

place ourselves in the same position as we are in at present. The Royal Commissioner made a very strong recommendation on the subject, and the Bill does not go the full extent proposed by him. In the Northern Territory the corresponding penalty is £100, or imprisonment for three months, or both: in Queensland, not more than £50, or imprisonment for any period not exceeding six months. There is a variation between the Northern Territory and Queensland in that respect.

Hon. L. Craig: The Northern Territory ordinance may be due to the Asiatic trouble, which is a menace there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think there should be a minimum penalty though I am not wedded to what appears in the clause.

Hon. L. Craig: I would agree to a heavy fine, but as regards imprisonment there may be extenuating circumstances.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the hon. member would reconsider his amendment with a view to substituting a minimum, I might be able to agree with him. I have no desire whatever to rush these clauses through.

Progress reported.

#### ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

**THE CHIEF SECRETARY** (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [10.13]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, the 13th October.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.14 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 6th October, 1936.*

	PAGE
Question: Auditor General's Report	995
Bills: State Government Insurance Office, 3A.	995
Pearling Crews Accident Assurance Fund, report	995
Land Act Amendment, returned	1031
Cue-Big Bell Railway returned	1031
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply, general debate	
concluded	995
Adjournment, Royal Show	1031

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

### QUESTION—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM (without notice) asked the Speaker: Can, you, Sir, get into touch with the Auditor-General and see when he is likely to submit his annual report to Parliament?

The SPEAKER replied: I have been in touch with the Auditor-General, who expects to have his report ready by the end of this month.

### BILL—STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

### BILL—PEARLING CREWS ACCIDENT ASSURANCE FUND.

Report of Committee adopted.

### ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1936-37.

*In Committee of Supply.*

Debate resumed from the 1st October on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates: Mr. Sleeman in the Chair.

*Vote—Legislative Council, £1,565:*

**MR. HILL** (Albany) [4.35]: The first thing I saw this morning on opening the "West Australian" was a report by the Premier on the state of our Loan Funds and the cuts, amounting to £800,000.

The Premier: That is not so: there was no cut.

Mr. HILL: In any case, I think members will agree it is essential that every attention should be given to this question. I should become popular with the Government, because I am not asking for any great expenditure, but I think I can point out where great expenditure could be saved. I do not doubt the sincerity of those members who advocate monetary reform, but I myself cannot see any easy way out of the State's difficulties. This Parliament cannot introduce a new monetary system, but it can manage the State more economically than it is doing. We suffer disabilities under Federation. We cannot cut the painter, but the Government can adopt economies in the interests of the State under Federation. We must all realise that Government money is the people's money and that when the Government borrow money the people must pay interest. The Government would be in a happier position if they did not have to pay out in interest one-half of their total revenue. I do not blame the monetary system or the financial interests for this. I agree with the ex-Premier, Mr. Collier, who on one occasion truly said that our troubles to-day were due to the reckless borrowing of the past. On another occasion the same hon. member said, "We are living in a fool's paradise; we are borrowing and spending money, but we are not creating assets to the value of the money spent." I do not blame the bankers for the fact that we are to-day paying over a million pounds a year interest upon our railways; I blame our predecessors, who have sat in this House. Our railway system is like Topsy, it has "just grown." It is to a large extent a combination of various pet schemes of politicians, or groups of politicians, whose one aim has been to get the maximum railway mileage for themselves. The Premier on one occasion said that if we could re-lay our railways through the wheat-belt we could serve the same country with a thousand miles less of railway line. Had our railways been laid down properly in the first place, the interest bill on them would have been perhaps £200,000 less than it is to-day. Our predecessors have passed on to us a railway system that has many miles of railway more than are necessary. It is over-capitalised, difficult to manage economically, the traffic is going the wrong way, and the system is severely handicapped in competition with motor transport. What are we going to pass on to our children? It is an economic impossibility to tear up the railways and re-lay them, but substantial economies can

