

admit it, although they are guarded because they do not desire to offend. The fact remains that there must be a failure of the system somewhere. I suggest that the real failure at the moment is that the Premier does not distinguish between what could be demanded by the Child Welfare Department and the Unemployment Relief Depot, and what is actually demanded. The thing is not what the worker gets, but what the surplus non-worker or relief worker does not get. If I thought this was a question involving the shattering of our finances, or shaking our stability, I would plump for State socialism. If I thought for a moment that Australia could not make everyone as comfortable to-day as he or she was before the slump, and do so through the activities of private enterprise, I would not hesitate to favour some system under which the necessities of life would be operated through the State. Of course, I would not include in that category luxuries of any description. I feel that is utterly unnecessary at the present juncture. Private enterprise has succeeded very helpfully in promoting production. If we have failed in securing the solution of the problem, we will not get any further by merely stating that fact. It might be of some interest if members, when the Budget is placed before them, were to closely scrutinise the Estimates for the Child Welfare Department and the Unemployment Relief Depot. I believe the situation to-day, in a nutshell, is that the market we are looking for lies in the midst of our own needy citizens.

On motion by Mr. Withers, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.43 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 8th August, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions : Taxation collections	98
Lotteries commission disbursements	98
Mine Workers' Insurance	99
BILL : Supply (No. 1) £2,200,000, 2r., etc.	99

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

QUESTION—TAXATION COLLECTIONS.

Hon. R. G. MOORE (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Chief Secretary: What amount has been collected each financial year under—(a) the Entertainments Tax; (b) the Hospital Tax; (c) the Financial Emergency Tax?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

ENTERTAINMENT TAX—				£
(a)	1930-31	6 months	...	34,360
	1931-32	year	...	63,169
	1932-33	year	...	62,486
	1933-34	year	...	75,262
	1934-35	year	...	83,951
HOSPITAL TAX—				£
(b)	1930-31	6 months	...	64,534
	1931-32	year	...	133,585
	1932-33	year	...	146,042
	1933-34	year	...	154,228
	1934-35	year	...	183,398
FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX—				£
(c)	1932-33	7 months	...	202,336
	1933-34	year	...	411,716
	1934-35	year	...	684,980

QUESTION—LOTTERIES COMMISSION DISBURSEMENTS.

Hon. R. G. MOORE (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Chief Secretary: What amount has been disbursed by the Lotteries Commission each year to—(a) Government hospitals; (b) public hospitals; (c) private hospitals; (d) other charitable institutions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

	(a) Government Hospitals.			(b) Public Hospitals.			(c) Private Hos- pitals.			(d) Other Charitable Institutions.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£			£	s.	d.
1933	2,770	0	0	1,662	10	0	200			26,870	18	10
1934	22,775	2	0	5,111	9	1	200			42,157	14	0
1935	16,541	10	2	10,661	6	3	55			39,330	19	4

Note.—The above are the whole of the allocations made since the inception of the Lotteries Commission, and included in these are amounts not yet paid out, one being £20,000 for the King Edward Memorial Hospital.

QUESTION—MINE WORKERS' INSURANCE.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: 1. Are the Government aware that various mining companies and mine owners in failing to cover their employees by way of insurance are not complying with the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act and the Mine Workers' Relief Act? 2. If so, will the Government issue instructions for the immediate prosecution of those employers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1. No information is available as to the extent of the non-compliance with the Act. Only a few cases have come under official notice. 2. The matter is under consideration.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1) £2,200,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.40]: The Bill is similar to that which comes down every year. It gives us an opportunity to discuss matters of public importance. A lot of members having missed the chance to speak on the Address-in-reply this session, I understand they propose to avail themselves of the opportunity presented by the Bill. I have looked through the Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor and I am bound to say that 90 per cent. of it consists of information which is available to members from the public records supplied by the Government. Apart from that, it reminds me of the parson who, it was said, read his sermons while his friends said that he preached extempore. This in due course reached his ears and he told them that on a certain Sunday they could provide their own text. As he stepped into the pulpit that day they handed him a blank sheet of paper. He looked at it and said: "Here is nothing, there is nothing. Out of nothing the Lord made Heaven and earth." We might well say that of His Excellency's opening speech, except that we have not the Lord administering the affairs of this country and bringing about the results that He might bring about. I have taken the figures available for the five years ended the 30th June, 1934, and I find that for the period ended the 30th June 1929 the State's indebtedness was 70½ millions, and at the

end of the five years concluded on the 30th June, 1934 the net indebtedness was 85½ millions. It will thus be seen that during those five years we increased our net indebtedness by 15 millions. I ask those members who travel about the country to look around and see, if they can, what we have got for that extra 15 millions that have been spent. I would point out that during the period when we owed 70½ millions our revenue was 9¾ millions, but that at the 30th June, 1934, when we owed 85½ millions, the revenue was 8½ millions. So as the result of increasing the Loan expenditure by 15 millions, all of which carried or should have carried interest and sinking fund, we received a revenue of one and a quarter million less than we had before the expenditure of that money. For the period ended on the 30th June, 1930, the State's per capita indebtedness was £163, whereas at the 30th June, 1934, it was £193. So we increased the State's per capita indebtedness by £30 during that period. To this has to be added our quota of the Federal indebtedness, which according to the latest figures I have is about £60 per capita. This gives us a total per capita indebtedness of £253. All the authorities I have been able to look up on finance say that a per capita indebtedness of £100 for each man, woman and child is about all that any community can be expected to carry. A lot of our money has been invested in trading concerns and public utilities. If these were being carried on at a profit there would be something to show for our per capita indebtedness, but seeing that most of them are carried on at a loss instead of a profit, they are more of a liability than an asset. A good deal of the prosperity we hear so much about in this State is due to the extraordinarily high price of gold. One cannot of course give goldfields' representatives the credit for that. I made a mental note of Mr. R. G. Moore's question about whether the collection of income tax on the goldfields is to apply to the goldfields only or to the State in general. I think it must be for the State in general and not for the goldfields in particular. From the speech of one of the goldfields' representatives yesterday I am inclined to think there should be a special set of conditions set up for the goldfields, even to include taxation. The bulk of the so-called prosperity we hear so much about is due to the expenditure of loan moneys. If that

money had been profitably expended there would have been something to boast about. When the overseas money market was closed against us I said in the House I felt inclined to throw up my hat, for I thought we would get back to earning the money first and spending it afterwards, instead of borrowing it first and in some cases squandering it afterwards. I overlooked the fact that the Australian market was not closed against the Commonwealth Government, and that a condition of affairs had been set up, due to the imposition of taxation, arbitration awards, Workers' Compensation Acts and other items whereby production became more or less unprofitable. Men would not put their money into industrial concerns, or other concerns which under normal conditions might be profitable, and thus risk their capital, but they were prepared to lend it to the Commonwealth Government and secure an assured rate of interest. Money was therefore taken out of private enterprise where it might have been profitably employed, loaned to the Commonwealth Government, and in turn distributed amongst the State Governments, to be spent as they thought fit. That is an unhealthy condition of affairs, and one that I do not like. I have never forgotten the statement that it is a wise policy to hope for the best and prepare for the worst. No preparation has been made for the worst. Even a schoolboy who looks up the financial position of Australia and of this State must conclude that there is a worse period ahead of us. Governments are only attempting to put that off by borrowing money and adding to our interest bill. There are many people who do not care about the situation. They say, sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. I read something in an English paper recently. An old rooster had been having a bad time and had been in a fight. His feathers were all ruffled and his comb was torn. He is reported to have said "What does it matter anyhow; to-day we are eggs, to-morrow we may be feather dusters." There is a big percentage of people living upon that motto. They will not look ahead. They do not care so long as they can get the Government to spend money. They are unmindful of the day of reckoning.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: That is occurring more than ever each year.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Reference was made yesterday to the Agricultural Bank. I do not want to condemn anyone without

giving them a fair run for their money. I do not know that the present Commissioners are suitable for the job. I think it requires some of the world's financial experts to pull the Bank out of the difficulties which the political element has created. I disagree with Mr. Cornell concerning his conclusion regarding political influence. This is a banking institution, and the business should be done as between the Bank and its clients. There should be no interference from any outside source. Owing to the statement that some people on the land have been getting away with the country's assets I think it is time someone woke up and took notice. I do not say that the ex-Manager of the Bank, Mr. McLarty, neglected his job in any way. This country can never repay him for what he has done. He was faced with the political element that I say helped to ruin the Bank. If the new Act does nothing else I hope it will keep political influence away from the Bank.

Hon. J. Cornell: I was referring to Ministerial influence.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have never had any dealings with the Bank. I must thank the Premier for making available the facilities for sending half-a-dozen members of Parliament to look at the North-West for the first time. When the matter was put up to him he was broadminded enough to see the value of the trip. I venture to say that if members discuss the North-West with those who made up the party those gentlemen will express surprise at the magnitude of the country through which they passed. Although they steamed on day after day and proceeded a long way up the coast, they actually only travelled two-thirds of the way up. I thank the Government for their assistance to the pearling industry, and also do I thank the Commonwealth Government. Broome has been a very important town in the northern portion of the State. I understand it has produced £10,000,000 worth of shell. This shell was sold on the world's market, and the proceeds were spent in the country. Owing to an unfortunate cyclone last year the pearlers lost between 20 and 30 boats, and between 140 and 200 men, including their best divers. The whole town as well as the industry was stranded. The State and Federal Governments came to the rescue, and have made a grant of sufficient money to enable the industry to get going for this season. The quota of money for this year should be considered as a first moiety, and a similar quota for next season

should also be given. That will restore the industry to what it was. A new system has been evolved for the gathering of shell, and this will tend to keep down the cost of production. If the cost of production is reduced the industry will show a greater profit by the sale of its products. I took a deputation to the Premier some months ago with respect to numbers of cattle that were being held up because of a report that they were affected by pleuro. The cattle were not allowed to travel because of that report. I afterwards saw the Premier who said that a number of men who attended the deputation he had never before seen. I replied, "These are not men to run to the Government for every little thing. It is only because they are right up against it that they go to you now." He immediately grasped the position. There is a new method for testing cattle for pleuro, known as the Turner test. By means of that test it is possible to ascertain whether there is pleuro in a beast or not. If there is no re-action the beasts are not affected. Three lots of cattle started overland, there being 1,000 head in each mob. That meant a good deal to the people of the North-West whose cattle had been held up for two or three years. Unfortunately there have been no winter rains between the Kimberleys and Northampton. This caused the cattle to be held up on the track. They could not be returned to the North because the Turner test would have had to be applied again. That is not the fault of the Government, which took prompt action to release the cattle, and did the job well and quickly. I wish to refer to the proposal for a railway from Wyndham to the East Kimberleys and the Northern Territory. Because of the number of agricultural railways that have been authorised by this House, and because there appears to be an arrangement between members that "If you vote for my railway I will vote for yours," I was rather surprised and a little annoyed when Mr. Baxter criticised this proposal without a knowledge of the facts. I do not propose to recommend the construction of this railway without an investigation and inquiry. I know that the Premier has been interviewed, and that the Minister for the North-West has also been seen by men who ought to know the position. The Government seem inclined to support the proposal and put it up to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government have a greater right than the State Government

