

This right of entry shall be exercisable only during any lunch hour or non-working period. It is readily granted by the majority of employers at the present time. Only those employers who continually seek to dodge the provisions of awards or agreements refuse the right of entry to representatives of industrial unions. A further right of entry is given, to be exercised at all reasonable hours of the day or night, if the officer of the union concerned has reason to believe that any person is at any time carrying out work in contravention of the provisions of the Arbitration Act or any award or industrial agreement. The offering or obtaining of premiums in respect to any employment is prohibited by the Bill.

The amendments contained in the Bill are considered necessary, especially as the Industrial Arbitration Act has not been substantially amended since 1925. During the intervening period there has been a considerable change in industrial practices and industrial relationships. I invite every member of the House to give close attention to each provision, as I am confident a careful study of the Bill will result in the greater part of it gaining approval from both sides of the House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. North, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 10.7 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 31st August, 1938.

	PAGE
Question: Mines, contract surveyors .....	482
Bills: Police Act Amendment, 1R. ....	483
Criminal Code (Section 211) Amendment, 1R. ....	483
Parks and Reserves Act Amendment, 1R. ....	483
Motions: Health Act, to disallow amendment to regulations .....	483
Town Planning and Development Act, to disallow by-laws .....	486
Address-in-reply, eleventh day, conclusion .....	490
Adjournment, special .....	518

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

### QUESTION—MINES, CONTRACT SURVEYORS.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Who were the contract surveyors employed by the Mines Department during the last four years to survey mining leases? 2, What amounts have been paid to each surveyor during the last two years (a) under the contracts; (b) for travelling expenses? 3, (a) Are tenders called for these contracts? (b) If not, on what grounds are selections made?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Surveyors J. A. Nunn, F. G. Medcalf, K. A. McWhae, J. A. Ewing, H. Gladstones, W. St. C. Brockway, F. Tupper. 2, Surveyor J. A. Nunn: (a) Amount paid, £2,693 1s.; (b) Travelling expenses, £235 3s. 6d. Surveyor F. G. Medcalf: (a) Amount paid, £1,980 10s. 10d.; (b) travelling expenses, £299 17s. Surveyor K. A. McWhae: (a) Amount paid, £1,314 15s. 10d.; (b) travelling expenses, £184 10s. Surveyor H. Gladstones: (a) Amount paid, £79 18s. 4d.; (b) travelling expenses, £7. Surveyor J. A. Ewing: (a) Amount paid, £31 18s. 6d.; (b) travelling expenses, £8 9s. 6d. Surveyor F. Tupper: (a) Amount paid, £2 11s. 2d.; (b) travelling expenses, nil. These are the only amounts paid by the department, and each surveyor has to pay all his expenses in connection with the work, including wages to survey hands, etc. 3, (a) No. (b) Surveyors are selected with due regard to the department's requirements.

**BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.**

1. Police Act Amendment.
  2. Criminal Code (Section 211) Amendment.
  3. Parks and Reserves Act Amendment.
- Introduced by Hon. J. Cornell.

**MOTION—HEALTH ACT.***To Disallow Amendment to Regulations.*

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter (East):—

That the amendment to Schedule B of the regulations made under the Health Act, 1911-1937, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 5th August, 1938, and laid on the Table of the House on the 10th August, 1938, be and is hereby disallowed.

**HON. A. THOMSON** (South-East) [4.41] The Chief Secretary seemed to imply that the objection to this amendment to regulations proceeded from agitators connected with the meat market. However, the people who are most concerned, and who certainly are agitating against the amendment, are the primary producers. Last night we had an interesting speech from Mr. Seddon, who quoted extensively from Mr. Clark, an economist. The economist said that primary industry was failing, and in his opinion must continue to decline. Is there any other reason for the decline than the continued imposition of regulations such as these now under review, regulations which in effect take away from primary producers the right to handle their own commodities?

The Chief Secretary: Can you indicate where the regulations do anything of the kind?

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** If that is not their object, why the regulations? They are promulgated in order to ensure that people who use the abattoirs shall be protected from arbitrary competition, to which protection they are entitled. Such, I understand, is the interpretation of the rules claimed by the Chief Secretary. Can the small quantities of meat that primary producers are in a position to place on the market prove inimical to the welfare of wholesale butchers? These regulations have been promulgated more in the interests of the wholesale butchers than in those of the primary producers. The latter are the people I want to protect if it is at all possible. Therefore, I object to the regu-

lations and the proposed amendment. Mr. Wood dealt fairly fully with them, and I have risen to voice my objections.

It is suggested that the Government desires to ensure that the meat market shall not be in a position to sell, either wittingly or unwittingly, meat which could not be sold if the regulations applying to the Midland Junction abattoirs are complied with. We all recognise that the health of the people must be safeguarded. However, before all these regulations were promulgated and before the central markets were established at Midland Junction, the cost of them being about £30,000, was there anything seriously detrimental in the meat sold? Was it in any way unfit for human consumption?

The Chief Secretary: Tons of it was.

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** I do not know that there was any perceptible rise in the death rate due to tons of diseased meat being sold for human consumption. The Chief Secretary asserts that considerable quantities of meat were condemned on account of putrefaction; but the reason why that meat arrived at the market in such a state was the introduction of a Government regulation co-ordinating railway and road transport and forbidding the picking-up of meat along the route by road transport. The consequence was that a great deal of meat had unfortunately to be condemned, the chief cause of its condition of putrefaction being the lengthy period required for railway transport. I can prove that. It is all very well for the Chief Secretary to shake his head and say, "The Government is out to safeguard the health of the people." I contend that the Government is out to force everything into the central abattoirs and, as Mr. Wood has said, to compel all stock to go through the slaughter yards.

The Chief Secretary: This regulation has nothing to do with killing.

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** No; only with marketing. If the statement made by the Chief Secretary is perfectly correct, why have these regulations been promulgated?

The Chief Secretary: For inspection of meat. This amendment to regulations gives your friends the primary producers an advantage which in its absence they will not have.

**Hon. A. THOMSON:** If the Chief Secretary can prove that to me, I will change my views. I have read the regulations, and I

heard the speeches of Mr. Baxter and the Chief Secretary. Moreover, I heard the remarks of Mr. Wood.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Read No. 3.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It reads—

The carcases of animals slaughtered outside the abattoirs area but intended for sale therein shall still be inspected and branded at the meat market or abattoirs.

Does the Chief Secretary regard us as simple enough to believe that this regulation will not mean extra expense? In the past it has operated in that direction, and I see no reason why it should not continue to do so. The final regulation convinces me that my vote must be recorded in favour of Mr. Baxter's motion. I hope the House will disallow the proposed amendment.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [4.50]: I am strongly opposed to the disallowance of the amendment to the regulations. The Chief Secretary told the House that the people who are pressing for the disallowance have not given the regulations more than cursory study.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What about the 10 road boards?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I have had letters from road boards in my district and the boards have been under a wrong impression.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: With all due respect to the Honorary Minister, I say they are not under a wrong impression.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: After listening to Mr. Wood's speech, I have come to the conclusion that some members have not even taken the trouble to read the regulations.

Hon. G. B. Wood: I read them to the House.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: The Chief Secretary explained that whatever is done regarding the regulations, the proclamation extending the abattoirs area will remain in force.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Nobody said otherwise.

The **PRESIDENT**: Order! I must ask members to allow the Honorary Minister to proceed with his speech.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: The Chief Secretary also explained that producers in the road districts mentioned by Mr. Wood, namely, Gosnells, Darling Range, Armadale-Kelmscott, and so forth, would still be

obliged to slaughter at the abattoirs. Nevertheless, Mr. Wood persists in confusing the regulations with the proclamation extending the abattoirs area. In this connection he stated—

The regulation provides that slaughtering shall be prohibited within the area.

As the Chief Secretary explained, the regulation does nothing of the kind. It simply states that all meat exposed for sale within a 25-mile radius of the G.P.O., Perth, must be certified fit for human consumption.

Hon. A. Thomson: Yes, at the abattoirs.

The Chief Secretary: Not at all.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: Certainly not. Nowhere do the regulations set forth, as Mr. Wood contends, that "slaughtering is prohibited in the area, except at the State Abattoirs or at slaughter houses where pigs are slaughtered under permit and inspected at the time of slaughter."

Member: It is done by proclamation?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: Yes. I submit that members have not properly grasped the facts.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Slaughtering is mentioned in the regulations.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: This is the regulation, but not the one quoted by Mr. Thomson—

And those portions of the State comprised within the circumference of a circle having a radius of 25 miles, with the G.P.O., Perth, as a centre.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What has to be done within that area?

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: I have not the information here. Mr. Wood quoted the observation of the Chief Secretary when he referred to the effect of the proclamation extending the abattoirs area, as though it were under the Health Act. The hon. member said—

Most of the remarks of the Chief Secretary related to the questions of health and inspection.

It would be pertinent to ask Mr. Wood to what he considers the regulations do relate. The hon. member added—

There are many things behind these regulations other than the question of public health, and I propose to prove that contention.

The whole of the hon. member's subsequent complaints may be summed up in one sentence, "The people concerned want the right to kill animals in their own districts, on the

ground that extra expense will have to be incurred in sending the animals to Midland Junction and having them taken back to the districts where the meat will be consumed." I have shown that that has nothing to do with the regulation before the House. How does the hon. member connect his statement with the regulations, which make no reference to the place where stock shall be slaughtered? I can quite understand the hon. member's having been misled by the letters so freely circulated by local authorities, including road board secretaries, who have misread the regulations. Mr. Wood's whole case has been built up on a false foundation, namely, that the regulation says that slaughtering is prohibited except within a certain area. One of two things is obvious; either the hon. member is trying to mislead the House—I do not believe he would do that—or he has not read the regulations. Mr. Wood has no excuse for any misapprehension that he might previously have entertained. The motion for the disallowance was moved on the 17th August and further debated on the following Wednesday. The hon. member has therefore had ample time in which to acquaint himself with the purport of the regulations and to ascertain to what extent his preconceived notions fitted the facts. I suggest that Mr. Wood and Mr. Thomson have not studied the regulations, for otherwise they would surely not have made such inaccurate and misleading statements. I ask members who desire further information on the subject to obtain it from the department in order that they may no longer labour under a misapprehension. In conclusion I would add that even if the regulations governing meat inspection and branding were rendered inoperative in the districts mentioned by Mr. Wood, producers there would still be subject to the Abattoirs Act. They would still have to send their stock to be slaughtered.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That was a "roughie" to put over them.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is the position; the abattoirs area has been extended by proclamation. Growers outside the abattoirs area who are at present unable to sell their meat within the 25-mile radius, except at the meat markets, would be free to dispose of their meat in the very districts where local producers come under the proclamation extending the abattoirs area.

They would be able to sell meat that had not been inspected and thus endanger the health of the public.

Hon. G. B. Wood: We do not ask that any meat should be sold without first being inspected. We have never advocated that.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Then the hon. member should withdraw his support of the motion.

Hon. J. Nicholson: But where would the inspection take place?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Wherever the meat was killed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: At a certified slaughter yard.

The HONORARY MINISTER: As the Chief Secretary pointed out, we would have the strange spectacle of the public in the abattoirs area purchasing and eating meat which had not been inspected and would probably be diseased, while at the same time local growers would be without any kind of protection from competition of this type. I hope members will seriously reconsider their attitude. If my explanation has not reassured them, I ask them to visit the department and make inquiries for themselves.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Are not producers outside the 25-mile limit in that position?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No. Producers outside the 25-mile abattoirs area must, under the regulation, have their meat inspected if it is sold inside the area. I ask the House not to accept the motion.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [4.58]: Having listened to the speech of Mr. Baxter and the explanation of the Chief Secretary, I find a wide divergence of opinion between the Chief Secretary's interpretation of the regulation and the interpretation of the former Chief Secretary, and the resultant confusion has been further confounded by other speakers who do not seem to have grasped what was meant. As I am desirous of doing the right thing and of casting an intelligent vote on the motion, I suggest that the debate be adjourned and that the Chief Secretary and Mr. Baxter confer with the officer who framed the regulation to ascertain exactly what is meant.

The Chief Secretary: That is very nice!

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Then whose opinion are we to accept, that of the Chief Secretary, or that of the mover of the motion? The two are diametrically opposite.

How can we, as floor members of the House, know what is right when the two big guns of the Council cannot agree on the interpretation?

The Chief Secretary: The trouble is that I gave you too much information.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I do not say that the Chief Secretary is wrong.

Hon. A. Thomson: And you do not say he is right.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I have heard so many members speak in support of the disallowance of the regulation that I wonder whether my vote should not be cast where the largest number of guns is firing. Before casting my vote I want to know more about this matter. Why not allow the mover of the motion to get an interpretation of the regulation from the officer who drafted it? We might then secure another opinion more convincing than those we have had.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley, debate adjourned.

## MOTION—TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT.

### *To Disallow By-laws.*

Debate resumed from the previous day on the following motion by Hon. H. S. W. Parker (Metropolitan-Suburban):—

That the by-laws (Nos. 1 to 7 inclusive) made under the Town Planning and Development Act, 1923, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 8th April, 1938, and laid on the Table of the House on the 10th August, 1938, be and are hereby disallowed.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.2]: I hope I shall make myself clear on this question, which deals with a subject entirely different from the one we have just been discussing. Mr. Parker, who has moved for the disallowance of these by-laws, did so from what I may describe as the purely legal point of view. He suggested that the by-laws were ultra vires, etc., and that he was not at all commenting upon them as by-laws. Naturally, I have gone to the trouble of getting a legal interpretation from the Crown Law authorities and, in order that I may not be misunderstood, I propose to read the information supplied to me. These by-laws were drafted a few months ago by the then Crown Solicitor (now Mr. Justice Wolff). They

were not drafted by the Town Planning Commissioner, as I think Mr. Parker suggested.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I did not suggest who drafted them.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He did suggest that whoever drafted them could hardly have been the right authority; otherwise they would not have been drafted in that form.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Were they placed before the Crown Law Department before they were gazetted?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Naturally.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Is the Crown Law Department now offering another opinion as to their legality?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This opinion is in reply to the legal points raised by Mr. Parker.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Had the Crown Law Department previously assented to their legality?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Certainly. The opinion I have is from the present Crown Solicitor, and not from the officer who drew up the by-laws.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do you say they were drawn by the Crown Solicitor, or perused by him after they were drafted?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They were drawn by him. The Crown Solicitor has given the following ruling to the Town Planning Commissioner under to-day's date, and after having read what Mr. Parker said when moving for the disallowance of the by-laws:—

Mr. Parker is wrong on his first point. His submission is that you have followed the provisions of Subsection 4 of Section 36 of the Interpretation Act, whereas you have followed the provisions of Subsection 1 of Section 36. Subsection 4 provides the machinery for making regulations by some authority other than the Governor, and Subsection 1 deals with the machinery for making regulations when an Act specifically provides that they shall be made by the Governor. Mr. Parker's contention is that you have acted under Subsection 4, because the Governor has not personally made the by-laws, but has simply confirmed by-laws made by someone else. First of all it appears to me that Mr. Parker is not aware of the provisions of Section 23 of the Interpretation Act, which states that when in any Act the Governor is authorised or required to do any act, it shall be taken to mean that such act shall be done by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Executive Council. In other words, the use of the word "Governor" in any Act means

"Governor-in-Council." It cannot be suggested that the Executive Council or the Governor should personally prepare regulations. Sub-section 1 deals with regulations which may be made by any department of the Government, whereas Subsection 4 deals with regulations to be made by some outside and independent authority like a road board or a municipality. In the first case the Minister or his departmental officers prepare the ground work of the regulations which may be approved, altered or rejected by the Governor-in-Council, whereas in the second case the Governor simply confirms or rejects regulations but does not in any sense make them. The fact that the gazettal of these regulations states that the Lieut.-Governor-in-Executive-Council has been pleased to approve of by-laws and the word "make" has not been used, does not alter the fact that the by-laws have been made by the Government.