be effected if we consider the problem of transport as a whole and use our commonsense and the State's natural advantages, instead of aiming to keep down railway mileage. I do not forget the first visit of the Minister for Works to my home on the Kalgan River. On reading "Hansard" or the Perth newspapers one would at that time have imagined that the welfare of the universe depended upon the extension of the Fremantle Harbour. I had no political ambitions then, so I listened while the Minister discussed the proposal with the late Mr. Hector Stewart, M.L.C. and Mr. Burvill, M.L.C. The Minister said, "We are not going to rush ahead with the scheme. It is a question of money and we can borrow only £4,000,000 a year." I said nothing, but I thought, "Fancy a State with a population of 400,000 borrowing £4,000,000 a year, or £10 per head! When is the crash coming?" I guess Mr. Millington and his colleagues in the Cabinet were glad they were not in office when the crash did come. Our job to-day is to get out of this fool's paradise, and when we borrow money we must be sure it is spent in creating assets to the full value. The Deputy Premier, when concluding his Budget speech, said that we must husband our resources and utilise the available money to meet the most urgent needs of the community. If the Government are sincere in their policy, they will abolish the present port zone system, which is based on railway mileage, and replace it with zones arranged to effect economies in the interests of the whole State. I should like to congratulate the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Hon. F. C. L. Smith) upon his elevation to the Ministry. At the same time I regret that the Government did not take the opportunity to carry out the recommendation of the Federal Transport Committee, which in 1929 recommended that all transport activities be placed under the one Minister, and that there be a transport authority to study, administer and co-ordinate all our transport activities. I am afraid it is too much to hope that the Government will scrap the so-called Transport Board and adopt the Federal Committee's recommendations, so I will point out that ports and railways must go together. Some of our ports are controlled by the Commissioner of Railways, and it seems only logical to suggest that our ports and railways should have the same Minister. It is essential that

if we are to have economy and efficiency with our transport, we must have unified control of ports and railways. The Government must economise, so I will draw attention to the fact that they can economise on our ports. The first year the Collier Government were in office, they spent £4,099,021 of Loan money, out of which £181,013 was spent on the ports, or 4.4 per cent. of the Loan expenditure. For 1929-30 the Loan expenditure was £3,693,052, out of which £263,255, or 7 per cent., was spent on our ports. In 1935-36, the Loan expenditure was £2,464,167, out of which £301,007, or 12.1 per cent., was spent on the ports. The loan liability of our ports is equal to 7.4 per cent. of our total debt. Since 1924 we have spent £2,448,089 of Loan money on the ports, or about as much per head of population as has been spent per head on the ports of Great Britain. That expenditure has increased the interest charges on our ports by about £100,000. One has only to glance at Return No. 17 to see why the Government must use the Fremantle Harbour Trust as a taxing machine. Last year the Trust showed a surplus of £90,408, while the other ports showed losses totalling £107,447, leaving a deficiency on our ports of £17,435. Unless drastic changes are introduced, our port charges will have to be considerably increased. The Federal Transport Committee in 1929 recommended closing-down some of the minor ports, and concentrating the trade on the more suitable ports by road and rail transport. That proposal is rather drastic. We should, however, adopt the recommendation of Sir George Buchanan. He recommended that the most suitable ports be selected, that all political wire-pulling be cut out, and the selected ports alone be developed as modern ports. I do not wish to discuss the ports of the North-West, because that is a problem in itself. The potential agricultural areas of the State extend from 100 miles north of Geraldton to about 100 miles east of Esperance. The four principal ports are Fremantle, Geraldton, Albany and Esperance. These are all practically equally spaced from each other. If we were to develop these four ports, we would have sufficient ports to keep our railway mileage down to the requisite lowest possible level. There would be sufficient trade to be developed on behalf of the State to warrant the provision of proper facilities at each of these four centres. They would

thus become more attractive to shipping, and bring about a better co-ordination of sea and land transport. I was encouraged to hear the member for South Fremantle advocate something which I advocated in the Press several years ago. I refer to his proposal to build a bridge at Fremantle with native timber and local labour. If the member for South Fremantle cares to move that the money it is proposed to spend on the trolley bus service between Perth and Claremont be spent on a new timber bridge at Fremantle, I will support him. I hope that the hon. member's remark that a timber bridge would have a life of 30 years is an indication that he realises there will be no need to extend the Fremantle harbour for another 30 years. Geraldton has had a million pounds spent on its port, and Esperance has a new jetty. Let me examine the position at Albany. Some four years ago Sir James Mitchell referred to the magnificent harbour at Albany. Whilst he was doing so, the member for Bunbury interjected that it was in the wrong place. I will give members the facts. Albany's position in the south corresponds with Geraldton's position in the north, and Bunbury's position corresponds with the position of Jurien Bay in the north. When the suggestion was made in this Chamber several years ago that Jurien Bay should be developed as a port, the present Premier wisely and emphatically squashed the idea by saying, "We cannot have ports all over the place." That is the trouble at the southern end of the State. Albany has natural advantages, Bunbury has political pull, and the taxpayer has the pleasure of footing the bill. In the Legislative Council on the 15th November, 1932, Mr. Seddon said:—