to take prompt action in this matter. I think the State and the Commonwealth should conduct a preliminary investigation, but I believe that when it comes to constructing and running the railway, it should be a matter for private enterprise. The unfortunate part of the position for this State is that a great number of the cattle come from the Northern Territory, and the Federal Government collect the land rents, income and other taxes, etc. The cattle are brought into Wyndham and treated by the Western Australian Government without profit. Surely that position justifies the State Government approaching the Federal Government to see whether we cannot get a move on in the direction indicated. The Federal Government's duty is to develop the Northern Territory, and if they can develop it through Wyndham of course we should have a say in the expenditure of the money. The position is that when we were dealing with frozen meat, it was frozen as hard as bricks, stacked in the holds of ships, and it did not matter in what condition it came out at the other end, so long as it was sound. Now, however, the chilled meat will prove a solution of our cattle owner's difficulty. When you have chilled meat offered for sale at the other end of the world, it must be of first-class quality. We are told that the prime condition of the cattle is ruined between the stations and the meat works, ruined while they are being driven in. You can drive fat cattle eight miles per day; that is about the limit for travelling cattle in the far North. Imagine cattle travelling 200 miles to the meat works and being 25 days on the journey! That might be all right for the first mob or two, but when you begin to drive 20,000 or 30,000 over the one track, it can easily be imagined how the stock will deteriorate, the result being that only a percentage of the cattle would be fit for killing and export. If a railway would get over that difficulty and enable the producer to put his fat stock into the meat works in a decent condition, he could then depend on getting a fair price for the beasts. I am not advocating the construction of this particular railway, but I am suggesting it is a matter for inquiry and, if it is possible, the Commonwealth should pay a considerable quota towards its construction, and the State its proportion to the extent of the benefit it would receive. In this way we would solve the difficulty

of dealing with cattle in the East Kimberleys. There is another problem in West Kimberley where it is proposed to erect works. That, however, is a matter that can be discussed later on. There are a few points I should like to have placed on record. The Wyndham Meat Works are the only meat works in Australia that have no railway connection with its cattle areas. The stock route at present carrying the bulk of the cattle to the Wyndham Meat Works is extremely hard on the cattle owing to the roughness of the track and the absence of feed after a few mobs have traversed it. At the present time, 30 to 40 per cent. of the cattle treated would not be passed for export as chilled meat. The bulk of this percentage would be fit for chilling if delivered in nearly as good condition as when it left the station. What are now just fit for chilling would be fit to go into a higher grade and realise more money. The Federal Government are defining a policy for unification of existing railways. This will not add anything to the production of any part of the country, and neither will it increase export trade. In view of the Federal Government's announcement, I suggest that a strong case can be put up to them to assist railway construction from Wyndham to a point, say, 200 miles inland. This railway would not only serve growers of Western Australia, but would serve pastoral areas in the Northern Territory. As the railway would add to the productivity of the Commonwealth, it may also be strongly urged that it would help the Federal Government with its Northern Territory problem. At present the Wyndham Meat Works handle a lot of cattle from the Northern Territory, and the Western Australian Government receive no assistance from the Federal Government with regard to the losses sustained at the Wyndham works. In addition to the cattle industry, there are possibilities of gold mining and sheep raising, if modern transport be provided. The railway would only require to be run for the period during which the Wyndham Meat Works operate. Settlers in the interior could arrange to have their supplies transported inland during that period. With all due respect, I submit that there is ample food for consideration. I know that the Premier will be able to grasp the position, and I hope it can be put up to the Federal authorities with success. I

do not wish to say any more at the present juncture except to add that I have submitted figures in accordance with the policy I have adopted during the past 15 years, figures which point out the direction in which we are going, and that when the crash comes, as undoubtedly it will—I may not be here—the present rising generation will point the finger of scorn to the members of Parliament of to-day. I hope that at that time someone will refer to "Hansard" of to-day and be able to say of me, at least, "Here was one who drew attention to the approaching catastrophe."

Hon. J. Cornell: You would not inflict to-day's "Hansard" on posterity?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: What I am saying now is exactly what I think is the real position of affairs. I have always tried to be fair, and I believe I have been fair, in my observations to-day. At any rate I hope that we shall get better results out of the 2½ millions, the amount set out in the Supply Bill, than we have had out of the 15 millions spent in the last five years.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [5.11]: In speaking to this Bill, one realises that to carry on the affairs of the State and maintain those public utilities which are essential, money must be made available. The chief concern of any Government should be not the amount of money they can get hold of to spend, but to get the best results possible for the money expended, and to endeavour as far as possible to live within their income. We know that for the past few years we have been passing through difficult times, times that have called for sacrifice from everyone, and times which have made finance both from a State and private point of view a very difficult matter. These difficulties have brought forth during the period we now call the period of depression a number of Bills which have become Acts of Parliament known as emergency legislation. Where these Bills have been introduced to ensure as far as possible an equality of sacrifice, no great exception can be taken to them, although it was realised that in some instances the giving of relief to some meant inflicting hardship on others, and as far as the Financial Emergency Act is concerned, I do not think it ever was a measure that called for equality of sacrifice. However, I do not intend to go into that matter now

except to say that the great difficulty about emergency legislation is not to get the legislation passed but to get rid of it. The unemployment question has been one of the most difficult to deal with, and it is very gratifying to know that it is not nearly so acute as it was, principally due, I think to the great improvement in the gold mining industry. This has probably accounted for the employment of more men directly and indirectly than most of us are aware of. I think that the improvement in the building trade in the metropolitan area is due to a great extent to the ready money that is flowing into the metropolitan area from the goldfields. The enormous increase in the volume of goods and material being carried on the goldfields railway gives some idea of the constant stream of money that is flowing into the business houses of the metropolis from the goldfields. We all rejoice at the prosperity of the gold mining industry, and we should all agree that an industry which gives employment to so many men, which produces a commodity for which there is always a ready market and which the nations of the world are anxious to secure, should be encouraged in every possible way. Far better is it to encourage and assist an industry which provides so much employment and produces a commodity about the marketing of which there is no difficulty, than to bolster up industries which are of problematical value and may not be of great importance to us. Wheat, wool, timber, gold, fruit, etc., are primary products of paramount importance to the State, for without them our secondary industries and public utilities would not be worth much. I have already referred to the building trade. On the goldfields the building trade is booming, but unfortunately the shortage of houses is causing a great deal of hardship and distress. Rents on the goldfields in many instances are altogether too high. We have on the statute-book a Reduction of Rents Act. That Act, applied to the goldfields, is an absurdity. It reduces rents of leases made when times were not nearly as good as they are now, and does nothing to regulate weekly tenancies or leases entered into since the passing of the Act.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think it applies to two hotels all told.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The hon. member is wrong: it applies to more. If it applied

to two, that would be two too many. On the goldfields we are confronted with the anomaly of a person having a lease taken under normal conditions and then, because things became abnormal in other parts of the world, having the rent reduced. Yet that person's next door neighbour can have his rent increased 100, 200 or 300 per cent.; in fact the sky is the limit. The Act should never have been applied to the goldfields in its present form, but some action is necessary to control rents on the goldfields. I realise that such a question bristles with difficulties, but something should be done to afford tenants a better deal.

Hon. G. Fraser: Would you favour a fair rents court?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I would favour anything that would ensure to tenants a better deal than they are getting at present. My strictures regarding high rents do not apply to everybody. Some landlords are letting houses for one-half the rentals that they could obtain, but such landlords constitute a minority. To provide additional housing accommodation, I have advocated extending the operations of the Workers' Homes Board to the Eastern Goldfields. In my opinion that would be a good step for the Government to take. It would not only relieve the congestion that now exists but would have a good moral effect upon the people concerned. I should like to stress that point. In some instances an owner has leased a property to a tenant and the tenant has sub-let it and has become far more rapacious than ever the owner was. I know of a tenant who has leased a property for £2 10s. a week. He put in a partition to form two shops and is now collecting £5 a week for each of those shops.

Hon. E. H. Gray: He is doing well.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Extraordinarily well. There is no legislation to control that sort of thing. I appreciate the difficulty of dealing with the matter, but there should be some way to deal with it. Recently an award was given to the miners under which they received an industry allowance of 12s. per week. On the face of it, one would conclude that the miners would be better off in consequence, but many of them are not as well off as they were before because that industry allowance has resolved itself into a landlord allowance. Whereas landlords were getting perhaps

15s. a week for their houses previously, many of them are now getting 30s.

Hon. G. W. Miles: A rent of 15s. must have applied in the depression time.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I tell the hon. member that 15s. was a fair rent for those houses.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It must have been a very poor type of house.

Hon. J. Cornell: A house bought for £50 is bringing in 30s. a week rent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Bought during the depression.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The houses I have in mind were not bought during the depression.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I mean when the goldfields were experiencing the depression—before the premium on gold.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: It is true that, at the time referred to by the hon. member, people were leaving the goldfields and rents became abnormally low. I am not suggesting that very low rents should be charged; I suggest a fair rent, not an extortionate rent. I know something of property on the goldfields; I own a little of it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why does not private enterprise build houses if such handsome rents can be obtained?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Private people are building houses.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If they will not pay their income tax, they will not pay their rent.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: They pay their income tax and their rent. I read in the Press that the Taxation Department were sending officials to the goldfields to see if they could collect more taxation.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You have no objection to that, have you?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I notice that an officer is also being sent to Meekatharra and Wiluna. If the Taxation Department intend to get buy in any goldfields town, attention should be given to every town. I have no doubt that there are some people in all parts of the State who are evading the payment of income tax. I commend the Taxation Department for doing their duty, so long as they do it properly and treat all people alike. I do not ask for special treatment for the goldfields people. I do not ask the Government to do anything for the goldfields that is not being done for other parts of the State, but I do ask the Government

to do as much for the goldfields. Surely that is only a fair proposition. Mr. Miles asked why private enterprise did not build houses to meet the shortage. Private people are building houses as fast as they can, but does not that apply equally to other districts where the Workers' Homes Board have undertaken the building of houses?

Hon. G. W. Miles: There is more permanency here than on the goldfields.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: But not so much money. It is possible to pay for a house with money, but not with permanency. I do not ask that elaborate houses be built. All I ask is that reasonably comfortable places be erected so that people can pay for them at a reasonable rate. Quite a number of people would be prepared to undertake that responsibility if the Government only had sufficient faith to spend a little money on the goldfields.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The people up there should obey the laws of the country.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I merely ask the Government to do what private enterprise is doing, namely, show a little faith in the goldfields. There are other people who do not obey the laws of the country.

Hon. G. W. Miles: In other parts the people do not defy the court.

The Honorary Minister: What would be the cost of a suitable house there?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: A suitable house could be built for £400 or £500.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: What rent would be obtained for that?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: If a private person built it, the rent would be 30s. or £2 per week.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I mean a reasonable rent.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I consider that a reasonable rent should permit of its being paid off in about eight years. That could and would be done. From what I can gather, people who ought to know believe the price of gold will remain fairly high for the next 10 years. We know that there is more stability on the goldfields at present than has prevailed for quite a long time. It would be a good gesture on the part of the Government to put a curb on the landlords and give the workers a little of the consideration to which they are entitled. Regarding the financial emergency tax, income tax and other taxes, we know very well that the goldfields are more prosperous than are other parts of the State, and this means that the Government are obtaining more revenue

from the goldfields than from other parts. I am not asking the Government to do anything for the goldfields in the shape of charity. I merely ask them to put into operation the scheme that operates in other parts of the State. If the Government did that, they would get their money back, together with a reasonable rate of interest.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: To clear off the purchase of a £500 house in eight years would require a payment of £3 a week, including rates, taxes and insurance.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: I think the hon. member must have worked that out as some of the landlords have worked out their rents.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Ten per cent. is needed for the upkeep of a wooden house.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Government officials could work that out for themselves. The cost of a house is not so high on the goldfields as in the metropolitan area. I know of a house built of wood within the last few months in Laverton, where costs are higher than on the goldfields. The total cost of the house was £500. It was built for a road board secretary, and it is quite a decent little residence. The material is jarrah. Outside, the building is partly jarrah and partly asbestos. Inside, it is lined with plaster board; and it has jarrah flooring.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That house was built for my friend Peter Buck.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The same class of house would be suitable in other parts of the goldfields. It is time that the Government stepped in to assist. If the problem is not too hard for them to solve, its solution would considerably ease the position. There are many ways in which assistance to mining can be effected. I do not refer to assisting big mines well established and in full swing, but outback mines in the early stages. The provision of water supplies and crushing facilities and assistance to prospectors are the best means of advancing the industry. In many districts the Government have provided crushing facilities, but there are still some centres where such facilities are not available, and would be of great benefit to prospectors and eventually to the State. Some time ago there was an agitation for the establishment of a State battery at Leonora. The Government sent an expert to go round the shows and see how much ore was available, and of what values, in order to decide whether the installation of a bat-