The second point that under Section 30 by-laws may be made by the Governor and at a later date prescribed for districts is not borne out by the reading of the Act. The Act says that the Governor may make and publish by-laws and does not insist that they should be proclaimed at a later date. The wording of the Act means that the making and publication may be simultaneous with respect to a particular district, and it could not possibly be inferred that the Governor must make by-laws for one particular district now and later gazette them for some other particular district. He must in his by-laws prescribe the district to which they are applicable. Of course he may make general by-laws applicable to all districts and he may make separate by-laws for special areas, but in either case he must specify in his regulations to which area or district they apply.

The third objection is that the provisions of Clause 8 in the schedule specify "houses on opposite sides of the street" whereas the by-laws mean houses on the one side. However, the provisions of Clause 8 in the schedule are intended to secure uniformity in the alignment of houses so that the distance between buildings on each side of the street shall be uniform. How this object can be attained without provisions similar to those in the by-law under discussion is not very obvious. Unless a uniform distance is prescribed on each side of the street you are not going to have a line at all, but will have a zig-zag of house frontages on each side of the street. The zigzag system is the one at present in operation and the by-law is designed to cure that trouble.

If Clause 8 in the Second Schedule meant that, as long as the same distance was preserved between houses opposite each other in a street without uniformity of line on each side of the street, you would still have the trouble which the by-laws now prevent.

There can be no objection to By-law 1 because it simply preserves vested and accrued rights, and if this by-law is not allowed to remain the provisions of Section 30 of the Town Planning Act would make the present by-laws override existing by-laws.

As far as the fourth point, that there is nothing in the schedule to permit a penalty, is concerned, I think reference to Clause 11 in the schedule is a sufficient answer to that argument. Under Clause 11 you are entitled to make a by-law to provide for the enforcing of observance of by-laws, and how you can enforce by-laws without fixing a penalty is not quite clear.

That is the opinion of the Crown Solicitor as supplied to the Town Planning Commissioner and handed to me just before the House met this afternoon.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Do not the by-laws provide for a zig-zag?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The by-laws are designed to overcome the difficulty of the zig-zag.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: According to the way I read them, they make the zig-zag.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: According to the Crown Law authorities, the hon. member is not reading them correctly.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Evidently.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: As is the case with other legal gentlemen, I suppose the hon. gentleman is allowed to differ.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Look at the plan.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not pose as an authority on matters of this kind. The Town Planning Commissioner has also submitted for my information a number of photographs, which he contends illustrate very clearly the points with which these particular by-laws are designed to deal. The photographs are particularly clear, and give a very good indication of the necessity for the by-laws. I propose to lay them on the Table of the House for the benefit of members. I would be very much obliged, in view of the importance of the by-laws, if when I have finished my remarks, the debate could be adjourned so that members may have the information that has been given to me, namely, the photographs, because I cannot convey it by word of mouth. They will give members an appropriate idea of the necessity for the by-laws that Mr. Parker seeks to have disallowed. The Town Planning Commissioner states that he has forwarded the photographs in duplicate, with their captions, to show the conditions that necessitated the promulgation of the by-laws. Mr. Davidson says:—

Mr. Parker did not question the necessity or the reasonableness of the by-laws, and admitted that he could not understand the straightforward plan, which is a copy of the survey of actual conditions in Mount Lawley.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: With no measurements on it, and a cross-street which does not cross a street?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Town Planning Commissioner says—

If the by-laws are disallowed it will mean that any person breaking the law of a local authority, with or without the consent or knowledge of the local authority, can unduly penalise his neighbours and cause loss of value by depriving him of amenity and convenience which have been created by the majority of residents in a street. Furthermore, in the event of a street requiring to be widened for traffic the Government or the local authority making resumptions in the future will have to pay far heavier compensation than if the buildings were set back a reasonable distance from the street at the beginning of the development of the street. The by-law is in the public interests, and can inflict no hardship on anybody who is not reluctant or unwilling to obey Parliament and the local authorities.

I understand there are numerous instances in which local authorities have either agreed or tacitly agreed to certain buildings being erected that are in direct conflict with their by-laws. In some of these instances the erection of the buildings has resulted in substantial reductions in the values of other buildings and residences previously erected in the same street. Evidently unless there are by-laws of this description, notwithstanding anything we as a Parliament may do through the Town Planning Act or by means of regulations that have been operative for years, or even through by-laws of local authorities that have been in force for long periods, it is quite possible, and at times quite easy, for people to defy the local authority or the properly constituted authority and to build premises that have the effect of reducing considerably the value of previously erected premises.

Hon. A. Thomson: What type of premises could be erected that would have the effect you suggest?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The two particular types to which I refer are motor garages and blocks of flats. The photographs show clearly what the effect has been. Information conveyed to me indicates that these premises have been erected in contravention of existing by-laws, and, in the circumstances, it seems absolutely essential that the by-laws before us should certainly not be disallowed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Does the Crown Solicitor say that the Town Planning Com-

missioner may usurp the authority of the local governing body? He seems to avoid that point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know that it is a question of usurping authority.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I raised that point.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If Mr. Parker will wait a moment he will realise that someone else has been usurping the authority of the local governing body and has erected premises that are totally at variance with the by-laws of the local authority. Where that has happened, some other authority should be able to step in; and that other authority, I consider, should be the Town Planning Commissioner, who has the advantage of the provisions of the Town Planning Act. He should be able to intervene and say that such a proposition should not be allowed.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: That was what I asked. Does the Crown Solicitor say the Town Planning Commissioner may do that under the Town Planning Act?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He has not said so in as many words, but in view of the by-laws, I should say he has implied that the Commissioner may do so.

Hon. A. Thomson: So the Town Planning Commissioner can override a local authority?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, in such matters as I have indicated where the local authority has not taken the necessary action. The first instance to which I shall refer relates to a new motor garage erected within the last five weeks in contravention of a by-law of a local authority requiring that such structures shall be set back to the line of the houses. No building plans were submitted for the garage and the building was not authorised by the local authority. No action has been taken by that local authority to enforce the provisions of its own Act, its building by-laws or the building line by-laws. Two views of the same garage are included in the photographs, and the second one indicates how the occupants of the house next door are deprived of the view down the street by the structure that was illegally erected. One can also note from the photograph how another motor garage shown on the left of the picture is in line with the houses. In that instance the owner was compelled by the same local authority to

observe the by-laws. So the photographs show that one man was compelled to obey the by-law when he erected his garage on the building line, whereas in the same street another man erected his garage without the authority of the local governing body and in defiance of the by-law.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: He was not permitted to do so; he committed a breach of the by-law and action was not taken against him.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so.

Hon. A. Thomson: Has the local authority a by-law setting out where the garage should be erected?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. A. Thomson: Then what has the local authority done about it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Apparently the local authority decided to take no action, so the Town Planning Commissioner has stepped in. I hope members will recognise that this is a serious matter from the point of view of the owners of property affected by what has been done. For that reason, I am anxious that before a vote is taken on the motion, members shall have an opportunity to ascertain what has happened, so that they may understand the position.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: May not the Town Planning Commissioner exercise the same discriminatory power as the local authority is now doing?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, provided these by-laws are agreed to.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: And this gives additional authority.

Hon. H. Tuekey: But he has not the power now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: These regulations will not take any power from the local authority.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: They will put the Commissioner and the local authority on an equal footing.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the by-laws are approved, they will give the Town Planning Commissioner, who should have the authority, the right to object where such instances have occurred, or are likely to occur. Another photograph shows a second garage in the same street as that to which I referred previously. It is set back in line with a building at the street corner, and represents a reasonable application of the local authority's by-law. In commenting on

this matter, the Town Planning Commissioner says—

In this short street, which is only 33ft. wide, it will be seen that one person can ignore both the building by-laws and the by-laws fixing the alignment of the building without action by the local authority, and that one ratepayer has been compelled to observe the by-law, whilst in the third instance a reasonable application of the by-law has been insisted on by the local authority.

Hon. A. Thomson: In effect, the Town Planning Commissioner proposes to override the local authority?

Hon. H. Seddon: He already has power under the Town Planning Act to do so.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: No.

Hon. H. Seddon: Yes, he has.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Town Planning Commissioner proposes to insist that the local authorities carry out their own by-laws. The Commissioner puts this question—

Why the invidious distinctions, and why should one man be permitted to deprive other ratepayers of the view they have enjoyed by the non-application, or condoned breaches, of legislation by Parliament?

He wants it to be distinctly understood that these are breaches of an Act of Parliament as well as of the by-laws of a local authority. I do not propose to speak at length regarding the other instances; they certainly speak for themselves. The next photograph shows garages erected at the side of semi-detached cottages and almost on the street line, which is contrary to the by-laws of the local authority. Then there is a close-up view of one of these garages, and it is quite easy to see how the occupants of the house on the left of the garage are deprived of a normal view along the street by this illegally erected structure. Another photograph shows a garage that has been erected, apparently, within a foot or two of the footpath. There was ample room for it to be set back, but that was not done. The owner of this garage was a member of the local authority! While he is allowed, contrary to the by-law, to build this garage of brick—it was not constructed of wood so as to be capable of being dismantled easily—other citizens are compelled to observe the law.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It is a strange breach of the local authority's own by-law.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, but when it is someone else, he is dealt with. The next set of photographs deals with three

garages erected in front of houses in an area contrary to the by-laws of the local authority. The garages have been constructed in three styles and this quite spoils the whole section for the owners of homes in the street. In addition, they certainly seem to spoil the appearances of the houses to an extent that would reduce their value considerably. The effect of a block of flats in a particular street is clearly indicated in another photograph, and here again the flats were erected in contravention of the Act. The photograph shows what is described as "The White House," which was built within 10 feet of the street line at an angle to the road. That was contrary to the Act, but was done with the consent of the local authority. The next photograph shows another view of the street and indicates how the White House projects beyond the line of the houses on the near side of it. The Town Planning Commissioner's comments on this matter are—

This White House, which is a group of flats, was built after all the other houses had been set back an average of more than 50 feet either by the consent of the owners or in accordance with the requirements of the local authorities, so that all home buildings might enjoy extensive views. Why should one speculator ignore the rights of other ratepayers and ignore the legislation designed by Parliament to protect the majority against a law-breaking minority?

Again, that photograph indicates clearly what the effect of this practice has been, and we desire to put a stop to it. The next photograph shows a garage at the right-hand corner of the picture set back from the street and screened by trees. In the middle of the picture another garage is seen built right up to the street line, and in that situation the structure spoils the view of the residents on both sides of it. The by-laws of the local authority and the provisions of the Act under which the by-laws were framed require garages to be set back in line with the houses. One can easily see the adverse effect caused by the erection of motor garages in this street. The next photograph deals with a residence in a street that is 33 feet wide. The Town Planning Commissioner has asked me to note the foundations of the garage, which are marked "A," "B," and "C." Permission to erect the garage was refused by the building surveyor, as the proposal was contrary to the by-laws, and the local authority upheld the action of its officer. Councillors visited the site, and the decision

was reversed. After written complaints by residents opposite, the town planning by-law was invoked, and the work stopped. The next photograph gives a view of the side of the house, showing ample room for a motor garage to be erected in accordance with the by-laws of the local authority. The Town Planning Commissioner asked why one person should be encouraged to defy the building surveyor of the local authority and cause it to attempt to legalise a breach of its own by-laws in defiance of the complaint of other ratepayers. Can a local authority allow any person to do wrong? Should any councillor or group of councillors set themselves up to commit or to condone breaches of legislation enacted by both Houses of Parliament?

I desire to lay the photographs, with the comments I have read, on the Table of the House, so that members may have as complete a knowledge of the subject as I myself have. I do not propose to add anything further, except to say that to me it does not seem right that any person, or group of persons, should be allowed deliberately to commit breaches of building by-laws and, by so doing, reduce the worth of other valuable properties erected previously in the area, particularly when the owners of those properties have complied in every respect with the by-laws. In some areas on the outskirts of Perth there are very desirable locations for the erection of excellent homes. If the breach of a by-law, whether made by local authorities or under the Town Planning Act, is permitted, it can but have a very damaging effect upon other properties in the same district. From remarks that I have heard outside the House, I am of opinion that there is much truth in what has been said about the actions of various people having had a very adverse effect upon the value of several fine homes. The matter is one we should take note of; we should not lightly disallow these regulations.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane, debate adjourned.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Eleventh Day—Conclusion.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**HON. J. T. FRANKLIN** (Metropolitan) [5.35]: I desire, with previous speakers, to congratulate the members who have again

been returned to this House, and also to join in the welcome to the two new members. From their opening remarks, I realise the State will derive great benefit from their membership of this Chamber. I express my sincere regret at the passing of one of our colleagues, the late Mr. Elliott. In him the State has lost a very capable legislator. We shall greatly miss his counsel, as he was thoroughly acquainted with all matters relating to the welfare of the mining industry of the State. I also regret the absence of Mr. Clydesdale who was unfortunate enough to lose his seat.

I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. I desire to make a few remarks upon matters that are of interest to me and probably to the people of the State. We have had the unemployment problem with us for some considerable time. The previous Government—the National Government—and the present Government have done excellent service in coping with this problem. The numbers of the unemployed have been substantially reduced; but, unfortunately, we still have some unemployment, which no doubt will continue for some time to come.

Is it not possible to educate our people to a keener sense of their responsibility to the State? We have primary producers who are thoroughly au fait with their industries, which are being satisfactorily carried on by them in all parts of the State, but they cannot be expected to bear the whole load on their shoulders. We must educate our people to the necessity for the establishment of a greater number of secondary industries. When visiting the Eastern States a few weeks ago, I observed that the secondary industries were in a thriving condition, due to the progress those States are making and to the patronage of the smaller States, especially our own. I understand our exports to the Eastern States amount to a little over £1,000,000, but that our imports amount to about £8,000,000. Is that fair to our people? We should insist upon their purchasing locally manufactured goods. An idea seems to exist among our people, as it does among people in other places, that because an article is manufactured locally it is not as good as a similar article that is imported. That is a false idea. Given the opportunity, we can manufacture goods equal to any that can be obtained from the other States.

Some scheme should be devised whereby young people who are leaving school each year and are being added to the ranks of the unemployed should be given the opportunity of learning a trade. That is their just due. We have too many labourers in our midst; we need more tradesmen to take the place of artisans who, on account of old age, can no longer carry on their trades. Apprenticeship should be provided for both males and females. That would be a step in the right direction. There is at present a scarcity of artisans in this and the other States of Australia; yet youths are not being trained to fill the gap. A few years ago, when I was an employer, I took an interest in my workers. There were not so many restrictions in those days, so if a labourer expressed a desire to learn a trade, I was only too glad to give him an opportunity to learn one. He could become a bricklayer, a carpenter or other tradesman. That is the policy we should adopt. We have proceeded on false lines, and I sincerely hope that some scheme will be evolved such as I have suggested. I do not know how it can be done; it is a matter of money and, of course, we must realise that there is always a scarcity of money. Perhaps some feasible means can be discovered to inaugurate such a scheme as I have indicated. I contend it is unfair that our youths cannot obtain employment in the State in which they and their parents reside. Possibly they may have to go to the other States to obtain a livelihood and that would mean breaking up the home.