One can only describe the railway system as one which has simply grown into existence. Any idea of laying it out as a scientific and co-ordinated system of transport has always been put in the background. There are certain portions of the State to which traffic should naturally gravitate. In attempting to arrange a scheme for this natural gravitation, one comes across obstacles associated with the construction of our railways which show that traffic is really being diverted in the wrong direction. As an illustration of this I will quote the railway from Corrigin to Brookton. The ruling grade of that railway is 1 in 40. Corrigin is the centre of a big wheat-growing district. In the ordinary course of events, the wheat traffic should gravitate from the Corrigin-Brookton railway, but owing to the fact that the grade

of that railway is so high, a large proportion of the traffic goes down to Narrogin, or up to Merredin, and then flows down to the port, in the one case to Bunbury and in the other to Fremantle. In both instances, the traffic has to be lifted in the air to cross the Darling Ranges, and it then gravitates to the ports. The natural way for the traffic to go is to the ports along such routes as can be obtained to give the best grade and the lowest costs of transportation. Our railway system through the wheatbelt has not been laid down in accordance with the natural lie of the country. Had that been done, a very much greater quantity of wheat would have gravitated to Albany which now goes to Bunbury or Fremantle. Certain railways have been foisted on the country by political string-pulling, and such railways have never paid.

Mr. Seddon referred to the Wagin-Bowelling line as an incubus to the railway system. When I showed his remarks to the late Mr. G. W. Stead, with considerable heat he said, "That is true." Mr. Stead explained to me that the railway officials of the day wanted the country east of the Great Southern opened up by a loopline from Beverley to Mt. Barker. He stated that the haulage over the Darling Ranges was not only costly, because it took two engines to do the work of one, but a double pull was exerted around curves, and this haulage on the skew caused heavy wear and fear and costly maintenance both on the rolling stock and on the permanent way. He also stated that not only was the haulage cheaper along the Great Southern line to Albany, but that there would be a considerable saving in rolling stock if trade were concentrated on Albany. Our present port zones are solely based on the railways which have been foisted on the country by political string-pulling. Our natural advantages and economic considerations have been completely ignored. The causes of Albany's decline as a port were investigated by the Federal Navigation Act Royal Commission. The Labour members of that Commission, Messrs. Anstey, McHugh and Yates, reported as follows:—

Albany is the finest harbour in Western Australia, but the Government of Western Australia spent large sums of money and constructed a harbour at Bunbury. They then constructed lateral railways to connect with the Perth-Albany trunk railway. Trade was diverted from Albany to Bunbury. Bunbury progressed; Albany correspondingly declined.

I am discussing the ports of Western Australia. I consider it my duty to tell the Committee the truth about the port of Bunbury. When the construction of the har-

bour at Bunbury was being discussed with the late C. Y. O'Connor, the member for Bunbury said—

Try the breakwater, if it is not a success, give up all hope of making a port here.

My friend lost his seat at the following elections. The interest due to the Treasury by the Bunbury Harbour Board to the 30th June, 1934, was £105,417. The deficiency last year was £17,516, and the revenue was £8,500. The estimated revenue for this year is only £1,500; but the financial position is not the worst feature of that port. I suggest that the Minister should lay on the Table of the House the original chart of the Bunbury harbour showing the then low water mark and the latest soundings of the undredged portion of the harbour. Members will then be able to understand, when they have examined the chart, why Bunbury was omitted from the Bulk Handling Bill when it was first presented to Parliament. Sir George Buchanan's remark, "If the port is to be maintained," is very suggestive. He further reports—

There are grave disadvantages attached to the port. The harbour appears to be steadily filling up with drifting sand. There are many difficult engineering problems to be solved before Bunbury can be made a port of note. Bunbury can be made a first-class port, but only at great cost both for construction and maintenance. Whether it would be politic to spend the large sums required is a matter for consideration by the Government. It would be cheaper to build railways to Albany than to develop Bunbury.