ttery was worth while. This genius reported that the ore was not of sufficient value to warrant the erection of a State battery. Since then three or four of the shows from which the bulk of the ore was to come have been developed, and the company intend to erect batteries on three of them. Yet the genius sent along by the Government reported that there was not enough ore at the place to keep one battery going. He reminds me of a certain Royal Commission that dealt with the question of wheatgrowing in the Esperance district. The then Government wanted the Agricultural Bank to advance money on Esperance lands. The Bank absolutely refused to do so, and refused more than once. Then the Government of the day appointed a Royal Commission to go into the question. The Royal Commission reported that Esperance lands were suitable for wheat production. Thereupon the Government built a railway and established water supplies, and said to the Bank authorities, "You have to assist those settlers now in order that the railway may be made to pay." That was the result of the work of one Royal Commission. Now as regards men who work in the mines, and the Workers' Compensation Act and the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. As regards workers' compensation, in the first instance miners have to go to a Government laboratory to be examined. They must obtain a certificate that they are clean, and one hundred per cent. well, before they can get employment on the mines. Thereafter they have to come up periodically for examination. If the laboratory notifies a man that he has developed silicosis, he is advised to get out of the mining industry. The laboratory tells him two things: "You have silicosis: it is not in an advanced or dangerous stage, but you should get out of the industry, and we advise you to get out." If the man goes out of the industry, he is in this position, that he knows mining but knows nothing else. He has been brought up as a miner, and he has no other occupation at his finger-tips. Nevertheless the laboratory advises him to go into a crowded labour market and look for a job. There is no compensation whatever for him. He may have been in the mines for 20 or 30 or any number of years, during all of which time workers' compensation insurance was being paid on his behalf. The laboratory tells him to go out of the industry while the going is good, and to tramp

the country for a job. Someone has to do the miner's work or else the mines must be closed down altogether. Sometimes I think that this would be the best course, that the mining industry is not worth the toll it takes of human life and human happiness. Unfortunately so long as men are looking for work and are willing to work, men will be found ready to work in the mines. They know the risk involved, but that does not affect the issue for them. They do the job, and premiums are paid for workers' compensation on their behalf. I consider that the Workers' Compensation Act should include a provision giving the miner some inducement to quit the industry after he has been notified that he has silicosis early. At present, no compensation is paid in such circumstances, and no other job is guaranteed the man if he leaves the mining industry. One of two things happens: either the man goes out of the industry and lives on the dole, or he goes back into the industry until such time as he becomes eligible for compensation. There should be some inducement to miners to get out of the industry while there is a reasonable chance of regaining health. The ideal on which the advice to leave the industry is based is quite all right. The miner affected with silicosis early is advised to go on the land, in the expectation that he will have better health there and will be able to provide a living for himself in his old age. Unfortunately, however, the disease develops quickly, and frequently the miner is unable to stand up to a day's work on the land. Moreover, the man who is one hundred per cent. fit on the farm and knows farming, still cannot make a success of it to-day. Then what chance of success has the man without experience and with silicosis? I do not ask that the Government should pay anything towards compensating such cases. The Government do not pay a penny towards it now. Another weakness of existing legislation I wish to stress is that a man may work 20 years or longer for a big mining company and be covered by insurance during the whole of the period, so that if anything happens to him a certain amount of compensation is paid, whereas in the case of a small mine the management may fail to insure the miner. The miner goes to the Government Laboratory and learns that he is suffering from advanced silicosis or from tuberculosis, or perhaps from both. Upon

applying for compensation, he finds he is not insured. He also finds that the employer is a man of straw, and not worth suing. The consequence is that the man, who has been covered by insurance for many years, eventually has to walk out without receiving anything except the payment from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, which is less than the old-age pension. So there is not much compensation about that feature. The Workers' Compensation Act should include a section making it compulsory for a miner to notify a Government officer when he changes his employer; and then the onus should be on the Government to see that the new employer has the man insured. The law makes it compulsory for an elector changing his address to notify the Chief Electoral Officer of the change. If he does not do so, he is liable to be fined up to £2.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I know that in the shearing industry contracts require the station owner to cover men who do not produce an insurance policy.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: That is right, and as it should be. However, I suppose in practice it is like income tax returns in the metropolitan area. The rendering of those returns is legally compulsory, but a great many metropolitan area residents are not paying income tax.

Member: Is not that so on the goldfields?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: There may be cases on the fields. My suggestion does not involve much trouble or any heavy expenditure, and it would safeguard the miner by keeping him insured. A case in point came under my notice quite recently. Some miners had been working for an employer over a period of years, and had been covered all the time. Then they went to work for another employer, and eventually were turned down absolutely as regards compensation because the second employer was a man of straw. Every employer is supposed to insure his employees, but it is not always done.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There can be a prosecution.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: How would that assist the employees concerned? The neglectful employer could be imprisoned or hanged; it would not assist the employee!

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How are you to get over the difficulty?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: In the manner I have already suggested. It should be made compulsory for every employee to notify a Government official when he changes his employment, and the onus should be placed on the Government to see that the new employer insures the man.

Hon. J. Cornell: The existing legislation throws the onus back for a period of two years upon the employers to do that.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: But if we were to place that onus upon the Government, it would not cost much.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: What about the unions?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The unions might watch the position, but so often the position is not known until something happens, and then the discovery is made that the unfortunate employee, who was injured, was not covered by insurance. The Government should introduce amending legislation along the lines I have suggested. Some references have been made to industrial troubles on the goldfields during the present year. I will not say much about that phase because some trouble still exists there, and if I have learnt anything since I have been a member of this Chamber, it is that in some matters a wise head carries a dumb tongue. I suggested long ago that there should be a round table conference, that both employers and employees should put all their cards on the table, discuss their respective points of view and endeavour to reach an amicable settlement. What is required more than anything else is better relationship between employer and employee. It is impossible to get the best out of discontented men, nor can the best treatment be received from discontented employers. It cuts both ways. The employer is made of the same stuff as the employee; both are human; each wants to get as much as he can for his money and each wants a fair deal. The trouble is that so often the employee is taught to regard employers generally as his enemies, who are out to do the workers an injury.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that what is happening now?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: That is what has happened for a long time.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Arbitration Court created that position.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: With all its faults, I think we should retain the Arbitration

Court, because that seems to me the best method by which industrial disputes may be dealt with. It has been said that one party secures the benefit and the other party is persecuted. There may be some truth in that in some respects, and if it is necessary to amend the Act to make it more workable, let us do that, but do not let us scrap the whole measure. It is a comparatively easy matter for an employer in a small way to gain the confidence of his employees and enjoy a good spirit of understanding with them, but it is not so easy when dealing with a large body of men. If it were possible to secure more friendly relationships between employers and the workers, it would be beneficial to all. Dealing with the agricultural industry, I realise that the farmers have experienced most trying times.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: They are still experiencing a bad time.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Yes. If any proposal can be advanced that will be of practical assistance to the farmers, I shall be only too pleased to give my support, but I do not feel capable of advancing any proposal along those lines myself.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Would you include the pastoralists as well?

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Yes, all primary producers. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.52]: The Bill is framed along similar lines to the Supply Bill that was placed before us at the commencement of the session last year. I have compared the two measures, and they are almost word for word. Therefore, in submitting the Supply Bill to us, the Chief Secretary is asking us to authorise what we agreed to last year.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And to act as we have done for many years past.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I was dealing with the actual figures more particularly. We understand that supply is essential, and there is much to be said for the observation by Mr. Holmes regarding the advisability of having the money in hand before we actually spend it. I can foresee difficulties for Governments in that, as in this instance, the Government have already spent some of the money respecting which they seek formal authorisation. It is necessary to have the money if we are to witness the maintenance

of industrial enterprises that we desire. References were made by Mr. R. G. Moore to the Industrial Arbitration Act, which, he contended, should be maintained. Last night Mr. Cornell said that there were some sections of the men on the goldfields who would not care if the Arbitration Act were scrapped. That does not seem a very healthy state of affairs for an industrial community, for any State or for any Government. It must give the Government cause for much concern, for naturally they are just as anxious as we are to see the best results achieved in industry. If the wheels of industry can be maintained, it is good for the State and our revenue will increase and there will be greater prospects of the Government receiving money that they so much desire. When the Arbitration Act was originally placed before Parliament—I think it was about 1900—it was regarded as the dawn of a new era, when it was hoped that peace in industry would be established.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That legislation was introduced before ever a Labour Government was thought of in Western Australia.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Precisely. I am at one with other hon. members in my desire to see industrial peace maintained, and, in the circumstances, I agree it would probably be unwise to scrap an Act of which we have had a certain amount of experience, and perhaps experiment with some other formula less likely to achieve the desired result. What I find fault with is that the Act has been so framed as not to be impartial in its application as it should be. Respect should be paid to the Act by both employer and employee, and that respect should be extended to the Arbitration Court as well. If the Court's awards and decisions are set aside or not adhered to, or if the Court's intervention in times of industrial unrest is not accepted by the parties concerned, we merely revert to chaotic conditions, and the sooner the Act is scrapped the better.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Have we not reached that stage?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I hope it will be possible to avoid it.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It is long overdue.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I believe something can still be done to instil greater respect for the Act and the Court.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is that not for the Government to do?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I would ask the Government to see to it that it was done, and also urge the Government to see that each party to an award observed its provisions, necessary action following in the event of any failure on the part of either party in that respect. If that were done it would remove the causes of complaint, which I regard as just, and which has been mentioned by other members. In that way, we would do good because we would demonstrate, in the first place, that the Court was established, and therefore must be respected. Its awards must be obeyed, and if they are not obeyed punishment must follow.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Has not the court power to enforce its awards?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The court has certain powers, but it is necessary for action to be taken on the motion of somebody, so as to bring it before the court. Punishment will then be exacted. If prosecutions are taken out by one party to the award against the other, instead of creating that friendly spirit which we all wish to see in industry the starting of those proceedings creates an embittered feeling.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Cannot we amend the Act to give the court power to go ahead?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That may be so, but I have not all the provisions of the Act at my finger ends. I suggest to the Government that if an amendment should be necessary to give the court power to enforce its awards and orders at the request of either party, probably something could be done in that way so as to simplify the procedure and avoid the necessity of the Government taking the action. I do not wish to bring in the Government and make them take the action.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Did not the president of the court call a compulsory conference, and did not the men set him at defiance?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I incidently granted that when, a little while ago, I remarked that those who refused to accept the intervention of the court should be dealt with. The president of the court did intervene, and he tried to get the parties together, but the men refused to accept his intervention.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you know what he said there?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you think we ought to maintain a court that cannot enforce its own awards?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: When a court cannot enforce its awards it becomes inept and useless as an instrument for the purpose for which it was created.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is not that the position to-day?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It looks very much like that, but I am hopeful that the position may be improved, so that we may still have that spirit between employer and employee which is in the best interests of the community. I desire to bring the two parties together and create that spirit of conciliation which is most desirable. Originally the Act was entitled, "The Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation Act," but the Title has been shortened to "Industrial Arbitration Act." When considering revenue, we look not only to the realms of taxation, but also to other sources, such as revenue derived from the various activities of the State. We have as the major State activity our railways. One is pleased to see from the published report that there was an improvement in railway revenue during the year just ended, an improvement of approximately £176,000. The leader in the "West Australian" to-day called attention to this revenue and pertinently asked how much of this improvement can be said to be due to the Transport Co-ordination Act. That Act was debated at considerable length in this House, and probably it would be very difficult at this stage for either the Railway Department or the Transport Board to say exactly how much of the improved revenue can be attributed to the introduction of that Act. The fact remains that there is an improvement, and it must give great satisfaction to the Commissioner of Railways and his officers. The very high capitalisation of the railways is a difficulty long recognised and is calculated to prevent the earning of interest and sinking fund which one desires to see in all State concerns. Despite that, we find that in many railways that have been authorised, there is a total unlikelihood of their earning sufficient to pay their actual capital cost, quite apart from helping the general scheme of railways. That difficulty has been created through many of our lines having been constructed in localities where there is not the necessary volume of trade at present, although no doubt there is a hope that traffic will increase and im-

prove the position generally. We have on the one hand the building of roads, many of them running alongside the railways and competing with the railways, and on the other hand we have the Transport Co-ordination Act to repress many of those people who had established themselves in the carrying of goods along those roads. But those people were able to carry goods at a lesser rate than the railways, due, no doubt to the improved condition of the roads.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You do not suggest we should not have good country roads?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, it is a good thing; but the position is that those people established themselves in order to give certain service to those requiring it.