Another matter that is causing concern to our people is our hospitals. That concern is justified. I was Lord Mayor of the City of Perth when the infectious diseases hospital was mooted, but, unfortunately, I ceased to hold that office before the matter was finally dealt with. I am pleased that the Government has decided to erect an up-to-date hospital in the city; but I would like the Government to take a further step and assume control of all the public hospitals of the State. I do not, of course, refer to private hospitals to which people with means can go for treatment. I shall be met with the question, where is the money to come from? But money is found for public works, railways, steamers and other utilities, so the Government should be able to find the money required to erect up-to-date hospitals not only in the metropolitan area—and I emphasise.

this on account of our country members—but also for hospitals in centres where they would be most useful. It is but right that large country districts should have facilities in the way of hospital accommodation such as we in the city enjoy.

The Government has to pay a proportion of the cost of the infectious diseases hospital, but who, in the end, pays the piper? The people. Therefore, it is immaterial whether the local authorities combine with the Government to carry out this necessary work, or whether the Government carries it out alone. The Government is in a better position to provide accommodation for unfortunate people who require medical treatment. I am speaking of those people who cannot afford to enter private hospitals. Those who can afford private treatment are certainly well provided for, but those who cannot should also be afforded similar facilities.

Another matter upon which I desire to touch is the way in which the Government has faced the difficulties connected with the sewerage system in various suburban areas. I have noticed from the reports that have been published that this work is approaching completion, that is, the underground portion of it. Unfortunately, however, the Government is not doing what was done previously, when the sewerage scheme was commenced. At that time owners received assistance from the Government to connect up to the system. If the Government agreed to do that in every instance it would be fair to everyone concerned. The Government has stated that the sewerage work will be completed in such and such a district, and at a certain time, and the owners are then requested to make the necessary connections. That is all right if they can afford to do so, but there are many people who are not so circumstanced. In the past it was possible for those people to have the work deferred for one, two or three years.

Hon. G. Fraser: The Government is doing now what you suggest.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Not in every instance. I should like to see an arrangement made whereby the owners would be able to pay for the connections say, by quarterly instalments, as they did when the undertaking was first started.

Hon. G. Fraser: A million pounds would be required to do what you suggest.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: The hon. member does not realise that the installation at

each house costs under £100, and so it is not such an expensive undertaking. Money could be borrowed for the purpose.

Hon. G. Fraser: The Government is finding £40,000 a year at the present time for those connections.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Why should the Government finance the connecting up of some houses and not others? Why not treat all alike? Again, the Government should insist on local products being used; that is to say, all enamelware required for the pans and the pipes made of earthenware should be locally produced, and a clause should be inserted in the contract to provide that whatever was required for the sewerage work should be of local manufacture if it was obtainable.

I should like to refer to the North-Western part of the State if I am not considered to be trespassing in respect of a Province that is worthily represented in this House by Messrs. Holmes, Miles and Angelo. The hearts of those three members are in their work, but my idea is that Ministers should put their heads together to formulate a scheme for the utilisation of the vast areas in that part of the State. Perhaps someone will ask the question that has often been asked whenever a proposal of this kind has been made—where is the money coming from? The Government is doing fairly well in the way of assisting and developing the North. A steamer has been purchased at a cost, I suppose, of nearly a quarter of a million pounds, and while on the subject of the State vessels I should like to add that in my opinion the sale by private treaty of the "Kangaroo" for £25,000 was a mistake. Tenders should have been called from people who were willing to purchase that ship; in fact, the Government should not dispose of anything that is the property of the people without inviting public tenders. There could then be no suggestion that anything detrimental to the State had been done.

Hon. G. Fraser: Even an old tram car?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Possibly the Government possesses an old tram car that could be presented to the hon. member and he could take it to the beach and live in it. The North-West recently suffered a very severe setback—I am alluding to the embargo on the export of iron ore. That part of the State has been unoccupied for years, and just as we were about to start on its development, an order was issued pro-

hibiting the export of iron ore. The excuse given is that there is not sufficient ore for our own requirements. Even if that were so, why not extend the embargo to other parts of Australia where the iron ore industry has been in progress for a considerable time? Why should we not be given a chance to reap some benefit from the expenditure that had been arranged in that part of the State? I suppose, however, if I went to the Prime Minister with my protest and offered any suggestion, I would be shown the door. Another matter in respect of which Western Australia has not been fairly treated by the Commonwealth also applies to the North of our State where we have large areas of tropical country just as Queensland has. The Federal Government grants a bonus to the sugar industry of Queensland, and if it is right for that to be done, why should we not receive similar assistance so that we too may develop our tropical areas? Sugar cane could be grown and we could further develop the banana and pineapple industry and other tropical fruits as well, and then supply the markets of the Near East. If the Federal Government were to do this, it would show that it had a kindly feeling towards Western Australia. But nothing of the sort has ever been done.

The Minister for Agriculture has returned from his business mission to the Near East. That visit should be productive of considerable good to Western Australia, and our exports to the countries that are not so far from our northern coast should increase. We can supply those countries with wheat, flour, potatoes and fruit and there should be ready markets there for those products. The Government should be complimented on having sent a responsible Minister on such a trade mission.

I am pleased at the success of the installation of trolley buses along Stirling Highway. I was always against the laying down of the tram-line there and the Government has always had a hard row to hoe in the way of providing transport conveniences for the people. Even when trolley buses were suggested there was considerable opposition. Now we can see that a wise policy was adopted. Mr. Parker drew attention last night to the fact that privately-owned buses should be given an opportunity to cater for the traffic when the Government buses were overcrowded. But I consider

that a scheme should be devised whereby not only Government buses, but the others, should be given the right to carry the traffic along that road. There were other subjects to which I had intended referring, but I have no doubt further opportunities will present themselves and so I shall content myself by supporting the motion.

**THE HONORARY MINISTER** (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [5.58]: I should like to preface my remarks by referring to what was said on the Bread Act by Mr. Parker last night. The hon. member said that a baker was not permitted to bake rolls because the Act said the dough had to be of the weight of 1lb. 4oz. That was an extraordinary statement for an hon. member to make.

Hon. G. Fraser: He was not the only one to make an extraordinary statement.

The **HONORARY MINISTER**: Section 4 of the Act provides that all dough intended to be made into bread shall be weighed in quantities of not less than 2 lbs. 4 ozs. for a loaf to be known as No. 2 loaf. Rolls are not referred to at all in the Act, except in the interpretation section where rolls are defined as meaning any bread weighing less than 4 ozs. Section 4 also sets out the way in which dough shall be made into bread. As a layman, I find it not an easy matter to criticise a lawyer; if I did, I would not perhaps be on safe ground. For the information of the House I should add that the Bread Act was a very difficult measure to frame because it substituted what might be called revolutionary sections for those which were contained in the previous Act. My opinion of the Act passed last year is that it is a good one. I have been in this House for 15 years and I have never known an Act of Parliament that did not require amendment in some shape or form and the Bread Act like many others will need some attention. Mr. Holmes was a very strong opponent of the Bill; he made an attack upon the amended Act the other day. This, I consider, is one of the good measures that have been initiated in this Chamber, and it was carried by a vote that accounted for 26 members, in addition to the President. With the exception of three members, two of whom were sick, and one of whom was called away on urgent business, all the members of the Council were accounted for. The voting, including

pairs, was 19 votes to seven—a substantial majority.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That was due to your persuasive powers.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The Bill was introduced late in the session for reasons that I explained at the time. Mr. Holmes overstated his objections. The Bill was not one the substance of which was unknown to members. On the contrary, it had been before the public and Parliament on several occasions spread over many years.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why apologise for something worth while?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am not apologising; I am making out a case for the successful administration of the measure.

Hon. H. Tuckey: There is no other place where a similar measure operates.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am coming to that. This Bill was really a compromise. From it were excluded many debatable provisions of previous Bread Bills that had been defeated in the House. Mr. Holmes classed the Act as “an abominable piece of legislation”—quite a wrong remark to make—but the hon. member utterly failed to make out a reasonable case to support his rash and ill-considered statement.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is nothing unusual.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Holmes said that Western Australia was the only place in the world in which a baker was not responsible for the weight of the loaf he delivered. This is a clumsily distorted account of the actual position. That this State, as far as we know, is the only place in the world where dough weights have superseded the old unsatisfactory method of bread weight inspection is true. But is there any reason why we should not pioneer social legislation in the interests of the people? The considered opinion of impartial and sound authorities is that the new method is of definite advantage to the consuming public.

The fact that Australia is seriously slipping from its once proud position as a pioneer in the legislative progress and economic improvement of the people is a matter for concern. Did not Australia pioneer the eight-hour movement, shops and factories legislation for the protection of young people and women, and the granting of old age and invalid pensions, and was not Australia first in the field in giving assistance to motherhood by the baby bonus

legislation? Did not Australia pioneer the stump jump plough and the combined harvester, creating by those two innovations, a veritable revolution in agricultural development? Is there, then, any reason for dismay that we are first in the field with this important development in the bread industry, establishing as a basis of inspection dough weight in lieu of bread weight?

The efficiency of the new method has been challenged by Mr. Holmes, who says the trade contends that competent inspection cannot be carried out. That is absolutely untrue. The trade has clamoured for many years for this method of inspection. Mr. Holmes advocates the old Act under which a customer could demand to have the bread weighed upon scales that the baker was compelled to carry with him. As a matter of fact, the provision of compulsory scales has not been enforced for over 20 years. It was inoperative and was therefore discarded. Before the introduction of this legislation, the supply of short-weight bread was rampant; it was distributed by unscrupulous bakers in the early hours of the morning. Thousands of loaves were sold that were one to four ounces under weight. They were delivered in obsolete and disreputable motor cars and other vehicles by unscrupulous bakers, who were endeavouring to undercut and ruthlessly destroy the trade of legitimate bakers. As a result of the new method of inspection, on a conservative estimate, bread of an additional 235,830 lbs. weight has been delivered to customers in the metropolitan area alone.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: How do you arrive at those figures?

The HONORARY MINISTER: They are based on the estimate that an additional one-seventh of an ounce per loaf has been delivered to customers. That is a conservative estimate and leaves out of consideration the former rampant undercutting by certain bakers. It is based on the admitted practice of the average baker, who weighed his bread at under 2 lbs. 3½ ozs. Many weighed at 2 lbs. 3 ozs., and those that sold at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning were known to weigh their bread in the oven at 2 lbs.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Why did you force them to give the extra weight?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Because that was considered by all competent author-

ities to be a sufficient margin of protection for the public.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: You mean 2 lbs. 8 ozs.?

The HONORARY MINISTER: No, 2 lbs. 4 ozs. When Sir Herbert Gepp investigated the matter in the Eastern States, he found that in the majority of cases—Tasmania was excepted—bread was weighed in the oven at 2 lbs. 4 ozs.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Has there been any test of the weight of the bread now delivered?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes, expert attention is being paid to the matter every day.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The bread is weighed?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: By what authority?

The HONORARY MINISTER: By factories and shops inspectors.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: They have been weighing the loaf?

The HONORARY MINISTER: They have been all over the place weighing the bread. As a result of their activities, the inspectors under Mr. Bradshaw have discovered only one serious instance of a mistake in the weight of the dough, and that occurred in a big bakery in consequence of a break-down of the dough divider or automatic weighing machine. In spite of the continuous inspection that has been conducted since February last, no instance of short-weight dough has been discovered in the metropolitan area.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I was speaking of short-weight bread.

The HONORARY MINISTER: One instance was discovered in Kalgoorlie, and I think the proprietor of the bakery was fined £25.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I was speaking of bread after it has been made.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I am speaking of dough, and bread.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I want to know whether any short-weight bread has been sold.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The inspector confines his attention to the weight of the dough and the weight of the bread when baked. He carries on a continuous system of inspection of dough and bread. The aim of the Act is to provide for dough-

weight inspection, and bread-weighing is part of the inspection under the Act.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Has there been any weighing of bread after it has been cooked?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Yes. The weight has been checked daily in shops and bakeries.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Has it been found over-weight or under-weight?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Generally over-weight. In well-equipped bakeries certain classes of bread baked in an ordinary baking oven come out  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ozs. over-weight 12 hours after baking. Other classes of bread are slightly under-weight because of—

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The breaking of the dough.

The HONORARY MINISTER: No, it is because of the crusty nature of the bread. Wise people eat crusty bread.

The estimated consumption of bread in the metropolitan area from February to the 31st August is 7,549,500 loaves, based on a population of 215,700, with a daily consumption of bread of 35,950 loaves, and allowing 1 and 1-7th loaves per day to every three of the population. Contrary to Mr. Holmes's statement, every customer is now receiving a guaranteed solid content loaf of bread which, if baked to an average standard, will weigh 2 lbs. twelve hours after baking.

I do not say that the system is infallible. The only infallible system would be to declare a solid content for a loaf, but if that were done it would be impossible efficiently to inspect bread. If we passed an amending measure that there should be 1 lb.  $6\frac{1}{2}$  ozs. solid matter in a loaf of bread, it would be impossible properly to analyse that solid content. The time taken would be too long and the system could not be efficiently policed. No law can be devised that will totally prevent rogues or deception. However, a marked improvement in the quality and quantity of bread manufactured is evident, following seven months' administration of the amended Act. An improvement has taken place in the quantity, because there is more weight in the loaf; and in the quality, because the article is better baked. The Bread Act is not perfect. Certain amendments are necessary. One is required to make clear that small shops may sell, during prohibited hours, bread that has already been delivered.

Both in the Press and in this House Mr. Holmes claimed that no bread could be sold after 7 p.m. My opinion to the contrary was based on legal advice that the amendment to the Shops and Factories Act overrode the Bread Act with regard to the hours of selling bread. That amendment was framed and passed in this House. However, to make the point absolutely clear, I am recommending that the Bread Act be amended to exempt certain shops from the prohibited hours of selling. The other amendments will still further protect the public from short weight bread.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

The HONORARY MINISTER: I would like to refer briefly to the demonstration of dough weight inspection that took place at the Enterprise Bakery on Friday night last. There was a representative body of men present, including health inspectors of the various local authorities in the metropolitan district. The demonstration itself was a great success, inasmuch as it gave both supporters and opponents of the new method an opportunity for full and frank discussion. Subsequent events and controversy have proved to me that it would have been advisable to consult the local authorities when the Bill was drafted. This course would have eliminated at least 90 per cent. of the opposition. I did not allow for the difficulty health inspectors would have in getting a grip of the methods of bread manufacture in the bakehouse. From this arose a great deal of the hostility among health inspectors, whom I hope shortly to see converted, all of them, to the new method. During the discussion at the demonstration, the Leader of the Opposition made a most valuable suggestion for the further protection of the public. It was to register all manufacturers of bread and to provide, for short weight, a further penalty clause deregistering any baker convicted of a flagrant breach of the relevant section of the Act. That view has been supported by large sections of operative bakers and bread manufacturers. The proposal will be carefully considered by the Government.

To the restriction of hours in the new Act there has been no pronounced opposition. Naturally, the ever-present struggle between operatives and employers has taken place—the employers advocating an earlier start in the morning and the operatives claiming a later starting hour.

From all sources there is indisputable evidence of a great improvement in the bread, brought about by the amending Act. This is very satisfactory, and represents an unassailable fact. We have reached this position with regard to the dough weight controversy. The new method is supported by the following persons and organisations:—

Operative Bakers' Union.