Four years ago the then Premier, Sir James Mitchell, in a speech in the House said—

At Albany, the harbour being a natural one, fortunately not much expense is incurred, but at Bunbury tremendous expense must be incurred to keep the harbour open for shipping.

The first instalment of that tremendous expenditure was £161,000, or £7,000 more than the total loan expenditure at Albany since 1896. In 1933 the Premier, Mr. Collier, told the House that he was not confident of the result of the expenditure at Bunbury, where there had always been trouble with silting and in other ways. He admitted it might be a Kathleen Mavourneen expenditure. In the "West Australian" of the 21st July last Mr. F. W. Roberts, Chairman of the Bunbury Harbour Trust, is reported to have said:—

Although the Government were doing its best to provide the necessary facilities to enable the port of Bunbury to handle its natural

trade and was spending a great deal of money it was taking the Government all its time to keep the port open. He had seen that morning a report of the dredging operations, which showed that the channel had considerably improved, but there was still a great deal of work to be done.

In the next issue of the "West Australian" Mr. Roberts is reported as follows:—

He fully appreciated the fact that the Government had as much as it could do to find £70,000 a year, which it was now making available to provide facilities to keep the port actively engaged in handling the existing trade, and providing improvements in dredging; but it was essential that in the near future increased financial help should be forthcoming to provide additional facilities.

Last year £50,000 was voted, and £79,517 11s. 11d. of loan money was spent at Bunbury. The expenditure since 1921 has been £242,579. In return for that enormous expenditure there is not one foot more of berthing space available, and the depth of water to-day is only 26ft. compared with 27ft. 6in. when I was in Bunbury in 1929. This is the port which under the present port zone system the Great Southern must use instead of the port provided for that area by nature. The producers in the Bunbury zone save about 1s. per ton by sending their wheat to Bunbury instead of to Albany. I cannot say what it costs the taxpayers to save that amount, but I feel safe in saying that the State lost £30,000 last year because at the request of the Government the super works were erected at Picton instead of on the waterfront at Albany. In 1929 the present Premier, when speaking at Ferguson, near Bunbury, stated that the problem of providing additional accommodation at Bunbury was causing the Government grave concern, but that was not his business. Now that it is his business to husband our resources, and utilise the money available to meet the most pressing needs of the community, I should like to point out that there is no need for the Government to be gravely concerned over the provision of additional accommodation at Bunbury, because except for the timber trade the Bunbury zone can be far more economically served by the ports of Fremantle and Albany.

Mr. Cross: You are jealous.

Mr. HILL: I am not. I am merely stating facts. The Government on the recommendation of the Transport Board are subsidising a motor service between Boyup Brook and Cranbrook, to keep down the capital ex-

penditure on our railways. I suggest that the Government adjust the railway rates to encourage the transport of wheat which now goes over the Darling Range to Bunbury to travel by the Great Southern railway to its natural port of Albany. We want to keep down the expenditure at our ports. By concentrating the trade on the one port, considerable savings will be effected by having one port terminal for bulk handling facilities instead of two. This will mean reduced overhead expenditure and handling charges. In the third place it will provide relief from the congestion on the Collie-Brunswick section, and in the fourth place the accommodation now lying idle at Albany will earn revenue for the State. Last year the 21 berths at Fremantle earned £246,890, while the six berths at Albany earned only £984. Since 1924 the following amounts have been spent at our main ports:—Geraldton, £831,027; Fremantle, £1,123,600; Bunbury, £243,579; and Albany £1,259. The maintenance and dredging during that period cost in the case of Geraldton £429, Fremantle £90,232, Bunbury £81,666 and Albany nil. The expenditure at Fremantle has not increased the depth or berthing accommodation, but it has increased the interest charges by £43,061. The expenditure at Bunbury has provided an extension to the breakwater, and a groyne which might stop some of the silting for a time. There is no increase in the berthing accommodation; and in spite of the expenditure of £81,666 on dredging, the depth to which a ship may load is now only 26 feet compared with originally 27ft. 6in. The loan liability of the ports and interest charged last year were—