The Honorary Minister: Do you think that was the reason?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, it was the chief factor in inducing those people to establish themselves. The goods were lifted from the store in Perth and delivered at farm or station so many miles away, the alternative being that the goods had to be sent from the city store to the railway station, and forwarded to the siding to which they were consigned, after which the owner of the goods had to come many miles to lift his goods at the siding. The owner often found considerable difficulty in being at the siding when his goods arrived. Consequently losses have been reported of goods delivered at unattended sidings, and the persons to whom the goods were consigned have had to bear the loss. I am trying to show why it is that people prefer to have their goods sent by motor vehicle: it was largely due to the fact that the motor vehicle was the safer, cheaper and quicker form of transport for those awaiting goods. The Railway Department, as a common carrier, carried goods at the risk of the owners of those goods. One knows the inconvenience that many country people are put to in coming in long distances from their farms to unattended sidings.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Transport Co-ordination Act would never have been passed but for the fact that we authorised so many agricultural railways which should never have been built.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Before tea I was describing the difference between the faci-

lities provided by motor vehicles in delivering goods practically from door to door, and the facilities afforded by the railways. Anyone desirous of having goods transported from one point to another, without inconvenience, and delivered to the final destination without risk of loss such as is evident in connection with railway transport, cannot be blamed for giving preference to motor vehicles. Railway companies in the Old Country are now recognising the importance of the competition of road transport, and the extent to which it is affecting their freights. These companies have risen to the occasion and have become interested in many of these road-carrying companies, and in a large measure have been able to control the diversion of business. They have now come to view road transport vehicles as a means of feeding the railways. They are offering facilities whereby the freight is lifted from one point and delivered at the other, just as the road vehicle does, and at the same time are able to feed their railways and prevent a lot of competition. I am not blaming the Commissioner or his staff for the situation that has grown up with our State railways. The Commissioner and his staff have a heavy load to carry and have to administer the Act as it is. They have under their control, lines that are almost dead, and are working against odds that are probably not present in other private concerns elsewhere. It is the Government that is to blame, not the management of the railways. I am referring to all State Governments who have had control from time to time. They are to blame for not recognising the advance that has taken place in the times, for not keeping pace with the times, and taking advantage of the opportunities offering. Instead of doing that, they put through the Transport Co-ordination Act, which seeks to impose heavy license fees on road vehicles and to restrain people from carrying out their work. There should be more co-ordination between the Government railways and those who are engaged in road transport, so that the facilities I speak of may be provided for the public generally.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Are you advocating a State transport service?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There should be more co-ordination between these services. We should not absolutely stop private enterprise, as is the case now, and compel

people to send their goods to a certain point, and then make arrangements to have them lifted. One must not feel disappointed that a merchant who finds it necessary to send goods from one point to another should prefer transport by any other method than the railways. The system is interfering with the success of the railways to a greater extent than has been recognised. I suggest the consideration of something in the direction I have indicated, to see if we cannot follow in the footsteps of companies in the Old Country. I believe the Government would sooner see those who have freight to provide coming forward voluntarily and putting that freight in the hands of the railways to transport, instead of being forced to do so by means of the Transport Co-ordination Act. There is a good deal to be said for keeping the goodwill of the people. When the Government set up in business, they should march with the times, and meet the needs of the people who have to be supplied. A little while ago my attention was drawn to an article which appeared in the Press in connection with the electrification of many important railways in the Old Country. I refer to this because of what one sees on our own suburban railway system between Fremantle and Midland Junction. We often see almost empty trains while the buses are well patronised. Such a matter should receive the attention of everyone concerned. I know that some thought was given to the question of electrifying the railways some years ago, the section between Fremantle and Midland Junction. At the time it was felt that the Government had not the money with which to carry out the work. When one reads of the great benefit which has been derived from the adoption of more up-to-date methods of travel in the Old Country, we are naturally impelled to bring that matter under the notice of the Government. I will read the article to which I have referred. The headings are, "Ideas do pay," "What a Great Railway has done," "A Road of recovery for the Iron Road." These are notable words and are very suitable for the occasion. We know that our passenger service between Fremantle and Midland Junction is not the success it ought to be. It is not the success it used to be before the days of road transport. The article then proceeds—

We wonder if any more striking example can be shown of the benefits of electricity in transport than the experience of the Southern Railway.

Nearly five passengers travelled on the electrified area last year for every four in 1932, while over half a million more made the journey between Brighton and London. The increase in revenue from passengers over the whole system amounted to £321,000 no less than £150,000 being earned by the new electric services.

In signalling electricity has saved huge sums, and has been far more efficient as well. Though many more trains have been running, 200 signal-boxes have been closed at a saving of £90,000 a year.

Since 1927 the Southern Railway has increased its passengers by 26,000,000 and decreased its expenditure by nearly £4,000,000.

It is a wonderful story of what intelligent foresight can accomplish, and we trust the other big railway companies who used to scorn the Southern will follow the fine example this company has set them. The recovery of the Southern Railway may be confidently described as one of the remarkable industrial events of this century.

Naturally considering the times through which we are still passing and the difficulties of finance, it may be asked where is the money to come from? The thought entered my mind to make a suggestion again to the Government regarding the question of trying to find the money. It was this: In connection with the Federal Aid Roads Agreement made in 1925 members will recollect the Federal Government launched a scheme to provide £35,000,000 for road construction, the payment to be spread over a period of 10 years. Under the original agreement the States were to pay 15s. for every £1 provided by the Commonwealth Government and the contribution which was to be made by the Federal Government amounted to £20,000,000 leaving the other £15,000,000 to be contributed by the States. The £20,000,000 was raised by the imposition of a special tax of 2d. per gallon on petrol, but in 1931 as the result of a conference between the States and the Commonwealth, an alteration was made in the agreement and the States were relieved of the provision of the 15s. At the same time the duty on petrol was increased to 7½d. a gallon. That apparently is the fund providing the money required to carry out the Federal Aid Roads Agreement. I am told that last year the amount received by the Commonwealth was about £7,000,000 and out of that only £2,000,000 was distributed amongst the States for the purposes of the agreement. From the inception of the agreement until last year the Federal Government have had a surplus from that fund of approximately £13,460,000. The

question that occurred to me is whether there could not be some further consideration given at a conference between the States and the Commonwealth regarding the re-allocation of that money, so that the railways, which in many instances are so far behind what we recognise as modern conditions, could be brought up to date to compete more effectively with road transport. I do not see why some portion of this huge surplus could not be diverted to apply towards the useful purpose of improving our railway system, whether it be by electrification of the suburban lines or an improvement of all lines. Take for instance a line over which I have occasion to travel, the railway to Bridgetown. The time occupied in covering that journey is far too long for any modern railway, remembering that by road the distance can be accomplished in about half the time taken by the train. That is an open invitation to people to say that they prefer to travel by road in order to obviate a needless waste of time. What I am asking therefore is that the railways be brought up to date, that the speed be accelerated and as far as the suburban section is concerned we should meet competition by adopting modern methods.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Would electrification pay with our present population?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Smaller cars would be used and fewer men would be employed. It would be wrong of me, however, to offer an opinion on the subject; I would rather have the opinion of an expert. The matter is worth inquiring into. I am merely speaking as a layman without that knowledge or experience which is so essential in these matters.

Hon. E. H. Gray: People can get to Perth by bus while they are walking to the railway station to catch a train.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I know there are many people who live fairly close to the railway who would rather walk the longer distance at the present time to catch a bus because of the more rapid and more frequent transit. With an electrified system trains could run regularly, one almost following the other. Long trains would not be necessary and we would no longer see trains running empty and at lengthy intervals.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are not suggesting electrifying all our railways?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest taking one section first, that between Perth and Fremantle.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You cannot run railways and buses at the same time with our present population.

The Honorary Minister: The matter has been looked into before now.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It took us all our time to get money to provide power for the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have some recollection of the electrification having been inquired into, and judging from the success which has followed the electrification of certain lines in the Old Country the question is whether we can apply the system here.

Hon. C. G. Elliott: There is certainly something wrong with the existing system.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is behind the times, and besides, people will not avail themselves of a slow method of travelling.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: On your own showing the Old Country has millions of people to carry and we have only 400,000 in the whole State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: All these matters will have to be inquired into. If we do not look ahead and meet the position we shall only be carrying a heavy burden all the time. If we can carry on the system without loss with the aid of the electrification of the suburban lines we shall be rendering a good service. There is one more matter to which I should like to refer, and it relates to the improvement in the position of our factories. The output of the factories for 1931-32 was £11,186,941 and a comparison of the number of factories shows that in 1931-32 they totalled 1,499 and in 1933-34, 1,606. The hands employed in 1932-33 numbered 14,815 and in 1933-34 that figure increased to 16,195. To an extent that helped to absorb a certain number of our unemployed.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That is the result of Labour rule.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The value of the materials used in 1932-33 was £6,677,000 and in the following year £6,791,000. The value of the output in 1932-33 was £12,327,000 and in 1933-34 that figure increased to £12,877,000.

Hon. E. H. Gray: All that shows confidence in the Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It shows that the people are determined to move ahead. I

have quoted these figures because, as Mr. Cornell mentioned yesterday, we are experiencing great competition from the Eastern States. Amongst the measures which are to be submitted to us will be a Bill to amend the Factories and Shops Act. I am inclined to think it is a good thing to leave well alone in view of the difficulties we have in getting factories established. Some observations were made in the Press the other day outlining the effect of the proposed amendment to the Shops and Factories Act. Apparently the measure will follow the lines of the Bill that came before us last session. That measure was rejected. It dealt partly with what are called backyard factories. We as a people are endeavouring to make our way against very heavy odds by reason of the competition of Eastern States factories, and it behoves us to weigh the position carefully and give encouragement to the small man to establish himself. We should not try to extinguish or repress him, but should give him a chance to develop our industries. The more secondary industries and factories we can establish in our midst, the more facilities we shall be providing for employment and the greater the prosperity that will accrue to the State. These are matters that should be considered in view of our difficulties in establishing secondary industries. One of the tragedies of life, it will be admitted, is the serious position in which the youth of the State is placed—the difficulty of getting him into some suitable employment. That difficulty is increased and enhanced by the fact that we have not the avenues to provide for the absorption of the boys as they leave school. Here we have to establish farm schools, etc., to provide them with a training to supplement that given by the technical colleges which, in itself, is not sufficient. I believe that the apprenticeship board in the building trades is desirous of helping in every way, but contractors find a difficulty because of the obligations imposed and troubles occasioned through the conditions placed on the employment of apprentices. Difficulties undoubtedly exist, and something should be done to remove them. The apprenticeship board occupy the position of masters of the boy, not the contractor. If apprentices are to be taught their trade, the contractors should be unhampered by the conditions that now

exist. If something could be done to remove many of the conditions that are imposed, there might be openings for more boys than are employed at present.

The Honorary Minister: Can you indicate what they are?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Not at the present time.

The Honorary Minister: Do you know what they are?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I understand that under many of the arbitration awards, only a limited number of boys may be employed, say, one apprentice to two journeymen.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It varies.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes.

Hon. J. Cornell: I think it is the other way round.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: One apprentice to three journeymen in some instances.