Bread Manufacturers' Association of Western Australia.

Sir Herbert Gepp and the Commonwealth Royal Commission.

Dr. Sutton, an eminent and independent authority.

Dr. Samuels, of the Agricultural Department of this State, who has given careful study to the question and whose expert opinion cannot be lightly disregarded.

Health inspectors of the three largest civic authorities in the State, and of a number of other health authorities.

The Chief Inspector of Factories, Mr. Bradshaw, has taken a very keen interest in the new legislation and has had under his direction a very complete, painstaking, efficient and continuous inspection by an expert officer. He also supports the new method of inspection, and reports from his department are highly satisfactory. The new legislation has created very great interest in the Eastern States and overseas, and favourable comments on it have appeared in trade journals of several countries. Its successful inauguration marks the commencement of a definite campaign for improving the quality of bread which, I think, will eventually result in manufacturing this basic food so that it will contain the necessary vitamin content now lost in the modern process of flour milling. Thus we shall have an appetising and health promoting product, which will safeguard the health of the people, assist the dairying industry, and confound the many cranks who have for years been a source of worry to the industry. I support the motion.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [7.36]: I have already extended to you, Mr. President, my congratulations on your election to the office of President for another term. I should like to add a few words of congratulation to other hon. members who have been returned for a further period of six years, and to make special reference to the new members,

both of whom have spoken on the Address-in-reply and both of whom, it is fair to say, will add interest to discussions on matters of importance to this House and to the State. In replying to the observations of hon. members in the course of the debate, I propose to follow the usual procedure, and to reply only to the more important matters which have been raised. Many things referred to by various members are no doubt worthy of consideration, but I shall deal only with the matters I have indicated—the chief reason being that if I did otherwise it would mean my speaking at extraordinary length, which I do not think would be justified at the present juncture. On the other hand, if any hon. member feels that he has raised a question worthy of consideration to which I have not referred, or if he has asked for information which I have not supplied, I shall be only too pleased to give him whatever satisfaction I can outside my remarks in this Chamber.

Various members, and in particular Mr. Nicholson, have deprecated the Government's achievement in attaining virtual financial equilibrium during the past year. Mr. Nicholson said—

Surely in ordinary circumstances, if this had affected a private concern more care would have been exercised with expenditure than had previously been shown, when there was such increased revenue for one year. If the Government had exercised the care that is so essential in the management of its affairs, then, instead of a deficit, we would have experienced a surplus of a substantial sum.

It is rather significant that the hon. member did not point to one item that he considered extravagant. Instead, like other members who have been somewhat critical of the Government's financial policy, he took refuge in generalities. As I have mentioned on previous occasions, I sometimes wonder whether these members realise how very small is the proportion of Government expenditure that actually affords the Treasurer opportunities for the effecting of economies. I feel that to repeat some remarks I made last year in this connection is not inadvisable.

Last year expenditure amounted to £10,829,735. Of this amount, almost 75 per cent was devoted to the servicing of the public debt and to expenditure on public utilities for the purpose of earning the revenue for which the Treasurer had budgeted. That is a highly important point,

and one which should be borne in mind when considering this Government's expenditure during the depression. The payment of interest, sinking fund, and exchange on the public debt absorbed a sum of £4,226,550 while expenditure on public utilities accounted for £3,624,657. Actually, therefore the limits of the field wherein the Government can effect economies are represented by a figure of something under £3,000,000. So when we speak of the revenue of the State being something over £10,000,000 and say that it should be possible to effect economies we must recognise the fact I have just mentioned—that something less than £3,000,000 is available to the Government for expenditure that can be in any way reduced to effect economies. But even of this sum payments totalling £392,512 were made last year under special Acts, which appropriated revenue for such purposes as pensions, retiring allowances, the University of Western Australia, Parliamentary allowances, and so on. Honourable members will realise also that a proportion of the balance comprise payments of salaries and wages of officers whose remuneration is fixed by agreement and awards.

There is, therefore, little scope for effecting any considerable economies in the remainder of the field of expenditure. May I also point out that while hon. members have suggested that the State should economise not one member advanced anything of a concrete nature of which I could take notice. Almost every member who has spoken has referred to the need for the Government to do this, that, or the other thing, the total of such items involving additional expenditure running to millions of pounds, I suppose. It seems to me, therefore, rather futile to criticise the Government for not making economies as suggested while advocating that the Government should spend considerable sums of money on works.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Unless there is a standing committee on public works to deal with those matters.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is a question of first things first. The main object of the present Government has been to provide employment, and I claim it has been highly successful in that direction. With that aspect I shall deal later.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do not you think a public works committee would be advantageous?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It has proved so elsewhere. There is, therefore, little scope for effecting any considerable economies in the remainder of the field of expenditure. This will be apparent when a comparison is made between expenditure during 1937-38 and the preceding year. Expenditure grouped under the headings I have suggested, was as follows:—

	1936-37. £	1937-38. £
Servicing of Public Debt .. ..	4,050,505	4,226,550
Special Acts N.E.I. .. ..	378,799	392,512
Public Utilities .. ..	3,623,550	3,624,657
Other Expenditure .. ..	2,503,784	2,586,016
	<u>£10,556,638</u>	<u>£10,829,735</u>

The respective increases were:—

	£
Servicing of Public Debt .. ..	176,045
Special Acts N.E.I. .. ..	13,713
Public Utilities .. ..	1,107
Other Expenditure .. ..	82,232
Total .. ..	<u>£273,097</u>

Thus the main increases in expenditure arose in fields outside the control of the Treasurer. Turning to "Other Expenditure," I find that the main increases occurred under the following headings:—

Treasurer (exclusive of public debt service charges), £35,147. Here the advance was due mainly to increases in respect of taxation refunds (£15,869), and grant to Hospital Fund (£12,946).

Crown Law £10,469, covering an additional expenditure for the Legislative Council elections (£4,209) and salary increases brought about by the rise in the basic wage.

Chief Secretary £13,075, comprising basic wage increases, Natives (£5,194), and Mental Hospitals (£4,735).

Agriculture £17,755, representing mainly increased expenditure on locust destruction (£17,316).

Education £21,040, covering salary increments and additional staff.

Obviously, therefore, it is quite wrong to suggest that the Government has not exercised the strictest control over expenditure. There are many things that I would have liked to get done, but increased expenditure would have been entailed, and the money was not available.

As I have pointed out the main increase in expenditure was in respect of the servicing of the public debt. Of the total increase of £176,045, interest payments overseas accounted for £29,744, largely as a result of

the increase in the interest rates on migration loans. Sinking fund contributions advanced by £38,068, and the balance was in respect of Australian interest payments on an increased debt. Under Special Acts n.e.i., the increase here was chiefly due to heavier transfers from revenue to the fund provided under Section 41 of the Forests Act, 1918. The increase recorded by Public Utilities was not significant. Those are items of which members should have a knowledge, because they afford a good indication that the Government has exercised the utmost economy.

Turning now to revenue, I should like to refer to Mr. Dimmitt's strictures on the Government's financial achievements. It may be recalled that the hon. member said—

I recognise that some Governments are assisted by a set of fortuitous circumstances, and this Government has enjoyed better economic conditions during the past three years than in former years. This has resulted in the collection of £4,372,476 in land, income, and emergency taxation against a total of £1,310,158 in the three years previous to the Labour Government taking over the Treasury benches. In other words, this Government has benefited from these three sources alone to the extent of more than £3,000,000 . . . the State has virtually regained financial equilibrium. But it has done that on an added income of £3,000,000, which does not suggest any very marked improvement.

Criticism of this type is not infrequently levelled at the Government. The argument is advanced that, with increased revenue and a financial emergency tax that yields over £1,000,000, the Government should have done more to extend social services and provide work. I think most members will agree that conditions to-day are not comparable with those of former years. Nearly all the increased revenue yielded from taxation over the last few years has been absorbed in making payments from revenue that were previously met from loan. If Mr. Dimmitt is fair, he must agree that the amounts of loan money available to the Government during the last few years have been considerably less than the sums raised in previous years. Let me recall that the first two reports of the Commonwealth Grants Commission condemned at length the financial methods adopted by Western Australia, more particularly the practice whereby loan moneys were taken into revenue. As Mr. Dimmitt is a man of considerable business experience, I am sure he will agree that the practice for-

merly in vogue was entirely wrong, and that the present Government has done the right thing in introducing sounder methods. Taking a case in point, I mention the crediting to revenue of interest due by the Agricultural Bank in excess of the amount actually collected from settlers. That was the practice for many years. As the trust fund from which the moneys were taken contained not only payments of interest but also repayments of capital, the Bank was often left with insufficient funds to make further advances. Money for this purpose had to be obtained from the loan funds, and the net result was that loan funds were transferred to revenue. Members had condemned that practice year in and year out, but we have broken away from it.

I am in a position to give some interesting figures revealing the effect of this alteration on the finances of the State. Since the amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act, the Treasurer has received only the actual amount of interest collected from settlers, and now has to make good the deficiency from revenue. Then there are other items of expenditure hitherto charged to loan or trust accounts that are now being charged to revenue. An example is furnished by the agricultural land purchase debentures. The original scheme contemplated under the Agricultural Lands Purchase Act was that receipts from settlers should be placed in a trust fund where they would be available to meet the costs involved in surveys, etc., and the interest on and repayment of the debentures issued for the purchase of the land. Previous Governments, however, took substantial portions of the payments by settlers into revenue, in the hope that money would be available from some other source to meet the debentures when they fell due. As members are aware, many of those debentures are now falling due, and the Government has to charge to revenue each year a substantial sum for the purpose of building up a fund to redeem the debentures on maturity. The House should know that had the Government followed the former irregular methods of budgeting, the Treasurer would have been enabled to announce handsome surpluses over the last few years. For example, the deficit of £371,000 incurred in 1936-37 would have been converted into a surplus of £434,000. In other words, during that year, it cost the Government some £805,000 to place the revenue finance on a

sound basis. Those are figures of which I desire members to take particular notice. Certainly, such figures would have conveyed an entirely wrong impression of the financial position. Under the present method, however, we do present to Parliament a statement of the position that is as accurate as it possibly can be.

Pending the finalisation of certain figures, I can give the House only a tentative estimate of the corresponding figures for 1937-38. From the available information the total would apparently be £754,000. This difference is made up as follows:—

	£
Agricultural Bank and Soldiers' Settlements .. .. .	400,000
Group Settlement .. .. .	270,000
Agricultural Land Purchase .. .. .	30,000
Trading Concerns .. .. .	29,000
Cartage of Ore .. .. .	16,000
Cartage of Wheat .. .. .	9,000
Total .. .. .	£754,000

I hope country members will appreciate that practically the whole of the amount, with the exception of £29,000, has reference to the country. That amount had to be found out of revenue this year to finance the items enumerated. Had the Government, therefore, continued to adopt the methods in vogue when it took over the Treasury benches, a surplus of almost £750,000 could have been shown for last year, instead of a deficit of £10,693. Thus, although the total collection of land, income and financial emergency taxation has been £3,000,000 greater during the last three years than in the three years previous to the present Government's administration, most of the increase has been absorbed in properly allocating expenditure against revenue, instead of against loan. When members criticise the Government's financial administration, those facts should be borne in mind. Fairness demands that the Government be given credit for having altered the method that was in vogue for so many years, and at the same time reached a stage where the Budget was almost balanced.

Some concern was expressed by Mr. Nicholson at the magnitude of the deficit for the month of July—£259,297. He suggested that the month's deficit might be explained by reason of certain items having been carried over from one month to another, so that an improved balance might be disclosed at the end of the year. By way of interjection, I

intimated at the time that nothing of the sort had happened in this instance. While the hon. member was apparently willing to accept my statement, he nevertheless indicated that an explanation should be offered. There is nothing unusual in the occurrence, as revenue collections during July are always well below the monthly average for the year. On this occasion revenue at £739,359 actually registered an increase of £31,744 on the corresponding figure for the last year. The principal increases were as follows:—

	£
Probate Duty .. .. .	3,819
Gold Mining Profits Tax .. ..	12,559
Commonwealth .. .. .	47,917
(Last year the monthly payments in respect of the Disabilities Grant were not received until August.)	
Railways .. .. .	11,299
(Increased carriage of wheat.)	

On the other hand, decreases were recorded in respect of income tax and financial emergency tax. Payments on a number of large assessments under these heads were not received before the end of the month. Other decreases were territorial £9,996 and departmental £10,988.

The expenditure amounted to £998,656, or £72,800 more than during July of 1937. The principal increases were as follows:—Interest and sinking fund, £12,951; exchange, £21,005; railways, £43,183, and other utilities, £9,537.

Of the increase in the railways, some £12,000 was due to the rise in the basic wage. In addition, the new system whereby the railways do not include the cost of the third pay in the month in which it falls, but equalises it by a charge over a period, accounts for a further £15,000. The remaining increase represents expenditure to earn additional revenue. I think I have shown convincingly that there was nothing in the suggestion of the hon. member that there had been any juggling of the finances for July.

For the most part country members confined any criticism they had to offer to the allocation of Government expenditure, as between the metropolitan area and the country districts, to matters relating to the provision of educational facilities. I may recall that last year I submitted a statement showing that, during the period 1933-34 to 1936-37, over 60 per cent. of the Government's loan expenditure was in districts outside the metropolitan area. Notwithstanding this,

various members, led by Mr. Baxter, again attempted to raise the old cry of "town versus country."

When referring to expenditure on education, Mr. Baxter said—

That which has been done in the country is mighty little compared with what is being done in the city, and the promise to the country of what would be done . . . There are many small places in the country which have not received reasonable treatment. For years Merredin has been in a shocking condition for lack of proper educational facilities and the school remains overcrowded.

Another member who was critical of the facilities provided at the Merredin State School was Mr. Wood, and, like Mr. Baxter, based his main case against the Government on the conditions alleged to prevail at that centre. He said—

The school is a disgrace and has been condemned by the Health Department. The place is full of water whenever it rains. The headmaster has not even an office.

In reply to these rather strong statements, I quote from a memorandum received from the Director of Education—

The statement that Merredin school lacks proper educational facilities and remains overcrowded is not in accordance with the facts.

The buildings consist of four brick class rooms, quite up to the standard of rooms erected elsewhere, one pavilion room of the usual type, and one wooden room (old style). Departmental records show that the enrolment in December, 1937, was 226. The accommodation provided is for 300. During this year there has been an increase, as shown by records (1st July, 1938) to 255, but ample accommodation is yet provided by the four brick rooms and the pavilion room—so that the old type room has been retained as a spare room for occasional use as a music room and for physical training.

The statement that "the place is full of water whenever it rains" is an exaggeration. The south-western corner is low-lying, and water does lie there after rains. As the rainfall is 12-13 inches a year, the number of wet days is limited.

In the central part of the grounds are the buildings, a play area and tennis court. A headmaster's office is not built until the plan of buildings has developed to an extent which enables the office to be built.

The residents have made a request to remove the school to an area selected on the south side of the railway line. While negotiations are proceeding, it is inadvisable to erect further buildings on the present site. Manual training instruction is provided for—room, equipment and teacher supplied.

The provision of domestic science is under consideration, but cannot be finalised until a

decision is arrived at respecting the transfer of the school to a new site.

Those are the remarks of the Director of Education. I prefer to accept his views on the matter rather than those of members who have criticised the Government and the department.

With regard to Mr. Wood's strictures on the Corrigin school, I am advised as follows:—

Corrigin school is a composite one. Its accommodation has been extended from time to time to cater for pupils transferred from closed schools. The department recognises that these are only temporary buildings, and has under consideration at the present time a brick structure to replace them.