	Loan.	Interest.
	£	£
Fremantle ..	3,412,578	126,680
Bunbury ..	676,734	25,009
Albany ..	153,292	5,665

On those figures I might be justified in asking for expenditure at Albany, but I am not asking the Government to spend money; I am pointing out how they could save money by taking advantage of the economic fact that extra railage to a natural harbour is more economical than interest and maintenance on a constructed harbour. If the Government desire to effect economies in the interests of the State, they will adopt the recommendations of experts and concentrate the trade on the more suitable ports. I realise that extra accommodation will in the future have to be provided for the State. At

Albany miles of wharves can be constructed for a fraction of what it will cost in other parts of the State. There is still another aspect. Since 1826, in peace and in war, the British Admiralty have persistently used Albany as their port for Western Australia. The attempts to make Fremantle the naval port, instead of Albany, have cost £1,300,000; and in return for that enormous expenditure the taxpayers have to pay over £50,000 a year in interest, and Western Australia, instead of having probably the leading naval port of Australia, has two white elephants, the Fremantle dock and the Henderson Naval Base. I do not think I shall betray an official secret when I say that in the event of war Albany will be used as it was used during the last war; that is, as a base for the ships necessary to protect the trade routes which converge at Albany, and as a place of assembly for convoy. Some years ago I wrote an article on our naval defence. I suggested that the State and Commonwealth co-operate to develop Albany as a commercial and naval port. Copies of this article were sent to the Prime Minister and Federal Government. The official reply was, "The Commonwealth Government realised the importance of ports, but the construction of ships had to have prior consideration. The Commonwealth Government would, however, assist the State Government or private enterprise to construct a dock at Fremantle or Albany; preferably at Albany." I have the best of reasons for believing that the Commonwealth Government would co-operate with the State Government to further develop Albany. It will be to the advantage of the State, the Commonwealth and the Empire to utilise the natural advantages of Albany. Money for all purposes is limited; and while ports are important a naval port is only useful for what the fleet can accomplish outside of it, and a commercial port is only useful for the country at the back of it. Whenever possible, natural harbours should be used, because constructed harbours are not only enormously costly to construct, but are almost invariably costly to maintain. Germany lost the war because she spent money on her ports at the expense of her fleet, while England economised on her ports for the benefit of her fleet. Our ports will not be of much use to us if our transport charges are so high that our producers cannot compete in the markets of the world. We must economise on our ports for the

benefit of our producers. When our present Premier asked the super companies to erect super works at Picton, he overlooked the fact that while 80 per cent. of the trucks required for the South-West must be landed empty from the metropolitan area, 95 per cent. of the trucks to Albany are hauled away empty. Just a little oversight, which resulted in a loss of something like £20,000 to the Railway Department last year, and delayed deliveries of super to the farmers. Similarly, when the hon. gentleman fixed the port zone boundaries, he ignored the fact that we must pay for harbour construction and maintenance as well as railage; and while Albany is one of the finest harbours in the world, with ample depth and accommodation, the Bunbury harbour is steadily silting up, and is a big sand bank with a dredged channel alongside the jetty. Are we going to pass on these blunders to posterity and neglect our resources and use the money available in fighting nature, or are we going to husband our resources and use the money available in meeting the most urgent and important needs of the community? As it will be to the benefit of the whole State for the Great Southern district to draw its super supplies from Albany, so will it be to the advantage of the whole State for the bulk handling facilities for the Great Southern district to be put at Albany and to cut out Bunbury as a bulk handling port. To justify this definite statement, I ask that the Government lay on the Table charts of Albany and Bunbury showing the original and the present depths.

Mr. Withers: And charts of the hinterland as well.