The Honorary Minister: It depends on the industry.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Precisely. The boys are allowed to go to the technical school to get certain training, but to my mind it is only disconcerting and disturbing to the training of a youth to be moving him about instead of allowing him to concentrate on the occupation in which he is engaged. I think that is a wrong system. There should be only one master, namely the contractor; otherwise there must be an absence of discipline. It is impossible to discipline the youth under existing conditions. I shall not attempt to discuss the matter at greater length, but it would be worth while to consider the whole scheme and review it. Present conditions are so alarming that we are really compelled to do something for the youths.

Hon. J. Cornell: Why not go back to the old practice? Let the father take the boy on the job and teach him the trade?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is a wise suggestion. Such a youth would be indentured in a proper way.

The Honorary Minister: I am afraid the hon. member has not a very good knowledge of the conditions.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I shall be glad to hear what the Minister has to say. I suggest that the matter is well worthy of inquiry and investigation. The position that exists is that there is a great deal of unemployment amongst the youth of our State, far too much, and the result is that we are simply allowing the youths to grow up as

unskilled labourers. Consequently when we require skilled workmen or artisans, we have to send for them from places outside. Instead of our own boys having the qualifications and being able to do the work, they are redrafted into the field of unskilled labourers. That is the position and it is a calamity.

The Honorary Minister: It is unfortunate, and it is a fact that not too many boys should be employed.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Why?

The Honorary Minister: Because they want cheap labour.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is probably where the mistake is made. A conception exists that every man who employs boys wants them simply for cheap labour. If the point were examined more thoroughly it would be realised that boys in any trade can do only a certain amount of the preliminary work. No one can say that a boy can do a man's job. It is useless to send a boy to do a man's job.

Hon. J. Cornell: Except driving a motor car.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He might do that, but we do not want boys to drift into avenues of that sort. It would be better for boys to possess the skill and knowledge and qualifications of some trade, and then they would be better equipped for life.

The Honorary Minister: I suppose you agree that they should be properly trained, not half-trained?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Yes, but there should not be a division of control. There must be discipline, and that can be enforced only by the master. A captain of a ship is in command and his orders have to be obeyed, but when boys are placed under the control of a body other than the master I am afraid it is impossible to secure proper discipline.

The Honorary Minister: I should like you to explain what you mean by control.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I was referring to the building trades. I have not spoken to anybody interested in the trade, but I recently read a statement by a contractor who said that the boys made complaints to the apprenticeship board. A boy might do something he should not have done, and be chided for it, and a complaint is made. The contractor said that masters were doing their best to teach the boys their trade, but it became impossible unless there was discipline. Discipline is necessary in any voca-

tion. When at school a boy has to obey the schoolmaster, and when the boy enters a trade, discipline is necessary there just as much as at school.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: If we pass the Registration of Builders' Bill, they will be in a better position to take apprentices.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not propose to speak further except to say that I shall support the second reading.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [8.13]: During this debate several members have referred to matters mentioned in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. Perhaps I may be permitted to mention one matter that does not appear in the Speech. I was very disappointed to find no reference giving any indication of the Government's attitude towards the future control and administration of the far North, particularly that portion which lies to the north of the 20th parallel of latitude. Three years ago the Government appointed an advisory council which consisted of the North-West members of this Chamber, the four North-West members of another place, drawn from both sides of the House, and representatives of the pastoral industry and business people. They made numerous recommendations regarding the present method of control, suggesting relief where relief was due and suggesting ways of improving present conditions. When they came to the question of the future development of the North, they could make only one recommendation. The committee seemed to realise that the development and peopling of the Kimberleys—that is the part to which I refer—was going to be a very expensive matter, and they realised that it could not be undertaken by the Western Australian Government alone. Therefore they suggested that the Western Australian Government should bring the matter under the notice of the Commonwealth Government and the Imperial Government and see whether some assistance could not be made available to try to people the huge empty spaces of the far North. Within the last few years we have seen how Japan has gone into Manchuria for one reason, and one reason only, namely, to make room for her overcrowded people. To-day we find Italy apparently determined to go into Abyssinia. Italy wants more land for her teeming millions. Even Australia is mentioned in the telegram from Italy. It is said

that Australia is no good as a place to which to send her surplus people, because, in a generation or two, they become Australians. We know that Germany is agitating for a return of her colonies for one purpose and one purpose only, namely, to make room for her surplus people. Mr. Cornell, speaking last night, said that the greatest questions confronting the world to-day were the question of marketing and that of land for the surplus inhabitants of these various nations. In our far North we have an area the size of the British Isles, with only a few hundred people. I am perfectly certain that the land-hungry nations are looking with envious eyes on those thousand miles of coastline absolutely uninhabited, are looking at those ten or a dozen beautiful harbours we have in the North untouched and unopened, and at the something like a third of a million square miles of country there. It is said by some people that our North could not carry a population. But that is absolute nonsense. Why is the North producing those hundreds of thousands of cattle and sheep? The North teems with game. The seas adjacent to its shores teem with fish. Every opportunity is there of obtaining land for millions of people. And still these other nations are taking up parts of the globe that already are to some extent populated. This is too dangerous a question to defer any longer. Ever since I entered Parliament I have heard that the question of peopling our North is to be dealt with, that the danger is to be prevented, that the menace to the Australian nation is to be done away with, that we are going to people that part of Western Australia. However, nothing is done. Last month I went along the coast as far as Darwin; of course, I had been up the coast many times before. With the exception of Gascoyne, which is progressing and increasing its population, the whole of our North is going backwards. We had more people, more cattle, and more sheep 25 years ago in the rest of the North-West than we have to-day. Something must be done. I have always been against the suggestion of handing over any portion of our North-West to the Commonwealth. I believe that the more land the Federal Government acquired, the keener they would be for unification. But after this last visit of mine to the North as far as Darwin, I have had to change my opinion. The other place besides Carnarvon that is being developed in our North is Dar-

win—under Federal rule. The difference between Darwin to-day, and Darwin as it was when I visited it last year, is positively marvellous. A garrison town has been created there; forts are being put up; the largest aerodrome in Australia has just been completed there. Big hotels are being erected in Darwin, and hundreds of houses are being provided for the increased population. I know it is all done with Government money.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do the Federal Government treat our North-West in the same way as they treat Darwin?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am coming to that point. We must realise that we cannot people the Kimberleys ourselves. I have changed my opinion, since speaking in this Chamber last year, for the very reason that I find the Federal Government doing something, even though in one spot only, to protect our far North. If they will do it in that one place, perhaps it would be better to choose one of two evils and hand the far North over to the Commonwealth rather than let some other nation have it, which is bound to come unless we do something in the near future. It has been suggested to-night that the Premier should discuss with the Federal Government the building of a railway from the Northern Territory to Wyndham. I do request our Leader to see whether the Premier and his Ministers cannot go a little further and have a heart-to-heart talk with the Federal authorities to ascertain whether they cannot be induced to bring in the Imperial Government as well, if necessary. But one thing we should realise: Western Australia cannot afford to people its far North. That is going to take a tremendous amount of money. Last night we heard how necessary it is to have holding and fattening paddocks in order to develop our beef industry. I am confident we can develop our beef industry. I am certain that our beef industry one day will be an excellent one, its existence rendered necessary by a shortage of beef required in Great Britain, because every year America is taking more beef, and no doubt the Argentine will supply America, whereupon England will have to look to her own Dominions. The development of the beef industry will require a great deal of money. It is our duty to be honest and say to the Federal Government, "We cannot do the work in the North, and so we invite you to come in and help us do it. If you cannot

come in, take the thing over." And the Imperial Government ought to be told about it, too. The empty North is not only a menace to Western Australia and Australia, but also a danger to the safety of the British Empire. If any other nation once gets a foothold in any one part of our dominion, the fact will only induce other nations to go to other parts. I support the second reading of the Bill.

HON. H. J. YELLAND (East) [8.25]: I shall not detain the House long in speaking on the Bill, but I have been struck with statements I heard in passing through the city and country, such as "We have turned the corner, and things are going on very prosperously, and everything is well as regards the future of Western Australia." I cannot say I am quite so optimistic as are my friends who have thus addressed me, and I want to give one or two reasons why I do not share their optimism. As I go around the city I do find evidences of prosperity. For example, it is difficult to park one's car anywhere in the business portion of the city at any time during business hours. Most of the cars parked are new cars, and one wonders where all the capital has come from to allow such seeming prosperity to be displayed about the city. But when we get outback, we have a different tale to tell. People there find it almost impossible to come to the city because of the lack of prosperity that is evident throughout the country districts. It is quite an ordinary thing to find a family badly needing holidays and recreation but unable, because of lack of wherewithal, to leave their farm and take relaxation by the seaside or in the city. If that is the case, evidently there must be an unbalanced condition as between the town and the country. I venture to say that if we went closely into the question, we should find that there are reasons which explain the whole situation. The agricultural reports, I think, cause us all to agree that the condition of the agricultural industry is of first importance for the consideration of any Government to-day, because agriculture is the basis on which the whole structure of our State finances rests. If these are in a precarious condition, it must follow that our seeming prosperity is nothing less than fictitious. If we have fictitious prosperity, a calamity must ensue sooner or later. I shall refer presently to a remark of Sir Herbert Gepp

in this regard when making his report on his work as Wheat Commissioner. It may be interesting to some hon. members to know that to-day the farmer is paying, in the shape of his interest bill, 1s. 6d. per bushel for every bushel of wheat produced throughout the Commonwealth, while he is receiving only about 2s. or 2s. 3d. per bushel. Hon. members will see how much is left for the carrying on of his farming operations.

Hon. J. Cornell: The farmer is not paying that; he is owing it.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: It is due.

Hon. G. W. Miles: One shilling and sixpence per bushel?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes.

Hon. G. W. Miles: For interest?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is on the debt.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: On the amount of debt due by the farmer to his creditors, in the way of money that has been loaned to him and the deficit which has accumulated rapidly owing to the difficulties which have beset him during the past four or five years. I have not checked the amount of interest, but I am given to understand that it is 1s. 6d. per bushel of wheat.

Hon. L. Craig: You are making wheat responsible for all of it.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: If we call upon the wool industry to pay the debts of the farmer, it will take 8d. per pound of all the wool produced in Australia to pay the farmer's interest bill. That seems a colossal charge.

Hon. J. Nicholson: This is not the national debt you are speaking of, but the debts of the farmers?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, the farmers' debt. Many of our colleagues are industrious in condemning the tariff, and I join with them to a certain extent in their condemnation; but after all said and done the disadvantages under which we labour from tariff burdens are an impost upon our wheat production equal to about 3d. per bushel. I have not found any comparison with the dairying industry, but I do know that that industry is in a precarious position both here and in the Eastern States. It is clear that the amount of money that has been advanced for the assistance of dairying must approximate what has been made available for wheat and wool men. One can appreciate that these extra imposts, under present conditions, are making a tremendous demand upon production throughout the primary industries. Sir Herbert

Gepp goes on to sum up the conditions of our primary producers in the course of his report, particulars of which were published in the "West Australian" about a couple of months ago. The report contained certain striking recommendations and, if we get down to bed-rock, we will realise the logic and justness of his proposals. His first recommendation is to secure the elimination of the unfit, and Western Australia has had practical experience of unsuitable men on the land, such as has not been shared by any other State of the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. Cornell: I would not say that.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I believe that is so, to a very large extent. I can give Mr. Cornell some information that I received 20 years ago, when there was a big rush towards the land. I remember on one occasion a man saying that he intended to take up land, although he knew nothing about it, because there was no necessity for him to put any money into the venture. If he made a success of it, it was his own; if he failed, it meant that the Government lost the money. In addition to that, there was, he said, always the possibility of being able to sell out to some other mug, and thus make some profit for himself. When I was an officer of the Lands Department I heard that position declared time and again by various people when I was attending to their requirements at the public counter. I often thought, weighing up the position at the time, that the Government would be in a very precarious position, seeing that so many of the settlers knew nothing about farming operations and were merely taking up land and gambling with it at the country's expense. That was what was done on many occasions. The system was largely responsible for the establishment on the land of a number of men who were totally unfit for the life. Certainly many of those who were obviously unsuited for the work had to give way, and, by that means, many of the misfits have been eliminated, but, in his report, Sir Herbert Gepp suggests that there are still many men on the land who will be unable to stand up to the extra imposts that are necessary to-day in order to carry on farming. He suggests that their unsuitability is a guarantee that they cannot make a success of their work. In those circumstances, we should cut the loss.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: There was no necessity to await Sir Herbert Gepp's report to

find that out. That has been known for many years past.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Quite so.