When listening to Mr. Baxter, members may have gained the impression that the department was not sympathetic towards the extension of manual training facilities in the country districts. In this connection, the Director has submitted the following comment:—

Concerning the department's attitude to the extension of manual training facilities to small country schools, the ex-Director during 1937 did promise to supply equipment if local residents erected a suitable room. The Director has now honoured these requests—Warooka in August, 1937, and Balingup in August, 1938. One further request of this nature has been made but was refused.

As to the members' general charges that expenditure has been on a more generous scale in the metropolitan area than in the country, an examination of the relevant figures discloses that their criticism is not borne out by the facts. For example, in 1936-37 the expenditure on teachers' salaries and equipment in primary schools totalled £571,481. Of this sum £245,120 was expended in the metropolitan area in catering for 29,139 pupils, and £326,361 in the country in catering for 26,885 pupils. The respective expenditure per pupil was—metropolitan area £8.41 and country £12.14.

Hon. A. Thomson: There are larger areas to provide for in the country.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Members have criticised the Government expenditure on the provision of educational facilities in the country, and this shows that their criticism is not borne out by the facts. Thus the expenditure per pupil is 45 per cent. greater in the country than in the metropolitan area. I might also add that an expenditure of £18,000 is incurred annually on driving allowances and contracts in country districts.

Unfortunately, figures are not available segregating the cost of capital charges, upkeep, etc., incurred each year in respect to primary school buildings in the metropolitan and country districts. However, the primary school expenditure in the country districts on teachers' salaries and equipment alone is as great as the combined expenditure arrived at by adding to the corresponding figure for the metropolitan area the whole of the annual charges in respect of all the loan assets of the Education Department, including the Narrogin School of Agriculture and Muresk College. No matter how much may be done by the Government, I realise that there will still be room for further improvement. There will always be a necessity for new schools in some districts, or additions to schools elsewhere. That is inevitable in a State like Western Australia. I suppose we shall also have a continuance of the necessity for schools being closed down owing to loss of pupils. The Education Department has a big problem to deal with, and considering its magnitude, I think it is entitled to credit for the way in which it has endeavoured to cope with the situation.

Hon. A. Thomson: We recognise that the department is reciprocating as well as possible.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not borne out by the criticism of some members of the expenditure by the Government in providing educational facilities in the country. Let me now quote some figures showing the loan assets and expenditure on primary schools for the year 1936-37—

Primary Schools:

Expenditure on teachers' salaries and equipment—

	£	£
Metropolitan area	245,120	
Country districts	..	326,361

Loan Liability: Public buildings including Narrogin School of Agriculture and Muresk College, £1,438,868.

Capital charges—

	£	£
Interest ..	52,585	
Sinking fund	5,622	
Exchange ..	7,201	
Net earnings dr.	16,579	
		81,987
		<hr/>
		£327,107
		<hr/>
		£326,361

Hon. A. Thomson: There is a much larger area in the country to deal with, and the costs must be correspondingly higher.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY:** Other matters bearing on the country areas were also dealt with by members. The first item I shall touch upon relates to rabbit virus. Mr. Craig, and, I think, Mr. Hamersley, suggested that the Government should press the Commonwealth authorities for the release of what is known as the myxomatosis virus. The Government's policy in this matter has been made clear from time to time by the Minister for Agriculture, both in public speech and in correspondence with the various vermin boards. He has intimated that when the Commonwealth Government releases this virus, arrangements will be made to have it distributed under suitable control. That was the suggestion of Mr. Craig. Members will recall that a resolution requesting the immediate release of the virus was recently passed by 23 road boards in conference. Following that resolution, the Agricultural Department communicated with the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research. A reply, dated the 22nd June, was received from the secretary of that body, as follows:—

**Re Rabbit Myxomatosis.**

I have your letter of the 17th instant, relative to a resolution passed at a conference of vermin boards requesting the immediate release of the myxomatosis virus.

At a recent meeting of this Council Dr. L. B. Bull, the Chief of the Division of Animal Health and Nutrition, outlined the rabbit myxomatosis work in some detail. He pointed out that Sir Charles Martin had shown at Cambridge that the virus was invariably fatal to wild rabbits, although in one or two cases recoveries had taken place in tame rabbits.

In following up this work in Australia, one experiment—the closed colony experiment—had consisted of putting 30 wild rabbits in an enclosure of 500 square feet, introducing the disease into the enclosure, and then maintaining the population roughly constant by adding the necessary numbers of wild rabbits twice weekly. It had been found that to do this it was necessary to add six rabbits on a Wednesday and six on a Saturday.

The experiment had been in progress for the last fifteen months, and its object was to determine whether recovery ever took place in wild rabbits. Up to date, 761 rabbits had been put into the experiment, but none had recovered. The great majority had died within the first 24 days of exposure to contagion, but five per cent. or so had lived longer, and there were four cases of rabbits not dying from the disease until they had been in the enclosure for over 100 days—one of them for 159 days.

Judging from cage experiments, the reason for this difference in time of survival appeared

to be that occasional rabbits possessed a temporary resistance, perhaps caused by a temporary increased secretion of mucus which washed away infection and prevented it reaching the respiratory tracts. Tests, however, had shown that such rabbits invariably died on injection of the virus; in other words, they did not possess any systemic immunity.

The variation he had mentioned, however, was a good demonstration of the unlikelihood of any disease accounting for the whole of a particular animal population. Nevertheless, the myxoma virus was favourable in that no wild rabbit had recovered from it over a period of fifteen months.

The Wardang Island experiments had been carried out under quarantine conditions in a double-netted enclosure of 90 acres. The disease had been introduced in November, 1937, at a time when some 450 rabbits were in the enclosure, by liberating 20 inoculated rabbits (obtained from outside the enclosure) in one corner of the fenced area. The object of the test was to determine if myxomatosis would eradicate the whole of the population, and to obtain information as to whether it was good technique to put foreign inoculated rabbits in such an area.

It had been found that the disease died out in the enclosure at the end of some 100 days, by which time about 250 rabbits, i.e., about 50 per cent. of the original population, had died of the disease. He did not think that there was the slightest evidence that the disease had failed to exterminate all the rabbits owing to the development of a natural resistance; the data obtained pointed, on the other hand, to the introduced rabbits not being accepted by all the colonies and thus some of the latter had escaped the disease entirely.

It was proposed to commence a second experiment on Wardang Island within the next three weeks. By that time the population would have been built up to about 1,000 rabbits. This time, however, the disease would be introduced in such a way as to make it reasonably certain that at least one rabbit in each colony would be infected. No animals from outside would be introduced.

Dr. Bull showed a mechanical arrangement whereby animals emerging from certain warrens would be infected by contact with a dust of the dried virus diluted with lycopodium powder. One rabbit from each of the other warrens would be caught alive, inoculated, and then released. The object of this test was to ascertain whether it was possible, by the procedure he had outlined, to obtain a rapid and effective result.

I have outlined the position regarding this Council's investigations on the matter at some length, in view of the fact that there is evidently a complete misunderstanding as to the facts of the case on the part of the vermin boards in your State. No one can yet say whether the virus is going to be of use as an agent for the large-scale destruction of rabbits. We hope that in the future, and under particular conditions, it may be a valuable aid in

rabbit control, but, until further progress has been made with the experimental work, we shall certainly not be in a position to make any recommendation as to whether the virus should or should not be released.

Members will see, therefore, that until the desired recommendation is made it would be a policy of doubtful expediency for the Government to press for the release of the virus. It is, of course, recognised that if success can be achieved in this experiment it will have an important effect upon many districts in this State. Country members can rest assured that the Department of Agriculture will watch the experiment with much interest, for the departmental officers are just as keen as they to do anything that will improve the position of the farmers operating in areas infested with rabbits.

With regard to irrigation areas in the South-West, reference was made by Mr. Craig to the disabilities under which many settlers are at present operating. He instanced the Harvey area where the irrigation authorities are unable to allow more than one watering of pastures a month. The Government is fully alive to the disabilities mentioned by Mr. Craig, and now has under consideration a comprehensive report dealing with additional conservation. As, however, a heavy financial obligation is involved in the construction of new works of an adequate nature, the present and future economics of agricultural development in the respective irrigation districts must be carefully explored. It will be realised, moreover, that it is necessary in the formulation of any further scheme of water impounding, to visualise the whole of the South-West coastal terrain as potentially irrigable for pasture and other agricultural development, rather than to concentrate attention upon those areas where already many thousands of pounds have been spent from public funds, and where the returns have never been fully reproductive from a direct, or financial, point of view.

The watering restrictions imposed by the Irrigation Commission at Harvey have been necessary, not because of water shortage itself, but because the purpose and use to which the water is put have so considerably changed since the irrigation works were constructed as to demand that more water and more frequent waterings be made available. Such demand has not been possible of entire fulfilment in the Waroona and Harvey dis-

tricts. Developments that we may reasonably expect in this district where we have such a limited scheme prevented that being done. More settlers participated in the industry and naturally they would use more water. Adopting forms of production in other directions, they would require an additional quantity of water and more frequent waterings, with the result that the quantity conserved has not been found sufficient. That is the explanation. On the other hand, in the Collie irrigation district, where Mr. Craig is fortunate in having his farm, no restriction in the area to be irrigated has yet been found necessary.

Hon. L. Craig: And will not be found necessary either.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Further, the more frequent waterings advocated by Mr. Craig have been afforded for the time being. The Government recognises that this is an important subject that will require the expenditure of a large sum of money.

Hon. L. Craig: But the work will be reproductive.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is correct, but to date experience has shown that it is not so productive from the Government point of view as some members would have the House believe.

Hon. L. Craig: But it means increased production, which brings increased revenue to the Government through the railways, and so on.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is quite so with the increase in production. Mr. Hamersley referred to the grasshopper pest. He suggested that the rural community had not received fair treatment in this matter from the Government. I was sorry that the hon. member made that remark. What has been done in that direction is, considering all the circumstances, a credit to the Government. I think I can claim that the present Government has done more than has any other in Australia in that regard; yet the hon. member complained that the Government had not done enough, and even said the farmers had not received fair treatment. It will be recalled that the first serious depredations from grasshoppers were experienced in Western Australia in 1926, when portions of the North-Eastern wheat belt were infested. Warnings as to the likelihood of such outbreaks following the extensive clearing operations which had been undertaken for some years had been uttered by

the Government Entomologist from time to time, and a close study of the situation had been made by him ever since the first signs of danger appeared.

Following the 1926 outbreak, little damage was done until 1935, when dry seasonal conditions again produced plague numbers in portions of the wheat belt. The three succeeding seasons have all been marked by a light rainfall, and many portions of the wheat belt have had the unique experience of witnessing four consecutive grasshopper plagues. This represented a serious problem affecting not only the settlers but also the Government. The department recognised the seriousness of the situation and did everything within its power to meet the conditions as it knew them. That greater losses have not resulted from the unprecedented conditions is due to the very active grasshopper campaign undertaken by the Government. This is what was done: Maps defining the egg laying areas of the pest have been prepared each year from information gathered by the field officers of the Agricultural Bank, and by this means it has been possible for officers of the department to keep a careful watch upon areas from which danger might be expected. In 1935 nearly £900 worth of baiting material was distributed free to farmers through road boards. In 1936, 273 tons of baiting material was made available at a cost of £2,647, and mixing depots were organised at various plague centres. In 1937, the sum of £9,000 was expended in baiting and spraying operations, and the following ingredients were distributed to over 30 road boards:—

716 tons of bran,  
127 tons of molasses,  
14 tons of brown sugar,  
17 tons of arsenite of soda,  
1 ton of white arsenic,  
8 spray outfits and tanks.

In addition, the Government arranged, through the Agricultural Bank, for the breaking up of 72,000 acres of abandoned holdings, known to be breeding grounds, at a cost of £13,000. Many thousands of acres were also leased for cropping at reduced rentals; in all, approximately 180,000 acres of land was treated as a direct response to the Government's anti-grasshopper campaign. During the last three years approximately £25,000 has been expended by the Government on grasshopper control, with an estimated saving of crops in the vicinity of

£1,000,000. Throughout these plague years frequent visits to infested areas have been made by officers of the Agricultural Department, and every modern means of grasshopper control has been investigated.

Close co-operation has existed between local entomologists and outside authorities, including officers of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Canberra, and the Imperial Bureau of Entomology, London. Two representatives of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Dr. Key, Research Officer appointed to work on the grasshopper problem, and Dr. Nicholson, Chief Entomologist, have been conducted on tours of the grasshopper areas, and both have expressed themselves strongly in accord with the measures taken to control the pest. A recent conference of Commonwealth and State entomologists held in Melbourne was attended by the Government Entomologist, and the grasshopper problem was discussed from a national as well as from a State point of view. During recent years more money has been expended by the Government of this State on grasshopper control than has been expended by all the other States combined. Consequently, no legitimate claim for baiting material from any centre has been refused, and results have shown that the outlay has been fully justified. This season approximately £1,000 worth of bait has already been distributed and extensive ploughing operations are again under way. An area of 24,000 acres has already been leased or let by contract, while additional large areas have been let at reduced rentals on condition that they are broken up. A communication from the Acting Minister for Agriculture appeared in the "West Australian" of the 5th July, 1938, stating that grasshopper control measures would be conducted this season on lines similar to those employed last year. The conditions referred to were—

- (1) The Government to deliver free baiting material to any railway siding.
- (2) The cost of mixing bait to be met by the Government at the ruling basic wage.
- (3) Free petrol to be supplied to indigent farmers who would otherwise be unable to obtain the bait they require. These farmers are to be nominated by the roads boards.

Further to facilitate the control of the grasshopper, and because doubts were expressed as to whether under the Plant Diseases Act sufficient powers were given to

enable the Government to enforce the drastic steps necessary for the eradication of the pest, grasshoppers have now been declared vermin. In view of the published announcement of the Acting Minister for Agriculture concerning the provision of free baiting material, the gazettal of grasshoppers as vermin cannot be interpreted as tantamount to throwing the onus of the destruction of the pest on the settlers themselves, as Mr. Hamersley has suggested. Under the provisions of the Act, vermin boards are not only empowered to appoint their own inspectors to enforce and supervise the carrying out of the Government's recommendations, but also to spend their own funds, when necessary, for this purpose. In previous years the boards have incurred various expenses for grasshopper eradication, but were not legally empowered so to do. As a result their activities have been hampered, and commitments have been confined to amounts such as could be entered up against the three per cents.

The farmers, therefore, far from being a "section of the community that has not received fair treatment in respect of the grasshopper pest," have been treated more liberally by the Government in this direction than have been settlers in the other States of the Commonwealth by their respective Governments. The gazettal of the pest as vermin, since it has as its main object the strengthening of the already vigorous campaign being waged against the grasshopper scourge, should be a matter for approbation rather than criticism. What I have said is ample refutation of the charge that the Government has not given the farmers fair treatment in this matter.

