cleared up, the better it will be for everyone.

The Premier: Hundreds of railway men are transferred all over the State.

Mr. BOYLE: Would the Premier compare a railway man with a medical man?

The Premier: Yes, certainly. Any person in the service of the State must go where he can best serve it. I was sent to the country. I have been to Yalgoo and many other places. Doctors must go where they are sent, too.

Members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOYLE: I seem to be rather disturbing members on the Government benches.

The Premier: No.

Mr. BOYLE: I wish to allude to several patients who have responded to this treatment.

The Premier: You will find hundreds of cases in the medical journals of the world. It is fortunate that this treatment is available.

Mr. BOYLE: I am quoting from the "Western Australian Clinical Reports, Vol. 1, No. 4, April, 1938"—

Case 1: Aged 24, had been left an orphan at 14 and had reared four younger children. She was described as "steady, sensible, hard-working." Her father had been a patient at Claremont. Three weeks before admission she broke down, began talking foolishly about her love affairs, was hallucinated, delusional, violent and uncontrollable. For six weeks after admission she was confused, unreliable, and spent most of her time in a single room. Cardiazol was then commenced. After the first few injections her behaviour showed marked improvement, but she was far from well mentally. She had 25 intravenous and two intramuscular injections. After one of these she had a mild status epilepticus. She became quite confused and showed no improvement, and treatment was terminated for this reason and because there was difficulty with her veins. I was disappointed, gave a bad prognosis, and decided to send her to Claremont; but a few

weeks after her treatment terminated she began to improve, and before she was discharged cured she was well enough to write an interesting letter describing her breakdown and recovery.

As I mentioned before, 150 of these cases have been treated, and 35 of them are reported in the journal from which I have quoted. I shall not weary the House by quoting other cases. I maintain, however, that Dr. Webster was responsible for the treatment of those cases. The Premier has said that the treatment is not Dr. Webster's. I have told the House that it is not. It was commenced in Budapest by Dr. Ladislaus von Meduna.

The Premier: He was not very enthusiastic about the introduction of the treatment, either.

Mr. BOYLE: The fact remains, however that Dr. Webster suspended the matron. That is known to the public, of which I am one.

The Premier: I thought you were talking about the cardiazol treatment.

Mr. SPEAKER: I suggest that this is not a duet, but a solo. Let the speaker proceed.

Mr. BOYLE: The soloist has a good chorus, Mr. Speaker. I suggest there is a connection between the removal of Dr. Webster to the Claremont institution and the suspension of the matron at the Heathcote institution.

Mr. Hughes: That is the reason Dr. Webster was transferred. He suspended the matron. There is no question about that.

Mr. BOYLE: I have no private feelings in the matter. I am not interested in it at all, except that we in this House cannot allow Dr. Webster to remain under a cloud. I am not advising the Government. The Government has its own responsibilities, but I do think that a select committee of inquiry would do much good. There is seething discontent amongst the nurses, both male and female, at the Heathcote institution. I know some of them personally. I also know that where hundreds of patients, mentally afflicted, are receiving treatment, there must be peace and concord. The patients should receive the best treatment. The sooner the present state of affairs is put an end to, the better.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.23 p.m.