The Honorary Minister: It may be that a man can be a good wheatgrower but a bad farmer at the same time.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I do not know that that is so. Having suggested the elimination of the unfit, Sir Herbert Gepp proceeds to deal with those who are likely to make good. The only way to really assist those who are likely to make good is to provide for an adjustment of their debts, which I will deal with more fully later on. Perhaps one of the most important recommendations Sir Herbert Gepp made was with reference to oversea selling. He suggests as a further stipulation, that there should be one oversea selling agency. That is tantamount to the suggestion of compulsory pools in order to put the consumer in Australia on the same footing with the primary producers of wheat and wool, as in other industries. He suggests there should be an excise charge on flour for the wheat producer, just as we have to pay excise on sugar in order to maintain the Queensland industry. He says that to make the industry economically sound, we must have a composition of the farmers' debts voluntarily, or, if necessary, compulsorily. I think it will be necessary to give that phase close consideration, and I understand that we shall, at a later stage, have that opportunity when dealing with legislation that will be companion enactments to those that will be introduced in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How will you get rid of the debts?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: We will never get rid of them.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you get rid of the debtor's liability, you will increase the creditor's liability.

Hon. L. Craig: At any rate, the latter is lost already.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: There can be no serious objection raised to the bulk of the recommendations, except, perhaps, regarding those dealing with compulsory pools and compulsory conditioning. I dare say those phases will be discussed at length but, in the meantime, I can say definitely that the farming community look forward with a great deal of interest to the forthcoming legislation that is to be introduced in the Federal Parliament in an endeavour

to save the industry throughout the Commonwealth. I could go a little further with regard to Sir Herbert Gepp's suggestions and deal with some measures that appear to be rather drastic. He goes so far in dealing with the possible solution of the position to suggest that there is a possibility of a new financial system being inevitable. In his own words, he said—

Indefinite continuance of the steps by which Australia is at present maintaining a semi-equilibrium will mean in the end a collapse of our social and financial system.

Further on he says—

Farmers and industrial workers face each other across a great chasm. Each can produce far more than enough to supply their present normal needs. Increased purchasing power for the masses seems the only way out.

That is the only possible way out, according to Sir Herbert, from the impasse of existing conditions. What it leads to is a better distribution of wealth.

Hon. L. Craig: That rather suggests Major Douglas.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: There is a certain suggestion of Major Douglas in that remark. When a man like Sir Herbert Gepp is responsible for such a suggestion, it must be realised he would not give publicity to it unless he had given the subject much sincere thought.

The Honorary Minister: A lot depends on who makes the suggestion.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Quite so. In this State the report of the Royal Commission on Bulk Handling has been heartily received and it bears out all that we have advocated for the system. The present administration is justified and that is a fine tribute to those who installed a system never before known in the annals of bulk handling. The system has been carried out successfully and representatives from the Eastern States have examined it. When I was in South Australia recently a number of inquiries were made from me regarding the system and the people there are enamoured of the possibility of installing a similar system, perhaps slightly modified, in the sister State. That is a great compliment to those who were responsible for the scheme and for its successful handling. It has stood up to the strain imposed upon it.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you say everyone is happy about it?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: They are satisfied that the bulk handling system will be a benefit to the man who uses it. It will mean the saving of about £100 a year to me, and that is something to be thankful for. I am only one of many thousands who will be benefited. The installation of bulk handling has reduced the number of men employed by nearly two-thirds. That was not the reason why the promoters introduced it. It was largely because of the fact that we have had to pay enormous sums to India every year for bags. When a man has only 200 or 300 bags on his farm his wheat must be carted while he is harvesting, and so the cartage is done much more rapidly and in consequence all his fields are available for stock feed perhaps two months earlier than they would be under the bag system, which entailed a tremendous loss of time and of stock feed.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How many farmers can go on harvesting and carting at the same time?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The carting is done largely by contract, leaving the farmer to go on with his harvesting, and so the whole business is completed in half the time.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is there not congestion at the sidings sometimes?

The PRESIDENT: May I suggest that the hon. member is not a witness under examination?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: I am prepared to answer any questions, because this is a subject which I feel is not sufficiently understood.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member should not provoke these questions.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The cost of transport from the farm to the siding is greatly reduced and various other advantages are well worth calculating.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The poor cocky who cannot pay anybody, has to pay a contractor to cart his wheat.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: The contractor can do it at less than the farmer could. I do not think the extra freight charged by the railways for bulk wheat is justified, although the Railway Department claim that there have been considerable losses due to it. Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., have paid all the costs of altering the railway trucks, and the department has not been put to any expense whatever in the con-

struction of new trucks for the transport of bulk wheat. There are other points which should be considered, as for instance the terminals at Fremantle and Geraldton.

Hon. W. J. Mann: What about Bunbury?

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Bunbury is coming later. It is suggested that Fremantle and Geraldton should be equipped forthwith, and it is also suggested to put the Fremantle terminal under the Harbour Trust and the Geraldton terminal under the Railway Department, but no reasons have been given for that. I should like the Minister to tell us why it is. The whole work of transporting the wheat it is recommended should be in the hands of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., whereas the terminals are to be placed in the hands of those departments I have mentioned. I do not see why the whole concern should not be left under the one authority. However, there may be a reasonable explanation of it, and if so I hope the Minister will give it. When I was in the Eastern States I was asked why Western Australian apples commanded a better price in the Old Country than did the apples from the Eastern States. I replied that we had so splendid a climate and paid such close attention to the exporting of the fruit that we were sending out the best apples the world could produce. Then we had an argument as to the use of the red case as against the white case. In that regard I hope the Government will stand solidly for the use of the local wood in our red cases.

Hon. J. Nicholson: They are well known in London.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes. This is a matter of so much importance that the Government should give favourable consideration to the retention of the red case. The question of rabbit destruction is of great importance to the farmers, and concerted efforts will have to be made to stop the inroads of the pest. Something will have to be done to get rid of this national vermin, and the only way to deal with it is from a national point of view. The Government should be called upon to show ways and means by which we can collectively get rid of this pest or at any rate keep it under control. That is all I wish to say about our rural industries; not that one could not go on to say a good deal more, but because I believe those I

have mentioned to be the most important awaiting attention at present. A great deal has been heard about the North-West railway, and I endorse what was said by Mr. Angelo, namely that if the North-West is to be retained as part of the Commonwealth it will be necessary to develop it. The railway is required in order to develop the meat industry. The export of our meat from the Commonwealth is one of national importance. The greatest competitor we have is the Argentine. Their stock is produced under conditions very different from those obtaining in Australia. They have a deep alluvial soil which will grow lucerne and various other fodders. The Argentine beast is fit for marketing before it is three years of age.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Before it is two years of age.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, very often. That means that the grower has an advantage of 25 per cent. in the length of period during which he has to keep the animal and, more than that, the beef is sent out under better conditions than are possible here. If it should happen that Great Britain gave Australian meat preference at the expense of the Argentine, it is possible that the Argentine would turn its attention to dairying and so would be able to flood the London market with dairy produce to the prejudice of Australia.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Denmark is almost doing that now.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND: Yes, but if in addition to the Denmark produce there came similar produce from the Argentine, where would we be? I should like to refer to an incident that happened while I was in the Eastern States. It shows how unfair and misleading newspaper reports can be. At an agricultural bureau meeting I was asked to give a resume of the agricultural development in Western Australia during the period I have been here. I did so to the best of my ability, without being able to refer to any statistics other than those contained in a small pocket-book I had with me. I had occasion to mention the difficulties of tick and pleuro under which our beef industry in the North-West was suffering. To my astonishment when the newspaper published a report of my address the disadvantages of the North-West through tick and pleuro were the only features mentioned. In the course of my remarks I had pointed out that Western Australia had produced 50,000,000 bushels of wheat, and that dur-

ing that year she was the highest wheat producer of the Commonwealth, but nothing whatever was said about that in the newspaper report. Then I dealt largely with the conditions of our dairying industry and the fact that we were now exporting eggs, whereas a few years ago we had to import eggs by the million from South Australia. Of that the newspaper took no notice at all but dealt only with the pleuro and tick which I had quite casually mentioned. I was dreadfully disappointed, but of course it was of no use trying to correct the Press report. I had intended to-night to voice my disapproval of the attitude of the Government towards the strike on the gold-fields, but I now think that would be superfluous, for the Minister knows perfectly well one's feelings as to the maintenance of law and order and the strict attention that should be given to any orders of the court. I must express my disapproval of the laxity of the Government in that respect, but have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

HON. L. CRAIG (South-West) [9.0]: Evidently I have not learned much about the peculiarities of Parliament, for apparently the Supply Bill is just like the Address-in-reply and resembles very much a sort of catch-as-catch-can, thereby enabling members to speak on everything in general. I have before me the auditors' annual report upon the Lotteries Commission. The total receipts during last year from the sale of tickets amounted to £206,000. On the expenditure side we find advertising £5,000; salaries, etc., all normal expenditure except as to the commissions, amounted to £18,867. That is rather disturbing. The prize money amounted to £89,000, and the available surplus was £84,000. The amount of commissions paid represented 9 per cent. of the total proceeds, the prize money represented about 43½ per cent., and the available surplus about 40 per cent. The surplus and the commissions amounted to half the total proceeds, or 50 per cent.

Hon. E. H. Gray: In the bad old days 25 per cent. commission was paid.

Hon. L. CRAIG: When the measure was put through I do not think it was the intention of Parliament that these lotteries should be advertised with a view to encouraging people to gamble and buy the tickets. I believe the intention was to make an effort to

absorb within the State money that was being sent out of the State for gambling purposes. It was not intended that sufficient commissions should be paid to agents to enable them to advertise and broadcast far and wide the sale of these tickets. Wherever we go we see the slogans "Now is the time to buy a lottery ticket," "Put your money into lotteries," etc.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: At 6s. an inch.

Hon. L. CRAIG: It seems to me that is getting away from the intention of Parliament at the time. One has only to go to a picture show to see advertisements urging people to buy lottery tickets. We see quite large advertisements in the daily Press to the same effect.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: The agents say they do not get any sales unless they advertise.