Strong comment was made by Mr. Piesse on the attitude of the Transport Board to local country tours. During the course of his remarks, he stated that the Transport Board would not permit country centres "to develop their own small tours for the purpose of enabling local residents to gain knowledge of the district." In support of these strictures he mentioned a case that occurred in Bunbury. A resident had exhibited in his window a notice that a tour to the Caves was being arranged, but the Transport Board had notified him that he must remove the notice. Upon enquiry I learn that in the instance referred to by the hon. member, objection was raised by the Transport Board to the person concerned endeavouring

to secure passengers for transport to Yallingup Caves and elsewhere, at separate fares, without having first secured the necessary authority in accordance with the provisions of the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933. For the convenience of operators, the Transport Board has authorised the Town Clerk, Bunbury, to issue permits for special trips for the conveyance of passengers at separate fares. If, therefore, such a permit had been obtained, no objection would have been taken to advertising the tour with a view to securing passengers. As to the hon. member's suggestion that the Transport Board is not sympathetic towards the promotion of country tours, I would point out that during the last financial year 1,890 permits of the nature referred to were issued by the board. In all cases, applications for permits are considered in relation to the existing facilities, and, when justified by the circumstances, permits are granted. In view of the importance that I attach to the tourist traffic of Western Australia, which I have always strongly encouraged, I thought it worth while to look into the matter so as to give the House the actual facts.

Hon. W. J. Mann: That idea may be comforting, but possibly a party may not be able to obtain a permit. That frequently happens.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I should say that the Town Clerk of Bunbury, who is keenly interested in the district, would attend to the matter.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You will have to improve a little on that idea.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There must be some method of granting permits. We cannot allow a person to commit breaches of the Transport Act. The Transport Board is prepared to make facilities available. I suggest that a telephone call to the Town Clerk's office would get over the difficulty.

In criticising the lay-out of the port wheat terminal at Bunbury, Mr. Thomson was not very helpful. He merely suggested that something more modern should have been installed, but he might have told us the nature of the installation he had in mind. He should be in a unique position to do this, since he has spent a lifetime in association with works and buildings. As far as I know—and I am assured by the Director of Works that it is so—the installation has, as far as possible, been erected on orthodox

and approved lines. I would explain to the hon. member that the conditions at Bunbury are unusual and required special treatment. This installation has been the subject of much investigation and many consultations with engineers and other experts in the Eastern States who are closely associated with the designing and operating of terminals. Generally speaking, terminals are concentrated units, storage bins being placed close to the shipping berth for convenience of transfer therefrom to the ship. At Bunbury this was impossible owing to the berth being at the end of a jetty about a mile long. To transfer the wheat from the storage to the ship by means of belts would be technically possible, but with the relatively small quantity to be handled it was economically out of the question. As I have indicated, the storage bins and the equipment follow regular and orthodox practice. Contrary to the hon. member's impression, the party most interested in the terminal—presumably Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited—was advised of the proposals in the early stages of their formulation and discussed them with departmental officers. Bulk handling facilities at Bunbury have of late been the subject of much discussion.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It is a most difficult proposition.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is. Our departmental engineers, instead of being criticised, might have been given some credit for improvising—of course, with the assistance of others—a scheme that has proved to be satisfactory.

In criticising the Railway Department, Mr. Wood urged that the Commissioner should do something to make passenger services more attractive, and suggested that a parlour coach should be put on the Albany run. I referred the hon. member's remarks to the Commissioner, who has replied as follows:—

There are only two parlour coaches (lounge cars) in service, and they are fully utilised on the "Westland" and ordinary Kalgoorlie express trains. A third car is at present being fitted up at Midland Junction workshops and should be available for traffic in the near future. The question of how it is to be utilised has yet to be decided.

The Commissioner has offered the following comment on the hon. member's remark about the necessity for speeding up services:—

The Kalgoorlie train referred to by the hon. member as doing the trip from Perth to Nor-

tham in two hours 33 minutes is the "Westland," a non-stop train with a strictly limited load. Most of the time saved by this train is due to the elimination of stops at refreshment stations, as each passenger is required to purchase meals in the dining car. A special express train scheduled on a much faster time table than the ordinary one is run to Albany once a week; and, from the patronage offering, only the one trip a week is warranted at present. The time occupied by this train on the journey to York is 3 hours 34 minutes. The Diesel-electric rail cars provide a service on Monday, Wednesday and Friday to York, the distance being covered in 3 hours 9 minutes. In the circumstances, insofar as rail communication with the city is concerned, York has apparently little to complain about.

When speaking on the Railway Department, Mr. E. H. H. Hall stated that he was—

considerably perturbed, in looking through the report of the Commissioner, to find no mention of an equalisation or financial adjustment between the Midland Railway Company and the Railway Department.

Continuing, the hon. member said—

The State Railways cannot show their shareholders—the people—a profit, but it is our duty to ensure that their interests are protected.

I submitted the hon. member's comments to the Commissioner of Railways, who has replied as follows:—

The original contract granted the company by the Government of Western Australia for the construction, equipment, maintenance and working of the line now known as the Midland railway, provided for the interchange and working of the traffic between the two systems to the greatest convenience of the public.

Furthermore, the covenant provided that the working of the railway, etc., and the division and apportionment of tolls, rates and charges should be as mutually agreed on between the two parties; any matters in which agreement could not be reached to be settled by arbitration.

Certain disputes and differences which arose subsequently, and on which finality could not be reached, necessitated recourse to such action, the arbitrator appointed being a Commissioner of the New South Wales Government Railways, whose award, which operated from the 1st January, 1927, is in force to-day. The award provides adequate protection of the rights of the Commissioner as well as those of the company in respect of all phases of railway operations, such as accountancy payments, terminal charges, loading and unloading services, etc., and interchange of rolling stock and equipment and, it might be mentioned, is working to the entire satisfaction of both parties. Details of the inter-system traffic are not shown in the annual report of the Commissioner of Railways nor, to my mind, is there any necessity to do so.

When moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply, Mr. W. R. Hall was severely critical of the Main Roads Department's attitude towards the Eastern Goldfields. I submit, however, that when due consideration is given to all factors, the hon. member will realise that residents in his province have not been unfairly treated. It must be realised that the policy of the Main Roads Department is to serve the needs of traffic in proportion to its density, having regard also to other transport facilities, such as railways, that localities enjoy. The daily railway service between Perth and Kalgoorlie greatly minimises any disability under which the travelling public labours by reason of the incomplete condition of sections of the road between Perth and Kalgoorlie. Moreover, the density of traffic over this road, particularly the section between Merredin and Coolgardie, cannot be compared with that between, say, Perth and Bunbury, and Perth and Albany. It is for these two reasons that, in the past, the section between Merredin and Coolgardie has not been declared a main road. The department, in endeavouring to follow the policy of first things first, must inevitably cause disappointment in certain quarters, but it must be borne in mind that the funds at its command are not unlimited, and they must consequently be parcelled out to the best advantage.

The current year's programme includes the completion of the bituminous surfacing as far as Merredin. The department has undertaken similarly to construct the road thence to Southern Cross a distance of 70 miles, within the next two years, and to service the whole road to keep it reasonably trafficable meanwhile. To that end it has placed power graders permanently on the road between Merredin and Coolgardie. Members may have gained the impression from Mr. Hall's remarks, that the road had been entirely neglected in the past, but that is far from being the position. During the past ten years £400,000 has been spent between Perth and Merredin, and £100,000 between Merredin and Kalgoorlie, making a total of half a million pounds during the period. In addition to this, other considerable amounts have been spent on other roads on the Eastern Goldfields, notably £26,000 on the Broad Arrow Road in recent years.

It is not to be thought that the road between Merredin and Coolgardie is uniformly

bad; there are sections which become difficult to negotiate after rain, and to which attention is given as soon as conditions permit. Generally, however, the road is serviceable, and this is evidenced by the time records that are from time to time established by those who make that journey.

Strong criticism of State battery charges was expressed by Mr. Baxter. As members may be aware there are 21 batteries departmentally controlled, many of them in very remote districts. It has been the accepted policy of Governments in the past to provide for a uniform charge at all centres and when the advisability of this point is conceded the question of charges and cost of treatment must be taken over the whole system. The extraction obtained at State batteries is high. During 1937, 102,800 tons were milled with a head value of 12.84 dwts. The recovery by amalgamation was 8.79 dwts. per ton, the whole of which is handed to the prospector after crushing charges are paid.

The average value of the tailings treated was 3.62 dwts., and the average residue value 0.90 dwts. The diversity of the material treated and the fact that 42.9 per cent. of the tailings produced averaged only 1.39 dwts. per ton suggests that an average residue of less than 1 dwt. is satisfactory, and could compare with the extraction obtained at larger and more expensively equipped mines.

Since the State batteries were primarily erected to permit prospectors to sample their shows in bulk, the policy of the Government has been to keep the crushing charge as low as possible. The present scale of crushing charges was introduced in 1909. Naturally, in small centres where only small plants can be kept going, the proportion of the wages cost to the total treatment is very high and the incidence of the increase in wages and concession to wage earners by way of insurance, the 44-hour week, and annual holidays has tended to increase the cost of crushing very considerably since the present charges were first adopted. Owing to the increased efficiency of the mill the actual cost of crushings to prospectors has been reduced, since apart from the charge of 10s. 6d. per ton, prospectors can crush on time, and the cost per ton under this provision is less than it was in 1909. The concession recently granted by the Government

of the payment of the full fine price for gold is one that is not granted by other crushing plants. Privately-owned batteries, almost without exception, deduct 3 dwts. to cover the cost of treatment and pay at the £4 per ounce rate. The fact that State Batteries have no competitors suggests that the charges are reasonable. Mr. Baxter said that the total cyanide charges are 22s. per ton, whereas the actual revenue per ton for 1936 was 13s. 5.8d.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: How did you arrive at that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member has pointed his remarks on tailings charges by quoting three crushings from Halley's Comet Mine at Marble Bar. These crushings are the most remarkable crushings ever put through the State Battery system, so far as the value of the tailings is concerned, and, whilst the revenue received by the department was considerable, it made no very appreciable effect on the average revenue received for tailings during the year.

The figures for a centre like Peak Hill, which is practically dependent on the State Battery, give the other side of the question. The battery crushed 5,981 tons during the year, at a cost to the prospector of 7s. 1.1d. per ton, and at a cost to the department of 11s. 6.6d. The average value of the tailings was 1.18 dwts. and the cost of treatment was 6s. 10d., and, although the tailings treatment was low for this isolated district, the revenue was slightly less than the cost per ton.

If Mr. Baxter wishes to compare the cost of State Batteries with those of privately owned mines, he should take, for example, plants that were somewhat comparable in size with our State batteries and not one of the major mines of the Commonwealth, producing in one month 50 per cent. of the total yearly output at State batteries. If he does so I am sure he will find that the costs at State batteries compare very favourably with privately owned plants. That this is so is borne out by the fact that the Western Mining Corporation and the Bernaldes group of mines use the State batteries very extensively for the treatment of their developmental ore, and I might mention, incidentally, that the Blue Bird Mine at Norseman, which is crushing large parcels regularly at our State battery, is quite content with the treatment charges, notwithstanding

the fact that its tailings at times exceed 3 ozs. per ton.

A statement was also made by Mr. Baxter that at nearly all Government plants the tonnage of the ore is calculated by measurement. That is not so, as 12 of our batteries, handling 65 per cent. of the total tonnage, are equipped with weighbridges, and notwithstanding the insinuation that the people at the battery see that they are well protected, the estimation of the tonnage by measurement has given every satisfaction. His remarks will not be appreciated by either the outback batteries' staff or the prospectors who have every confidence in the management.

Reference was made by Mr. Dimmitt to the Government's unemployment policy. The hon. member did not have a proper understanding of the position, and it is necessary, therefore for me to point out that his statements, which may be repeated in various places, are likely to give a wrong impression about an important subject. I wish to correct the hon. member in one or two statements that he made, and when he hears my explanation he will realise that his statements cannot by any stretch of the imagination be borne out by the facts.

The hon. member pointed out that since the present Government took office, employment in business establishments had been swelled by over 8,000 additional hands, and that the building trade had also absorbed a large number of men over the same period. But then he went on to say, "The fact that nothing it has done has provided work, or any prospect of work for the 6,500 men, is evidence of the Government's failure to cope with the unemployment problem. I have come to the conclusion that the Government's so-called unemployment policy—if it can be described by so grandiose a term as a policy—has broken down of its own weight." It would be interesting to know what the hon. member really means by that statement. Can Mr. Dimmitt name any State or country in the world where private enterprise finds employment for all the workers, or does he even suggest that such was once the case in Western Australia?

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Yes, Russia.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have always had our quota of unemployed, and I propose to show that the position to-day is an improvement compared with the period before the depression.

Hon. J. Cornell: It ought to be better; you are now getting an extra million a year revenue.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I pointed out previously that although there has been an increase in taxation as mentioned by the hon. member, there has also been a very large decrease in the amount of loan moneys available to the respective Governments, and, in addition, over 75 per cent. of the revenue of the Government is required to meet the public debt and for servicing our public utilities. Had the hon. member been here previously he would have realised that an increase in taxation receipts is not the important factor that he and some other members endeavour to make it appear.

Referring to the progressive recovery in Western Australia up to 1936, the Commonwealth Grants Commission in its fourth report, paragraph 65, made a comment which I shall quote. In view of the important place the Commission occupies in the affairs of the Commonwealth, I think it can be regarded as a competent authority. The comment is as follows:—

The reduction in unemployment to about pre-depression volume, and the consequent large increase in wage income provided such a stimulus that the State was early in moving out of the trough of depression.

Amongst the business indicators adduced by the Commission as showing the course of recovery is an index of unemployment. This index, with the three year average 1926/1925 = base 100, is as follows:—

Three year average	..	..	100
1931	..	..	231
1932	..	..	250
1933	..	..	210
1934	..	..	151
1935	..	..	114
1936	..	..	69*
1937	..	..	45*
1938 (June quarter)	..	..	45*

\* Commission's index brought up to date.

Where we had a base of 100 in the years 1926 to 1928, for 1937 the equivalent was 48 and for the June quarter of 1938 it was reduced to 45. So actually unemployment to-day is less than it was before the depression, notwithstanding the check the State has sustained through the drought and the decline in export prices.

The following table sets forth a comparison of percentage unemployment in the

several Australian States for the years 1928/29, 1932/33, and 1937/38:—

	1928/29.	1932/33.	1937/38.
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
New South Wales	10.6	31.2	10.0
Victoria	9.7	24.8	8.2
Queensland	7.0	17.4	6.9
South Australia	14.6	32.0	7.3
Western Australia	9.1	28.0	5.4
Tasmania	10.4	22.4	10.0
Australia	10.2	27.5	8.5

What I have quoted shows that our unemployment policy, or rather should I call it our employment policy, instead of having as Mr. Dinmity declared broken down of its own weight, has had the opposite effect; and may I again suggest that in matters of this kind, if members want to be reasonable and fair, it is well for them to ascertain the actual facts and to give credit to the Government for improvements that it has effected.

It is pertinent that I should inform the House what the Government has done in providing unemployment relief. When the Government assumed office in April, 1933, the weekly earnings of married men on relief work was limited to £1 more than their approved sustenance rates, with a maximum of £3. Even if men were entitled to allowances, such as margins for skill or holiday pay, in no instance were they permitted to exceed those maximum earnings. A survey of the conditions at present governing employment on relief work, discloses the extent to which the Government has been able to improve matters during its term of office. As a result of successive increases in the amount of work allotted to each man according to his family responsibilities, no married man to-day receives less than an average of £3 3s. 5d. per week. A great number of men receive the basic wage or more for the entire duration of the work on which they are engaged. Apart from this, notable improvements have been effected in other directions. Thus all men engaged on relief work receive the full benefit of margins for skill, holiday pay, and increases in the basic wage, whereas under the previous Government increases of this kind did not result in any material benefit to the workers concerned, as they were simply stood down for a longer period, the Government having set a maximum rate of pay that could not be exceeded.