Mr. HILL: Yes. No further argument will be needed. We must all realise that the State is right up against it financially and that for many years the strictest economy must be practised, and, further, that it is to our primary producers we must look for the State's prosperity. We must keep producers on their holdings on the groups at Denmark and on their stations in the North-West and instead of trying to run the country for the benefit of the ports, we must realise that our first consideration must be to provide our producers with export facilities at the lowest possible cost. I have here returns for a consignment of 53 cases of applies which I exported on consignment this year. These returns are typical for this season. The fruit realised about £26, Aus-

tralian, in London. After paying all expenses I received about £3 8s. for my 12 months' work. These figures show how the producer carries the community, and how essential it is that costs of production and transport be reduced. We cannot reduce costs without effecting economies in the interest of the whole State, and I have shown one way in which such economies can be effected. We must also realise that economies will not be effected without sacrifices in some quarters, but we must consider the State as a whole, and not selfish and parochial ambitions. Another asset that we must use more is our tourist asset. I was very disappointed to see that the tourist vote is only increased by £279. The value of this trade is, I am afraid, considerably underestimated by the Government. The Tourist Bureau may not be a revenue-earning concern itself, but practically all other Government departments stand to benefit by the tourist trade. A few days ago I went to the Tourist Bureau for some literature to send to South Australia and could not get any worth having. I hope that the Government will be able to increase the Tourist Vote, sufficiently to provide literature worthy to advertise the State and to subsidise the local tourist organisations. I am sure that money spent in this manner will be repaid many times over by increased revenue to other departments.

**MR. THORN** (Toodyay) [5.9]: I regret that I endeavoured to make the pace too hot a while ago, but probably I was flurried by the overloaded state of the Notice Paper. During the Address-in-reply I missed the opportunity of saying what I wished to say. With the permission of the House I shall now endeavour to state my case. In the course of the Address-in-reply discussion several members, including the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) and several members opposite, dealt with emergency taxation, and called attention to the fact of the shortage of revenue and the necessity for raising additional funds in order to help along the various activities of the State. Some hon. members have suggested that we further graduate the scale of emergency taxation dealing with incomes of over £500 a year. I suggest to the Chamber that there is one avenue of taxation which up to the present has been hardly touched—our goldmining industry. I do not make that observation with any but

the best of feelings toward the goldmining industry, the importance of which to the State as a whole I fully appreciate. However, steps are being taken by the Government to reduce taxation on industries that may be described as up against it. Here is an industry that is prospering.

Mr. Cross: You are giving us some credit.

Mr. THORN: I am not giving it to the hon. member interjecting. If that hon. member looks after South Perth, he will be doing all right. Further revenue could be raised from this source. South Africa to-day is raising considerably more than we are from goldmining. The Ministry should go into the question and ascertain whether it is not possible to obtain further taxation from the goldmining industry. The effect of exchange is often quoted here, but I want to speak on that phase from the primary producer's point of view. My honest opinion is that the primary producer of Western Australia has derived very little benefit indeed from the exchange. I want to make that point in this way—that, as a producer, I find that our commodities on the London market have fallen in price commensurately with the exchange. Far lower prices are being received by us in many directions. I am sure the apple-growers will back me up in this statement which I know to be true also from the point of view of the dried-fruit grower, as well as from that of many other of our primary producers. They will agree that so far as primary producers benefit from the 25 per cent. exchange, their commodities on the London market have fallen in price to the same extent. That is what I mean, and I do not wish to be misunderstood.

Mr. Cross: The primary producers have a big organisation which absolutely insists on this.

Mr. THORN: I do not understand the interjection. I know the hon. member interjecting is an authority on everything—in his own mind.

Mr. Cross: You've made absurd statements.

Mr. THORN: The position of the farming community has been discussed here many times, as also the question of the rehabilitation of the farming industry. Unquestionably all schemes of rehabilitation require finance. That is a fact I fully realise. However, in my opinion, one of the best methods of rehabilitating the far-