Hon. L. CRAIG: That was not the intention of Parliament. The commissions should be just sufficient to make it worth the while of bookshops and suchlike establishments to sell tickets. I went through an arcade in Perth the other day where there is a small box of a shop for the sale of lottery tickets, and I saw five employees engaged in the disposal of tickets as fast as they could. Actually we are making a business of selling lottery tickets instead of carrying out the real intention of Parliament, which was to absorb within the State the money that was going out of it. I suggest that 9 per cent. commission is far too much to give and is getting away from the intention of Parliament. I congratulate the Government on arranging the North-West trip for certain members of Parliament. I think that Mr. Gray formed one of the party. I was up there myself following the official party. It has been voiced to me on several occasions that the visitors only saw the choice stations along the coast. That is a fact. They visited Brick House, Minderoo, Minilya, the best places along the coast. Elsewhere, however, there are many station people who are no better off to-day than they were 25 years ago. I refer to those in the spinifex country. Those who made the trip should not imagine that the North-West is all like the parts they saw. The coastal country is the best and the oldest settled part of the North-West. It is standing up best to the conditions resulting from the depression. Had the party been able to visit the spinifex country they would have seen some depressing sights. I know people up there who are

worse off than when they were young men 30 years ago, and they are living under worse conditions than are wheatbelt farmers. The party certainly saw some beautiful stations. I am interested in one of them. They are nice places, but they do not serve as a general indication of what the North-West is like. Mr. Nicholson dealt with transport questions. As a farmer myself I am in sympathy with the Commissioner of Railways. No doubt it is very hard for some people who have been accustomed to getting their goods delivered by motor lorry to be forced to use the railways. Motor lorries cater for only a special class of goods, the small heavy goods which have a high freight value. I agree with the Commissioner, who says "We carry your superphosphate at a loss, we carry your wheat at cost price, and if we do these things for you the least you can do is to give us those goods on which we can show a profit." Western Australia has more miles of railway per head of the population than any other country in the world. We cannot be compared with the Old Country with a population of 40,000,000, all contained in a small area. As a farmer I could probably use motor lorries quite a lot, but we cannot have the benefits both ways. If we get our essentials carried at a low rate we must give the Railways those things on which they can show a profit. I congratulate the Government upon their Dairy Products Marketing Act which was passed last session. It is working well, and to the satisfaction of the producers as well as the manufacturers and merchants. I also congratulate the Government upon the appointment of the two producers' representatives. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party in another place castigated the Government over the appointment of the producers' representatives who were selected by a body called the South-West Conference, with which I have a lot to do. He also castigated the Government for refusing to accept the nominees of the Primary Producers' Association.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Were those gentlemen farmers?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I will come to that. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party had the temerity and the audacity to castigate the Government for making those appointments. The South-West Conference is a body of producers, who meet in Bunbury every year, and enjoy quite a reputation

for being genuine producers. The executive of that body appointed two genuine dairy farmers, who were both financial members of the Primary Producers' Association. A coterie of the Primary Producers' Association, not representative of one-quarter of the dairy farmers of the district, held a small meeting, and selected two men, neither of whom had any interest in the dairying industry nor were producers themselves, but were paid organisers for the Primary Producers' Association. The Minister for Agriculture very rightly said that the producers' representatives must be genuine producers themselves, and I congratulate him on making those appointments.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Were not the other two residents of the city?

Hon. L. CRAIG: The other two were both residents of the city, yes. I am surprised at the audacity or temerity of Mr. Ferguson in making those statements. As regards the dairying industry, the board appointed are at the present time functioning satisfactorily. On all sides I hear that they are functioning to the satisfaction of the manufacturers. The industry is in a better position to-day than it has been for some considerable time. That feeling of depression—that feeling of “Are we ever going to do any good?”—is gradually disappearing. Among dairy farmers there is now a feeling of confidence, because Western Australia to-day is receiving more per pound for butter-fat than any other part of Australia. The net receipts are greater in Western Australia than anywhere else in this continent, and almost greater than in any other part of the world. But there is a danger. Every extra pound of butter-fat that is produced now reduces the return to the producer. We are exporting butter; and, as most of us know, the local price of butter is 1s. 3d. per lb. wholesale while the oversea price is something under 5d., the latter sales being made at a loss, of course. Therefore I urge the Government to be careful about encouraging the extension of the dairying industry. Let us concentrate on the coastal districts in the South-West, where dairying can be carried on to the best advantage. To me it seems that our efforts should be concentrated on the development of our wool industry. To-night we have heard from Mr. Yelland that the Argentine can beat us in the beef industry, and probably could produce butter-fat at a price lower than is possible here because the

Argentine climate and land and pastures are better than ours. Butter-fat can be produced, and is being produced, in Russia, Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, and in fact in every country of Europe, whereas the fine wool industry is confined absolutely to Australia. No other country in the world can ever compete with Australia in the fine wool industry—not even South Africa. I spent some considerable time in Bradford with the South African wool expert, and I asked him, “What are the prospects of your country beating Australia in the fine wool trade?” He replied, “We have small areas of land suitable climatically for growing fine wool, but the total of those areas is so small that we can never become a serious competitor of yours.” The same remark applies to the Argentine. A country with a summer rainfall can never produce fine wool. Fine wool is a commodity that can be stored, a commodity that has never yet been over-produced. It seems foolish to encourage unduly other industries in which all other countries can compete with us, and probably can compete with us under advantageous conditions, and foolish to be exporting a perishable commodity which to-day is being sold on the world's markets at a loss while we should be concentrating our efforts on a commodity which is always saleable and in which no other country in the world can compete with us. In Western Australia good-quality wool can be produced on land with a 40-in. rainfall, because of the dry summer. We have a dry summer, and therefore can produce a very high quality of wool. I urge the Government to use their best endeavours to induce settlers to go in for more sheep—not run sheep but farm sheep. Many settlers are just running sheep as a sideline. If the same energy were applied to the farming of sheep as is applied to dairying, the returns per acre from sheep would be just as great as those from the dairying industry are to-day. I suggest that the Agricultural Department concentrate upon that aspect and, if possible, keep the dairying industry away from Katanning, where they can dairy, but where they can produce the best wool in the world. The Katanning district cannot dairy as successfully as the South-West. I have something to say on the subject of employment. In the farming districts to-day the employment position is fairly acute. In my particular district it is almost impossible to get a man

—I do not mean a permanent man but a man for a temporary job lasting a week or a fortnight—as men used to be obtainable previously. In the North a station manager said to me, “I have never known it to be so difficult to obtain men for station work as it is to-day, and I have been here for 40 years.” It seems to me that sustenance work for single men could be altered. The dairy-ing industry is unable to pay what is a reasonable wage. No dairy farmer can pay the basic wage. That is the reason for the present demand for boys. Sustenance work seems to be destroying the morale of the single man. He has been given—I speak subject to correction—two days’ work a week at about 12s. a day, the equivalent of 24s. or 25s. a week.

The Honorary Minister: He can earn up to 30s. a week.

Hon. L. CRAIG: His wage on a farm would be £1 or 25s. per week and keep. The single man may well say, “I am not going to work on a farm for £1 or 25s. a week when I can earn 30s. by working for the Government about two days a week.” The Government have a right to say to the single man—I am not referring to the married man at all—“If you are unable to obtain employment, we will see that you do not starve. We will find you work, but it shall be on a different plane from the ordinary work. We will allow you still your 30s. a week, but instead of earning that amount in two days you shall earn it in three or even four.” That would encourage the man to go into private employment. Under those conditions the single man would say, “I will take this sustenance work while I must, but at the first opportunity I will get away from sustenance work into private employment.” The spirit of adventure seems to have gone from the young men, and apparently the spirit of enterprise is going. What I suggest would be a good move, because opportunities are sticking out to-day for enterprising young men who are not afraid to go out a bit. I myself sent three men up to the North at the request of my brother, who wrote to me, “I have a big contract here, and I cannot get men locally.” Those three men have never looked back. I believe that after paying all the cost of their keep, they earned something like £250 each last year. They have written to say that they have three years’ work ahead of them.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you want more men?

Hon. L. CRAIG: I do not know whether more are wanted. I was told that if good men, willing to do the work expected of them, mostly contract work such as fencing, but well paid, go up North, there is work for them. But good men must go up and look for the work. There are two men shooting kangaroos on one property and each has been making £15 per week. There are thousands of kangaroos to be shot. These are some of the avenues along which young men of enterprise may find healthy and remunerative occupation. The sustenance rates that apply to-day and the conditions governing the system are such as to discourage men from taking up other work. I think the Government should see to it that the conditions governing sustenance work and payments for single men are such that they will be induced to seek private work and thus cultivate their own initiative, which they have lost to-day. I know of some young fellows who refuse to take work outside the city because, they say, they are frightened to do so. In truth, I am not very enamoured of the youth appeal campaign. I have had many requests to find boys for dairy farms. What they require is not necessarily boys but cheap labour, for the industry will not stand the payment of a big wage. There are many opportunities for boys to take up jobs with the wages at 10s., 15s., or £1 a week, and keep.

Hon. E. H. Gray: There are not too many at £1 a week and keep.

Hon. L. CRAIG: No, but I know of some. I had six requests in one week. An institution with which I am connected had last year 1,800 applications for 70 children who were available. Members will see that the demand is there. I am sure that hundreds of youths could find positions on farms, but the question arises as to whether the people of Western Australia are supposed to make jobs that the boys want to go to, or should we tell the boys that they must go to the jobs that are offered. There are jobs offering on farms for boys that will give them a future that will be reasonably bright. All the legislation we pass seems to seek to get more money for someone. Surely the farming industry, despite its deficiencies, of which it has many, provides a decent, healthy life. It is clean, honest, healthy. For anyone with the least sug-

gestion of an agricultural mind, it provides a very happy life. If we could place boys in an industry that would provide them with happiness, health and prosperity, surely we should do all that is necessary.

Hon. E. H. Gray: If everyone's home were of the same calibre as your own, there would be a rush of boys to farms.

Hon. L. CRAIG: Don't make any mistake. There are very many good homes.

Hon. E. H. Gray: But hundreds of bad ones.

Hon. L. CRAIG: If we have no faith in the future of the agricultural industry, have we faith in anything at all? We should legislate for the happiness of people rather than for their wealth. In the South-West the settlers have small holdings and they will not be wealthy, but they will constitute one of the happiest and most healthy sections of the community, and surely that is worth while. That is all we should aim at. In my opinion, the schools should be encouraged to develop an agricultural bias in the minds of the boys so that rather than be forced on to the land, they will have a keen desire to go on the land. Surely that is not an unreasonable suggestion. If I were a boy and had to start over again most decidedly I would go in for farming. We should almost force boys to go into the country instead of continuing to find them jobs in the towns. They may get better wages here, but they will certainly not be so happy or so healthy. I hope the Government will give attention to the few matters I have suggested, and perhaps the State as a whole will be a bit happier if we can only have a contented, agricultural-minded community.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [9.26]: Seeing that this House is asked to endorse a cheque for £2,200,000 and so far we have not received any information as to how the Government propose to spend quite a lot of it, I want to submit one or two matters affecting my province that I think we can justly expect to receive attention. I trust the Government will find additional money for the Railway Department, in order that they may be able to recapture some of the business that has been lost. If something is not done very quickly, that part of railway work will have to be abandoned. When Mr. Nicholson spoke about the electrification of the railways, I presume he referred to the suburban lines.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Of course!

Hon. W. J. MANN: I was going to suggest that if he referred to the outback lines that work would be something our grandchildren's grandchildren might probably witness. The passenger traffic on the railways is at a very low ebb at present, and those who travel by trains that run parallel to roads have ample evidence of the volume of traffic that is lost to the railways because people prefer to travel by car. On former occasions I have given figures to show what the saving by car amounts to. If I were to travel to Perth from Busselton by car I could, journeying reasonably, do the distance in 4½ hours, whereas, under the best possible conditions, it takes nine hours on the railways. As a matter of fact, the section I refer to is rather fortunate for the people who live further south and south-west have to spend a proportionately longer time in the train. I presume that some day the Government will instal motor coaches on the spur lines to act as feeders for the main lines. They would be single unit trains, controlled by one man and would travel much faster and do all the work required by the people outback under conditions that would make the settlers there prefer to make use of the railway facilities, rather than avail themselves of their motor cars. It would be extremely popular and at the same time would give the railways a chance to improve the position they are in to-day. I want to give those in control of the railways a word of praise for the efforts they are now making and for the improved result that has been shown during the past year. But I believe that some money made available for them to purchase the form of rolling stock I have mentioned would be amply repaid. I had intended to make extended reference to the dairying industry, but owing to the lateness of the hour I will content myself by pointing out that last year our butter production was a record; between 13,000 lbs. and 14,000 lbs. of butter is a splendid record of which the State might well be proud. There has been some criticism of the dairying industry but I am sure the results achieved are highly gratifying. The group settlements have not yet come up to what was expected of them, but the position of group settlers there is scarcely analogous to that of some of the older settlers who have larger areas and whose position is much less invidious

than that of the group settlers. I am sorry to see that the Agricultural Bank Commissioners have not yet thought it advisable to make any public statement as to the future of the group settlers. On the other hand, it seems to me that the harassing tactics to which the settlers have had to submit are most discouraging. Of course, if a man has commitments and can pay, he should pay, but if it is utterly impossible for him to pay and if the people who are handling him know it is impossible for him to pay, where is the sense of subjecting him to so many onerous conditions? It has not had any effect whatever in regard to the payment of interest which, in fact, has driven a number of the best settlers off their blocks. Never before have so many of the highest grade settlers been forced off their blocks as during the last couple of years. I am not going to say that the forcing was altogether the fault of the Government, for there has been and still is a certain element of discontent amongst settlers. Quite a number of them are old goldfields residents and some of them have received intimations that, if they care to go back to the goldfields as experienced miners, there is a job there for them.