In contrast to that principle, the present Government has stipulated that the men are not to receive less than a stated minimum amount, but they may earn more. Whereas under the previous Government the weekly earnings of a man with a wife and no children were limited to £1 14s., to-day his minimum weekly earnings are £3 3s. 5d. The following sets forth the present scale of work for a man with a family:—

	Average Weekly Earnings.	
	£	s. d.
Man with wife—6 weeks on, 2 weeks off	3	3 5
Man with wife and 1 child—7 weeks on, 2 weeks off	3	5 10
Man with wife and 2 children—7 weeks on, 1 week off	3	14 1
Man with wife and 3 children or more—full-time for the duration of the work.		

To-day a relief worker is permitted to perform work privately up to the value of the basic wage during the period he is not doing relief work. Under the previous Government his working period on relief work was correspondingly reduced. The present Government also increased the earnings of single men on relief work from 25s. 3d. to 30s. per week. The actual time taken to earn that amount has since been adopted as a standard, and single men now work for a fixed time and thus receive the benefit of increases in the basic wage. Accordingly, at present their average weekly earnings are 32s. 5d. per week.

To enable single men to seek private employment, the Government instituted a system whereby they might be allowed to earn an additional sum of £9. During the winter months single men in the South-West were allowed to earn an additional £5 to enable them to purchase clothes and other necessary comforts, while single men in other parts of the State were granted an increase of 4s. per week to compensate them for the higher cost of living in their respective districts.

It will be recalled that when the Government assumed office, 36 per cent. of the total number provided for by the Government were in receipt of sustenance only. The corresponding figure to-day is 5 per cent., as a result of a policy that has enabled a greater number of those engaged on relief to share the work provided—a different state of affairs from that mentioned by Mr. Dimmitt who seemed to assume that the 6,500 men

were unemployed, whereas actually they were employed by the Government. Included amongst those previously on sustenance was a considerable number of men unable to do the ordinary work provided because of some physical disability. Special work to suit those men has been undertaken, and many of them have already been found employment.

Among the important improvements effected by the present Government was the closing of Blackboy Camp, which had cost the State £122,000, and the discontinuance of the scheme whereby the previous Government, in co-operation with the various local authorities, employed men to the extent of the sustenance rates only. The unemployed single men in Blackboy Camp were put into profitable employment, and the men working under the other scheme were absorbed in reproductive work. In its endeavours to improve the condition of men employed on relief work, the Government has been severely handicapped by the rising cost of materials and the reduction in the State's allocation of loan moneys for works. It becomes more difficult each year to find works in which the amount payable for wages is not heavily outweighed by the cost of materials. This is illustrated by the following figures, which show the high proportion of expenditure at present absorbed by materials in three representative undertakings:—

	Wages per Man Employed each week.		Materials, etc., per Man Employed each week.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
Goldfields Water Supply ...	4	8 6	3	14 1
Metropolitan Water Supply	4	0 2	4	16 10
Main Roads (Trust) ...	4	0 6	4	9 10

Consequently the money available does not go so far as it did formerly in relation to the employment of a similar number of men for a similar period. That is a real difficulty. I as a metropolitan member receive many complaints from my constituents that they have to go into the country. On the other hand, members of this House complain that the Government does not do enough work in the country owing to doing too much in the metropolitan area. That idea has been exploded. But the fact of our having to find work in the country in the way I have mentioned is a disability that is perhaps not sufficiently understood. Every attention is being given by the Government and by the engineers to the possibility of finding for these men work that is either directly or in-

directly reproductive and such as will enable the money to be spent mainly on wages instead of on materials to be used in the job, which materials are obtained largely from outside Western Australia.

Hon. members will realise, too, that in general the works which enable the greatest amount of expenditure to be paid in wages are not always the most desirable from the aspect of reproductivity. This is more than ever the position to-day, at a time following the concentration of works on enterprises which absorbed the maximum amount of labour for a given amount of expenditure. Then again, a certain amount of expenditure in recent years has necessarily been devoted to works which do not provide direct employment to any of the men dependent on the Government. In this category are the purchase of rolling stock for the Railway Department, the erection of public buildings, and so on. While expenditure on works such as these has stimulated industry and earned more revenue for the Government, it has not, except indirectly, assisted the Government to provide full-time work on relief employment.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The production of materials employs a great deal of labour.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In some cases it does. In others it means the importation of materials from outside the State. In yet other cases the labour employed in the production of materials is small relatively to the total cost of the materials.

A suggestion made by Mr. Dimmitt was that the Government's capital assets were rapidly deteriorating for want of maintenance, and that in this direction we should spend more money than we have been spending. For several years past, one item in particular, known at all events in this House as belated repairs, and applying more especially to the railways, has necessitated the expenditure of large amounts, running into hundreds of thousands of pounds, simply because the previous Government had not maintained Government assets in the manner in which they should have been maintained. It has been necessary for this Government to find the money required in an endeavour to overtake those belated repairs. We are not afraid of any criticism of our activities in that direction. If Mr. Dimmitt cares to look up the figures, he will find that they run into many hundreds of thousands of pounds. Therefore, this Government cannot

be accused of having neglected to maintain State assets, as has been suggested. I grant that there are many of those assets which would be improved by some attention, but everything cannot be done at one time. The hon. member will recognise that. It is just as well to quote figures showing the amount of money spent on maintenance from revenue—

#### ASSETS: MAINTENANCE FROM REVENUE.

	1934-35.	1935-36.	1936-37.*
	£	£	£
Railways .....	962,372	1,074,030	1,167,894
Goldfields Water Supply .....	62,018	54,274	54,819
Electricity Supply .....	48,893	46,350	40,117
Metropolitan Water Supply .....	33,482	31,415	32,314
Public Buildings .....	21,933	41,959	40,183
Other Hydraulic Under-			
takings .....	23,148	28,021	36,055
Other Maintenance .....	62,504	65,550	88,198
	<u>1,209,540</u>	<u>1,341,509</u>	<u>1,477,580</u>

\* 1937-38 figures not available.

Certain maintenance is charged to loan. During 1936-37 such expenditure amounted to £93,097. The details are—

	£
Point Samson Jetty .....	46,748
Fremantle Harbour Trust (Victoria Quay Renewals) .....	37,114
Other Maintenance .....	9,235
	<u>£93,097</u>

The figures show each year an increase of between £130,000 and £140,000 in expenditure on maintenance alone. Thus there is not much in the advice tendered by Mr. Dimmitt to this Government, though it might well have been offered to some other Government.

Youth employment is a question very much to the fore at the present time. Several members have referred to it, and Mr. Bolton charged the Government with having done very little, if anything, towards improving the position of youth employment. Presumably the hon. member is not aware of the Government's activities in this regard. To-day over 7,000 youths are being trained in technical and vocational training, and all of them are being trained for employment, or for promotion from employment which at present gives little or no prospect of advancement. Even greater facilities are under consideration, but final determination had necessarily to be delayed pending the settlement of a permanent site for technical training. Notwithstanding that the Commonwealth grant will be the means of providing buildings, the maintenance will be an ever-increasing cost to the State. The reference to the Government's failure to give effect to the findings of Mr. Justice Wolff,

who was appointed a Royal Commissioner to investigate the whole position of youth, is not correct. As hon. members well know, in the opening Speech special reference was made to proposed legislation to deal not only with this aspect, but with other aspects deemed to provide a greater field of employment for youth and also for adult citizens. The suggestion of the hon. member that the Government's inactivity in this regard is due to the possibility of displacing adult workers is ludicrous. As a matter of fact, if youths are put out of employment on attaining a certain age, it is due to the action of employers in private industry. That is well-known.

Respecting the Boys' Employment League, which is not now functioning, the hon. member—who was associated with that organisation—should know very well the reasons why it is not now in existence. It was intimated in the Press that the Government had decided to establish a branch of the Employment Department to deal with youths; but the members of the executive of the Boys' Employment League were informed that the Government would have no objection to their continuing their operations, though the staffing of such an organisation could not be agreed to by the Government. I take this opportunity of expressing, on behalf of the Government, thanks for the work that the Boys' Employment League and other similar organisations have done and are doing to assist in the youth problem.

At the same time the figures quoted by Mr. Bolton cannot be accepted, especially when he makes the statement that such figures do not include replacements. Then again, the deductions made by the hon. member as to the economic losses from fewer positions being obtained since the Government took over these activities are somewhat mythical, and are consistent with some of the statements and statistics that appeared from time to time when the league was in operation. But notwithstanding these aspects, the Government appreciates the work that was done. I am assured by the Minister controlling the department that the work now being performed in providing employment for youth is being carried out quite as effectively as that done by the Boys' Employment League, and the figures furnished in reply to the hon. member's question are definite. We believe that the system now in operation of recording registrations and engagements is

such as to give a truer indication of the numbers placed.

Replying to the remarks of Mr. Thomson regarding the Commonwealth grant for youth employment, I point out that the amount of the grant was only £14,000, and that the Commonwealth Government intimated that preference should be given to proposals that would enable the money to be spent on capital expenditure, such as the purchase of land, erection of buildings, installation of machinery, equipment, etc. The whole of the grant has been allotted to items that come within the specifications laid down by the Commonwealth. Of the £14,000, at least one-half was spent either on the Goldfields or in the country districts. According to Mr. Thomson nothing is being done for the young men of 19 to 20 years of age. As previously stated, there are to-day over 7,000 youths being trained in technical and vocational occupations, and of this number 1,170 are between the ages of 18 and 21, while 479 have passed their twenty-first year. Therefore that statement was not as accurate as it might have been. Regarding the hon. member's statement about age restrictions on apprentices, I direct his attention to the fact that there is a large number of apprentices who are 21 or over, and that no fewer than 114 such apprentices are attending the Perth Technical College alone. Much more might be said on that subject, but there will be other opportunities to discuss it.

Questions were raised by Mr. Baxter regarding regulations gazetted under the Native Administration Act. He referred to specific regulations such as the one dealing with mosquito nets. There will be an opportunity to deal more exhaustively with that matter than is possible to-night, but to one or two points he endeavoured to make I should like to reply. He said—

By the gazettal of the regulations on the 29th April last, the department itself is seeking to get more power than Parliament intended it should have or than is good for the native or the State.

In support of this statement, he referred to specific regulations, some of which moved him to irony. Referring to Regulation 81 (b), which stipulates that "bedding and mosquito nets and ground sheet as required shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Commissioner," the hon. member asked—

Where shall we finish? The native must have a mosquito net! The regulation is ridi-

culous, especially when members bear in mind that Regulation 36 makes no reference to mosquito nets.

To this I reply that surely the hon. member is not aware of the facts. Throughout the North mosquito nets are commonly used during certain seasons of the year, and life without them even for the natives would be intolerable. A few years ago tertian malaria made its appearance in the Kimberleys, and since 1933 we have records of the deaths of a large number of natives from the incidence of malaria. Probably the greater proportion of the deaths in 1933-34 was due to tertian malaria. There are certain possible endemic centres, and in those districts nets are essential. The department has supplied mosquito nets to indigents and employees at its own stations and hospitals in the North, and at one or two ration camps. Even native prisoners in gaols in the North have been supplied with nets.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The regulation does not apply to that portion of the State only.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is no need to stipulate that it shall apply to the North only, because provision is made for mosquito nets to be provided to the satisfaction of the Commissioner. Many of the regulations contain similar qualifying words. Does Mr. Baxter suggest that the Commissioner would say mosquito nets shall be provided for all natives in the State? He knows full well the Commissioner would not do that. Members, however, will note that the regulation says "as required," which implies that employers living in malaria-infested areas may be asked to supply mosquito nets for native workers in the event of an outbreak, or because of frequent malarial visitations. Does Mr. Baxter suggest that there is anything ridiculous in that, particularly as experience has shown the necessity for it? Although the hon. member maintains that he has never had occasion to protect himself against mosquitoes when in the North, I venture to suggest that he will find very few people in that area who do not sleep either under a net or in a mosquito-proof room for a good portion of the year. I cannot see anything ridiculous in the regulation, and people possessing a knowledge of the North agree with me and with the Government that such provision is absolutely necessary. Very few people of the North indeed would be prepared to sleep without a mosquito net during a consider-

able part of the year. If the hon. member perused the Queensland regulations, he would realise how advanced they are as compared even with those of which he complains.

The hon. member also referred to Regulation 39 which provides—

All letters to and from the inmates of an institution shall pass through the hands of the superintendent or manager, who may, in his discretion, withhold them from transmission or return them to the writers.

While this procedure has not previously been laid down by regulation, it has been adopted in practice ever since there have been settlements. The same procedure is adopted in other institutions; there is a similar provision in the Child Welfare regulations. Not to exercise this power would be definitely dangerous, as the hon. member would soon ascertain for himself if he had the handling of the correspondence.

Another point raised by Mr. Baxter was the legality of station owners or managers holding small supplies of morphia. This matter will, of course, be considered by the department. However, he went on to say that he could not understand the department's reason for the regulation dealing with the provision of first aid and medical necessities. The list of medical requirements was supplied by the medical officer attached to the department—Dr. Davis—who, in the light of experience, considered the provision necessary.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Morphia was the one to which I objected.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Regulation 85 dealing with the wages of natives is also considered by Mr. Baxter to be ridiculous. Contrary to the practice in Queensland, we do not insist that all wages of natives shall be paid to the department through its various officers and protectors. However, there are individual cases in which it is necessary to safeguard such wages, and for that reason the Commissioner must be empowered to have the payments to him in trust for the native. As members are no doubt aware a similar practice is followed in the case of most State wards at institutions for white inmates. A definite provision to this effect is included in the regulations of the Child Welfare Department.

The object of Regulation 85 is to ensure that the native receives his earnings. Generally speaking, and except in the case of trainees, the power conferred under this

regulation is not exercised, but it is required occasionally. We simply stipulate that a proportion of the wages shall be paid into a trust fund for the native. A separate account is opened with the Commonwealth Bank, a bank book is provided, and the money is kept there for the use of the native. That is done to protect the interests of the native, to ensure that he is paid the amount to which he is entitled, and further to ensure that he does not squander the money he earns.

Hon. L. Craig: Who shall say whether he squanders it, the Commissioner?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This provision applies largely to boys and girls trained in State institutions and sent out to positions. A girl might be paid 15s. a week, of which she would receive 2s. 6d. while the balance of 12s. 6d. would be paid into her account. Upon the money so saved she could draw as desired. This is done by agreement under the regulation, and Mr. Baxter objects to the regulation.

Hon. L. Craig: But who shall determine whether the money is squandered, the Commissioner?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes. We know of many natives who, immediately they receive their pay, weekly, monthly, or quarterly, have a certain way of getting rid of it, and some protection is necessary in those cases.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I agree with you so far as you have gone, but there is no limit to the regulation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Let me emphasise another difference between our regulations and those of Queensland. Here the money is paid to the credit of the individual, but in Queensland a percentage is paid to the credit of a common fund, which is utilised by the Government for the benefit of all other natives. That fund to-day has a credit in the vicinity of half a million. The position here is entirely different. In Queensland it is provided that the money belonging to these people shall be paid through the protectors to the department. I shall later on have an opportunity of dealing with these particular regulations.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Where are the regulations? Have they been laid upon the Table of the House?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not yet. I shall be in a position to show the House

that, notwithstanding the ridicule which has been heaped upon some of the regulations, they are essential and so much in the interests of the natives that there is little in them to complain of. We do not exercise our rights with adults, except in exceptional cases, but with respect to juniors we endeavour in every case, by agreement with the employer, to ensure that before the boy or girl is employed, an arrangement of this kind shall be made.

Hon. L. Craig: You have to sign a contract, do you not, that when you employ a minor you have to pay one-third of the wage to the institution?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not to the institution, and not in the case of natives.

Hon. L. Craig: I am talking about a ward of the State.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is so in regard to the Child Welfare Department, but in the case of the Native Affairs Department, that percentage, whether it be 10, 20 or even up to 75 per cent., is paid into a separate trust account for the individual native. If members will look at the annual report of the Commissioner for Native Affairs, they will obtain a full account of the activities of the department in that direction. There is a large number of such accounts for natives, and a fairly considerable sum of money is involved.

The Government's decision to introduce a five-day working week in its administrative offices has called for some interesting and—to be charitable—some very misleading comments. Mr. Holmes said—

This country cannot go on paying an increased basic wage and reducing hours of work to civil servants and others on the eve of a general election.

Mr. Nicholson suggested—

This matter might have been more deeply considered before it was actually decided upon, because it will be bound to have a reaction that we can hardly contemplate at this stage.

Other members made similar statements, all of which seemed to imply that the Government had no right to take any action in the interests of the community in the year next preceding a general election.

As members are probably aware, the Public Service Commissioner, in his report for the year 1936-37, suggested that greater efficiency might be achieved in the public offices through an adjustment of hours providing for a five-day week. In May last, a

combined deputation, representing the Civil Service Association and the Railway Officers' Union, waited on the Premier to request the Government's consideration of their case for a five-day week. After the fullest enquiries had been made, and the Government was satisfied that there would be no extra cost, and that arrangements could be made to suit the convenience of the public, it was decided to adopt the proposal. Under the new arrangement, officers work the same number of hours as previously, notwithstanding Mr. Holmes's statement to the contrary. Provision has been made for cashiers to be in attendance for the receipt of cash on Saturday mornings, for the Land Titles Office to open as required by statute, and for offices in country centres to remain open on Saturday either with a full or a skeleton staff as may be required.

Hon. L. Craig: Do they get overtime for that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, they get time off. Skeleton staffs will be in attendance at most metropolitan offices until the new arrangements are working smoothly. If the experience of the Commonwealth service, and of the services of New South Wales and Tasmania, may be accepted as a guide, it will probably be unnecessary to maintain the skeleton staffs for any length of time. In those services skeleton staffs, which were retained when the five-day week was first inaugurated, were subsequently dispensed with as they were not required by the public.

A letter received from the Public Service Office, Hobart, Tasmania, mentions, *inter alia*—

So far as the closing of Government offices on Saturday mornings is concerned, no complaint has emanated from the public or from any direction.

There is a strong presumption that greater efficiency will accrue through the new adjustment of hours. In this connection I will quote from a letter received from the Chairman of the Public Service Board of New South Wales—

An exhaustive search and careful examination of the reports were made to ascertain if the records would supply sufficient data to enable me to give you comparative figures indicating the result of the change. This has taken considerable time, but, unfortunately, there is insufficient material upon which to base any mathematical conclusion, although the reports clearly indicate the five-day working

week tends to greater efficiency, as well as having a beneficial effect from a recuperative point of view.

In other departments the adoption of the five-day week has resulted in a reduction of overtime.

Officers, too, are more contented by reason of the elimination of Saturday morning work. No statistics are available to indicate the effect on sick leave of officers, but, in the board's opinion, the recuperative benefits resulting from the allowance of two full days free from duty at the end of each week tend towards greater efficiency and an increased output, as well as improving the general well-being of officers.

There is every reason to anticipate that similar beneficial results will accrue in our own service, and that any slight inconvenience which the general public may suffer during the initial stages of the change will be more than compensated in other directions.

I do not know that I would have said as much as I have regarding the five-day week had it not been for Mr. Macfarlane's remarks of last night. Members will recollect that Mr. Macfarlane was somewhat critical of the introduction of the five-day week. In effect he said that it would affect business rather embarrassingly in some directions and might even cause business losses. The reason he gave for holding this view was that it was not possible for his firm to have certain documents signed on Saturday morning when a boat was leaving either on that day or on the following Monday. I asked Mr. Macfarlane to which department he was referring, and that he mentioned the Agricultural Department. Some of his actual words were as follows:—

The mailboat sails for England on Monday and carries a large quantity of primary produce for overseas countries. . . . Let me relate an experience of the effect of the five-day week in the Public Service. Saturday being a holiday, the papers for Monday's shipments by the mailboat had to be prepared on Friday. Representatives of the State and Commonwealth Governments were not available on Saturday to sign the requisite papers. This difficulty causes delay, and might even result in financial loss through the drop in the market between the arrival of one ship and another in Great Britain.

It will be recollected that the hon. member referred to his being interested in eggs as well as in butter. I was rather anxious to know the actual facts, because after listening to Mr. Macfarlane last night it did appear to me that there was a weakness in the present administration. If the hon. member's statements were correct, it was a weak-

ness which should be remedied with the least possible delay. Just before the House met this afternoon, the Minister for Agriculture handed to me the report of Mr. Shaw, the Poultry Adviser, who deals with these matters. I have not yet completely perused the document, but it appears to me so important that I will read it—

The Under Secretary for Agriculture.

With reference to yours of the 31st August, my remarks were contained in the personal explanation issued previously. The Hon. James Macfarlane is not correct in his assertions in "Hansard." I personally interviewed all Export Floors and informed them that as Saturday was a holiday, inconvenience might be caused if they did not inform us that they required documents and inspections on the Saturday mornings.

I personally interviewed Mr. Ellard, manager for the Hon. James Macfarlane's establishment trading under the name of Baxter & Macfarlane, and informed him that we would be present to issue documents or inspection on any Saturday morning providing the firm gave us notice on the Friday afternoon. I was thanked accordingly.

On the morning of August 20th I was present in the office doing nothing. On the morning of August 27th I gave permission to Mr. Lovegrove to be absent owing to the fact that he had been working three nights during the week on Muresk Egg Laying Trial results; and as no requests arrived in for documents on the Saturday, Miss Rogers and myself were not required in the office.

Baxter & Macfarlane have little to complain with regard to the facilities offered by the officers of the Poultry Branch. Many nights have we worked on their premises facilitating their activities with neither recompense nor the expectation of recompense; and at times we have been there in the early morning in order to facilitate the export of eggs. This has been a distinct breach of Regulation 19 which reads as follows:—

19. (1) A person who intends to export any dairy produce shall furnish to the department, after the goods have been delivered at an appointed place or at any other place permitted by the secretary in pursuance of Regulation 18 of these regulations, a notice and declaration in writing, which shall, subject to sub-regulation (3) of this regulation, be in accordance with Form 3, 4 or 5, as the case requires.

(2) The notice and declaration shall be furnished—

(a) in the case of butter (other than milled butter), cheese, egg pulp and eggs in shell—at least three clear working days before the proposed date of shipment;

and your officers have broken this regulation extensively in order to facilitate the shipment of eggs from Western Australia, and the Hon. James Macfarlane has expressed appreciation of our attitude on many occasions when we

have waived this regulation in order to facilitate shipment for his firm.

Apart from this aspect there were two Commonwealth officers on duty that morning, on whom the responsibility for issuing documents falls equally with the officers of your department, and they, on request, would have facilitated any shipment required by Baxter & Macfarlane, Ltd. If I might pass a comment:—The remarks of the Hon. James Macfarlane are not in accordance with facts, for on Saturday morning, August 27th, Inspector Stocker was present on the floor of Baxter & Macfarlane, Ltd., certifying eggs for export, and these cases were part of the consignment over which the Hon. James Macfarlane complained. Inspector Stocker being present on the floor on Saturday morning could, and would, have issued any necessary documents had he been requested to do so.

So much for the complaints made by Mr. Macfarlane. I could go further in regard to the matter if I so desired. However, I do wish to express my resentment of statements of the kind made by the hon. member for political advantage—statements which he must have known, in view of the document I have just read, to be not in accordance with the facts. Notwithstanding that, however, the department is prepared to give all the facilities it possibly can either to Baxter & Macfarlane or to any other firm engaged in the export industries of this State. My experience has been that most of our officers are prepared to inconvenience themselves even greatly in order to provide a service which will be satisfactory.

Now I wish to refer to the remarks of Mr. Parker. The hon. member dealt with two or three questions such as starting-price bookmaking and the administration of the licensing laws. It will be remembered that Mr. Parker spoke last night, and all I have been able to do so far is to submit his remarks on starting-price betting and the licensing laws to the Commissioner of Police. I have here the Commissioner's reply. For myself personally, I need only say that the Government has already announced its intention to introduce during the current session a Bill dealing with starting-price betting. If we secure an Act as the result of introducing the Bill, it may be hoped that some of the things mentioned by the hon. member will become non-existent, or at any rate be very materially reduced. This is the reply furnished by the Commissioner of Police—

I say without fear of contradiction that the hotels are as well conducted here as in any part of Australia. In fact, I am of the opinion, as the result of my experience in the East—

tern States, that they are better conducted. There is no differential treatment meted out to any one of them, and from the reports given to me by the liquor inspection branch I am of the opinion that none of them is granted immunity.

So far as starting-price betting is concerned, the figures regarding prosecutions that are mentioned in my annual report speak for themselves.

I would point out to hon. members that the report of the Commissioner of Police was tabled in this House yesterday. To continue the Commissioner's statement—

If Mr. Parker is referring to some of the larger starting-price bookmakers, I would draw his attention to the fact that they are paying approximately £1,000 per annum in fines, and this fact has been stated on several occasions.

Hon. L. Craig: A sort of license fee.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Commissioner continues—

There is none of them immune from prosecution where evidence can be obtained, and Mr. Parker would be the first to admit that unless you have the evidence, it is useless to bring a case into court.

With respect to his remarks about allegations of bribery and corruption, which he states he hears on all sides, it is only reasonable to ask that he make public his information and his informants, and then it can be seen what justification there is for such wild statements.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: May I ask the Minister if he believes that some hotels are not immune?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do, and I would refer the hon. member for further information to the report of the Commissioner of Police that was tabled yesterday.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I was referring to hotels.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: On this occasion Mr. Holmes did not provide me with much to reply to. One point he raised had reference to the closing hours of certain shops. He mentioned the recent action of the Government in extending the closing hours of those shops and suggested that it had acted contrary to the law. That contention was entirely wrong. Under the Factories and Shops Act, provision is made for the temporary suspension of the Act in so far as it applies to the closing time for shops. The request for this concession was, in the first instance, submitted by a deputation that included Mr. R. S. Sampson, M.L.A., and was representative of the fruit-growers. It was pointed out that as fruit shops were required to close at 11 o'clock, a large volume of trade was lost, and that this

was having an adverse effect on fruitgrowers. Similar temporary suspensions of closing hours of shops have been granted to meet exceptional circumstances of this description. I merely mention that fact for the information of the hon. member.

Information was sought by Mr. Parker regarding the cost of trolley buses. I have received from the general manager of the Tramways, Ferries and Electricity Supply, Mr. Taylor, the following information:—

The total cost of trolley buses to date amounts to £97,515. This covers the Claremont conversion and the complete Wembley service, the amount being made up as under—

	£	£
Original trolley buses (3)		
and overhead line, Wembley .. .. .		17,625
Claremont conversion .. .. .	26,900	
Wembley extension .. .. .	5,240	
Fourteen new buses .. .. .	47,750	79,890
Total .. .. .		£97,515

I find I have some information which I intended to supply earlier in my remarks, but which I overlooked. I refer particularly to expenditure in the country. The point arose mainly because of Mr. Thomson's remarks on hospital expenditure, in the course of which he was severely critical of the Government and said it had one law for the city and another for the country. Commenting on the Government's proposal to erect a new Perth hospital, he said—

There is a greater number of votes in the metropolitan area than in the country districts, and in consequence the Government is not game to tell the city people that they must pay towards the cost of their hospital, as the people in the country are required to pay for their establishments.

For the information of members generally, it may be as well to point out that the total amount of hospital tax collected during the financial year ended the 30th June, 1938, was £245,659. The subsidies paid to hospitals totalled £300,866. These were allocated as follows:—

Metropolitan hospitals—£126,378, which includes £15,994 expenditure on buildings and equipment.

Country hospitals—£174,488, which includes £14,963 expenditure on buildings and equipment.

Hon. L. Craig: Mr. Thomson was referring to the decision of the Government to pay the total cost of the erection of the Perth Hospital.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, probably that was what occasioned the hon.

member's remarks, but there was no need for him to make the statement he did. These details show that his assertion is not borne out by the facts.

I realise that I have been speaking for a long time. There are many points I have not touched affecting matters that were mentioned by members during their Address-in-reply speeches. The information I have given to-night in reply to members is as up to date as possible and can be taken as accurate. I have endeavoured to obtain details respecting other matters, but the information has not yet come to hand. I will make it available to the House when it is in my possession. The general tenor of the debate this session has been gratifying. There has been some criticism which, I presume, is inevitable. At the same time it appeared to me that the criticism offered in many instances was constructive, and certainly was not so severely destructive as it frequently is in this House. From the remarks of many members I believe they realise the difficulties ahead of the Government, particularly in view of the pessimistic outlook that appears to confront the farming community and primary producers generally. Due to other factors as well, this will mean a considerable reduction in the revenue available to the Government this financial year. In those circumstances it will be recognised that, although many of the requests were made by members as essential in the interests of their electorates, the Government will not be able to accede to all the suggestions for financial assistance. Nevertheless it will endeavour, to the best of its ability, to be fair in the distribution of the money at its disposal. I thank members for the courteous hearing they have accorded me.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

On motion by the Chief Secretary resolved: That the Address be presented to His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor by the President and such members as may desire to accompany him.

### ADJOURNMENT SPECIAL.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [10.9]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 18th September.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Wednesday, 31st August, 1938.*

	PAGE
Questions: Relief work, "C" class men, definition and earnings	518
Railways, Diesel cars, inadequate accommodation	518
Education, State school grounds	519
Yampi Sound, number of employees	519
Papers: Midland light lands, case of Henry George Townsend	519
Motions: Legal Practitioners Act, to inquire by Select Committee	520
Firearms and Guns Act, to disallow regulation	529
Health Act, to disallow amendment to regulations	530
Bills: Mullewa Road Board Loan Rate, 1R.	519
Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act Amendment, 1R.	519
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2R.	533
Local Courts Act Amendment, 2R.	535
Companies Act Amendment, 2R.	536
Fisheries Act Amendment, 2R.	540
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2R.	544
Alsatian Dog Act Amendment, 2R.	545

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

### QUESTION—RELIEF WORK.

*"C" Class Men, Definition, and Earnings.*

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER asked the Minister for Employment: 1, Will he define the work of a "C" class man on relief work? 2, Is any of such work piecework? 3, If so, what is the lowest weekly amount earned by "C" class men in such piecework? 4, What is the highest weekly amount so earned?

The MINISTER FOR EMPLOYMENT replied: 1, Forestry and land clearing. 2, No. 3 and 4, Answered by No. 2.

### QUESTION—RAILWAYS.

*Diesel Cars, Inadequate Accommodation.*

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Railways: 1, How many special trains were necessary to transport passengers who were unable to secure accommodation on Diesel cars last Friday? 2, What was the cost of running the special trains? 3, Will he make arrangements to notify his department of the approach of school holidays at Christmas and Easter, so that adequate transport may be provided for intending passengers?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Three. 2, £76. 3, This is not necessary; the specials were run to accommodate delegates returning home from the Country Women's Association conference.