Hon. J. Cornell: No, for they would not be able to get laboratory tickets.

Hon. W. J. MANN: They are good men, experienced miners, and many of them have already gone back to Kalgoorlie, where they are now working on the big mines. That has something to do with the exodus from those farms. I am not going to say that the Agricultural Bank Commissioners should have been in a position to make a definite statement of policy almost as soon as they were appointed. The task they have undertaken is too colossal for them to be able to do anything of the kind; it will take them a long time to make a close survey and get a fair idea of the position. But I think they could reasonably have made a statement to the effect that until such time as they were able to bring down a concrete policy, the settlers would be permitted to carry on and do the best they could, and would not be harassed and called upon to do utterly impossible things.

Hon. J. Cornell: We are told that, like their clients, they have not got a policy.

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have heard it stated that there are about 4,000 farms mortgaged to the Agricultural Bank and un-

tenanted. If that is the position, there is a tremendous lot of capital in jeopardy, and some of it already lost. Surely it would be better to permit those people to stay on their blocks, even if only to look after the asset.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And what will become of the asset?

Hon. W. J. MANN: In the South-West a number of group settlers have been forced off their blocks by reason of the authority we gave the Agricultural Bank in the Bill of last session. Clauses 51 and 52 of that Bill, we were told, were to be used only in case of extreme necessity and were not by any means likely to become the usual thing; yet we find that every advantage has been taken of those clauses, and people have been forced to get rid of their stock and do a number of things I feel sure the State will be sorry for later on.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And when the asset has disappeared, what will happen to the stock?

Hon. W. J. MANN: In their case a lot of the stock were State purchased, and they have been forced on the market. If what I am told is true, there was a sale in the far South-West at which stock was sold at prices that were positively ridiculous.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Is it a fact that it was stock that had been purchased by the Government?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Whether it was on a group settlement or not, that sort of thing is not peculiar to that area. I have heard of the sale of wheat, implements and other things that belonged to the Bank. I do not think the Commissioners are acting rightly in the matter of privately-owned stock. I heard it stated that if the Bill were passed in the form in which it was presented to us, the farmer's wife would be precluded from selling a dozen of eggs. We ridiculed the idea that the Commissioners would go to such an extreme, and the Minister agreed that the suggestion was ridiculous. If the Commissioners have not got down to the level of objecting to the sale of a dozen of eggs, they have got pretty close to it. I know of a farmer who managed to sell two or three pigs for a few shillings, and the Bank pounced on the proceeds. Seeing that £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 has been spent on group settlement and that much of the money is being lost, it does not seem a very

wise policy now to try to save 30s. or a couple of pounds.

Member: To what stock are you referring?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I am referring to stock purchased by the farmer out of his own funds. Certainly the stock received sustenance on the block, but the proceeds from the stock have been devoted to the purchase of fertiliser, so that the Bank asset has received the benefit of the money. Now the Commissioners are asking that all stock be made over to the Bank; otherwise the settler must leave his holding. I agree that there are instances in which the proceeds of sales have been used to the disadvantage of the Bank, but in most cases the settlers have utilised privately-owned stock for the advantage of the asset. For a number of years successive Governments urged the settlers to purchase their own stock. When State-owned cows were being offered for £20 to £23 each—a fabulous price—and a settler found that he could buy good stock from adjacent farmers for £10 or £12, the Government agreed that, provided the inspector was satisfied, the money should be made available for the purchase of such stock. Many group settlers have purchased a large number of their own stock, and much of that stock has been in profit, and the profit received from it has been put back into the farm in the shape of fertiliser and used to keep the place going. I regret that the Commissioners have not seen their way clear to issue a statement to the settlers as between Bank and client. The Commissioners should have urged the settlers to carry on to the best of their ability, rather than call upon them on every possible occasion to pay interest when they knew the settlers could not do it. Let me refer to the statement made by the chairman of the Bank Commissioners regarding members of Parliament. I assure that gentleman that, if I am any judge of the situation, no member of Parliament regards it as a pleasure to interview the Agricultural Bank or any other Government department.

Hon. H. J. Yelland: We do not go there to ask favours.

Hon. W. J. MANN: No. In 19 cases out of 20, I suppose we merely introduce the Bank client, because he is under the impression that if he is introduced by a member of Parliament, his chances of receiving a hearing are better.

Hon. J. Cornell: It gives him a certain tone.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Yes, additional tone. Out of the £2,200,000, I hope the Government will make available a sum for further improvements to the Bunbury Harbour. Although a small amount of dredging was done there last year, no appreciable advantage was gained, because the depth in the basin is still only 26 feet, and a depth of at least 28 feet is required. We want to see that dredging continued over a longer period of the year until a proper depth is obtained. Bunbury Harbour last year handled about 250,000 tons of cargo, and I believe that quantity would have been appreciably greater had there been a greater depth of water. If my memory serves me aright, those figures showed an increase of 40,000 tons on the quantity handled in the previous year. That is evidence that trade is brightening and that the improvements requested are justified. Reference has been made to the fact that our fruit has been bringing the highest price on the English market. The credit for that is wholly due, I think, to the packing. The fruit growers of this State are keenly alive to the advantages of good marketing, and I know that 98 per cent. of them exercise the closest supervision to ensure that only the very best fruit is sent abroad. The growers, however, feel that they are under a disability because they have to rail their fruit 100 miles further than is necessary. They feel that the proper place from which to ship their fruit is Bunbury. If the harbour were dredged to the required depth, it would not be long before fruit was shipped from that port. Fruitgrowing is not a diminishing factor. If anything, it is increasing in extent, and each year a large area of young orchards is coming into profit. Consequently our exportable surplus will grow. We want to see that our fruit reaches the market with as little cost to the producer as possible. I urge upon the Government to attend to this matter and give the port its due. With a deepened harbour and facilities for cool storage, I feel sure the rest will follow in rapid order. The greatest menace the farmer in the South-West has, the rabbit pest, arises from Crown Lands. That is where the main breeding of rabbits takes place. Up to a year or so ago the South-West was

tolerably free from rabbits. From my own observations and the remarks of men whose veracity cannot be doubted, I gather that the pest is rapidly becoming worse. The Crown Lands are chiefly responsible for this increase. The matter has been taken up by various vermin boards, but they can do nothing with Government property. They can force settlers to keep down the pest on their own holdings, but that is the extent of their authority. If I were able to force members of this Chamber to keep their properties clear of rabbits, that would not give them much satisfaction if there was a huge property alongside them where the pest could not be kept in check. Steps must be taken to deal with this important matter. The inspectors of the department should be able to do this. I am pleased the Premier has recognised that it is time the tourist conscience of this State was awakened. He has stated that the Government propose to rebuild Cave House. I wish to give the Honorary Minister a measure of praise, because I am sure that his own efforts as well as the efforts of others have helped to bring this matter to fruition. It was regrettable that the big trade which was done at Cave House should have gradually disappeared because the facilities there were of the poorest. We hope the Government will not lose any time in rebuilding Cave House, so that it may be ready for the coming summer. It is absolutely necessary also that the Government should make a move to control street betting.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Do you support Mr. Marshall's Bill?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have not seen it yet. The position in the city is bad enough, but if other towns are like those in the South-West, the position on Saturday afternoons must be deplored by every self-respecting person. A great deal has been said about our youths. I am afraid there is a kind of complex developing in the youths of to-day that it is not necessary to do much work, to get down to any solid industry, or to learn anything. The tendency on their part is to read the sporting columns of the newspapers, be able to tell the breeding of any kind of horse, and to know the starting price of competitors in races. It is astounding that the people have stood this for so long. Storekeepers are not only feeling the pinch but a mighty big crush because of these gambling proclivities. I went into an

office the other Saturday morning, and as I did so I noticed a scatter amongst the staff. Upon inquiry I found that they had a list of the weights for the Goodwood races that afternoon. The staff had held up proceedings until they had formed their opinion as to what horses were likely to win, and I found out later that their money was put on by one member of the staff. This is not a fairy story. It is deplorable that the Government do not take steps to minimise the evil. We can control the liquor traffic and the drug traffic, and we could control the gambling evil to a great extent, or a greater extent, though probably we could not wipe it out altogether. The authorities should not allow the footpaths to be crowded by youths and men who ought to know better. They block the traffic, and frequently say things in loud voices that self-respecting people cannot tolerate.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I was wondering where the Agricultural Bank money had gone.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Some of it may have gone through those channels. I hope something will be done with regard to the Industrial Arbitration Act. I feel that its operations to-day are altogether lopsided. One side is pretty well forced to obey the provisions of the Act, while the other side can, in many instances, please themselves. That sort of thing should not be permitted to continue, otherwise arbitration will be brought into such a state of disrepute that it will go by the board. I support the second reading of the Bill.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—in reply) [10.1]: I have listened with great attention to the many speeches made on the second reading of the Bill. They have been exceptionally interesting to me and, I think, to those who have listened to other speakers. As regards the suggestions which have been made—valuable suggestions—I shall see that they go to the proper departments. That is not a mere form of words, for I can call to mind more than a few instances in which suggestions made by this House have been adopted by the Government, either in connection with legislation or in connection with administration. In other speeches there have been requests for information; and regarding those requests I shall adopt the course that I have taken in the past, with the consent and approval and, I believe, the apprecia-

tion of hon. members, of getting from the departments the fullest information obtainable and later conveying it to hon. members in the manner in which I have conveyed it in the past. In some instances I might venture replies to questions which have been put; but I think it far better to wait and submit information which, I feel sure, will be more reliable, and more complete, than it would be possible for me to afford to-night.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, and reported without amendment.

Read a third time and *passed*.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 8th August, 1935.

	PAGE
Question: Railways, Maddington crossing	127
Leave of absence	127
Address-in-reply, Fourth day.	127

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, MADDINGTON CROSSING.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware that another accident occurred at the Maddington crossing on the night of Wednesday, 17th July? 2, Have proposals and estimates of costs for affording protection at this death trap yet been arrived at? 3, Will he give an assurance that the matter is under consideration, and, if so, whether and when effective action to provide a measure of safety from railway traffic is to be taken?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No. An accident occurred at

Gosnells on the date named. 2, No finality has yet been reached. 3, The question is under consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to the Minister for Employment (Hon. J. J. Kenneally—East Perth) and to Mr. Raphael (Victoria Park) on the ground of ill-health.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [4.33]: First let me join with other members in congratulating the newly-elected members for Avon and South Fremantle on their election, and also in congratulating Mr. Wise upon his appointment to Ministerial rank. The subject under discussion is the Speech of the Lieut.-Governor, and members, in addressing themselves to this question, take the opportunity to place before the Government various questions of importance to their respective constituencies. To do that is quite justifiable, but from the Acting Leader of the Opposition one would expect a speech dealing rather with matters of policy than with parochial matters. I did not have the privilege of being present on Tuesday afternoon when he began his speech, but I heard the latter portion of his address, and I was surprised to find that he had his eye turned in one direction only. His speech occupied something like three and a half hours—

Mr. Doney: No, two and three-quarter hours.

Mr. WITHERS.—and it reminded me of the Marathon wheelbarrow races that are being contested in various places. The Acting Leader of the Opposition was followed by several members of his party who adopted a similar strain. They seemed to have the idea that it was their duty to represent one section of the community only. I hope that when other members of the Country Party speak, they will take a broader view, instead of dealing merely with the wheat belt they represent. From Country Party members so far we have heard little but talk about wheat, wool and the destruction of rabbits. One can sympathise with the farming community in their difficulties, but