ming industry to-day is to bring in farmers from all the outlying areas, the doubtful areas where there is no assured rainfall, where farming is positively a gamble. I refer especially to the eastern wheatbelt. Let us bring in the farmers from such districts, and let us see if we cannot place them on abandoned farms in areas where the farmer has a sporting chance of making good. In making that suggestion I fully appreciate that to carry it out requires finance; but the sooner we are able to do it, the better it will be for the welfare of the farming community and for the State as a whole. I know that shifting the farmers means that they will have to be financed in some measure to make a fresh start. However, I make the suggestion for the consideration of the Government. I am sorry to note that the Federal Government have reduced the manure bonus to farmers by 5s. That bonus represented a great help to the farming community of Western Australia. In the Federal Budget it is pointed out that relief is being given to this industry and that industry in the way of reduced taxation. The industries that are being given relief are all city industries. The best that can be said, in this respect, about the farming industry is that the bonus of 15s. per ton which was being given with regard to superphosphate has been reduced to 10s. That is all the farming community got out of it. That bonus was of great benefit to the farmers, for it allowed them to go in more extensively for the application of super., enabled them to topdress their pastures, build up their herds, develop a better class of fat lamb, and so on. And now their bonus has been reduced to 10s. per ton. I protest against that action by the Federal Government who should have continued the bonus at the rate of 15s. per ton. Next I will touch on the position regarding fruit marketing, which was mentioned by the member for Albany. The low prices obtainable in the markets to-day make it almost impossible for the fruitgrower to secure a living from his holding. We had not previously experienced prices as low as those that rule to-day, not within the past 12 years or more. When the scheme was propounded for housing all the markets under one roof, I thought it was a fine idea. In the early days we had to dodge from the markets in James-street to those in East

Perth and elsewhere. Now we find, however, that the result of having all the markets under one roof is to place full power in the hands of the buyers. They move about in groups and know exactly what is available. There is little opposition and the system of auctioning is "up to mud." The producers receive very little for their fruit.

Mr. Warner: The consumers pay enough for it.

Mr. THORN: That is so. I do not exaggerate at all when I say that many growers in the Swan district have not averaged half a crown for an open case of 60 lbs. of grapes, and out of that return they have had to pay cartage, packing and other production costs. I do not know how much longer they will be able to continue operating if such prices rule.

Mr. Lambert: The growers should have the right to nominate their own auctioneer.

Mr. THORN: If it were not that the growers have other side lines, such as dried fruits, they could not carry on. I am pleased to acknowledge that the market in London for our dried fruits is much brighter to-day.

Mr. Patrick: Is that not due to conditions in other countries?

Mr. THORN: No doubt it is due to that. Everyone regrets the unfortunate position in Spain to-day, although we have to agree that the revolution in that country has been the means of stabilising the price of dried fruits in London. Some of our lines were sold as soon as they reached London. That was due to doubts regarding Spain marketing her crop this season. Another development has been the participation by the large city emporiums in the selling of fruit. I do not know that that has been of any advantage to the industry. That trade legitimately belongs to the fruiterers. When the representatives of the large emporiums buy supplies, they bargain for what they require and naturally get their supplies as cheaply as possible. Too often they are content to sell the fruit at a loss because that section of their business is merely to attract attention and, in consequence of the practice, the growers suffer. Naturally the man who is legitimately employed in the fruit-selling business has to secure his supplies as cheaply as possible otherwise he cannot carry on, so that phase does not assist the



industry to any extent. We have heard a lot of discussion about the James case and the referendum suggested by the Commonwealth Government as the best method to be adopted to deal with the situation that has arisen in consequence of the Privy Council decision. When I was in Melbourne, I discussed the effect of the decision with those interested in the business. They stated definitely that the excise proposal would meet the situation. I was pleased to note that the Minister for Works supported the excise scheme when it was considered at a recent conference in Adelaide. Nevertheless, we should be very careful in dealing with the question, and we should not be too keen to express an opinion until we find out what are the intentions of the Commonwealth Government. I would remind members that a year or two ago a referendum was held in Western Australia on the secession issue and by a large majority the people declared in favour of secession. Now we find various organisations committing themselves to the latest proposal to give the Commonwealth Government additional power. I do not know how they can justify that course. I am of opinion that if we can secure some scheme that will fill the bill, the last thing we should agree to do is to give the Commonwealth Government further power by means of an amendment to the Constitution.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. THORN: I do not believe in agreeing to anything of the sort, nor do I think it necessary. We should examine every avenue possible in an endeavour to bridge the gap without providing the Commonwealth Government with additional power. How often has it been stated in this Chamber when we have amended legislation, "If I had only known that that was to be the effect of the amendment, I would not have voted for it." We may be in that position again if we agree to alter the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Lambert: At the same time, we must have uniformity.

Mr. THORN: There may be other methods by which we can secure uniformity. Naturally the Commonwealth Government will not admit that there may be other methods because their sole object is to secure more and more power.

Mr. Lambert: The only other way by which we can secure uniformity is to adopt the course pursued in Spain.

Mr. THORN: I would not suggest that for one moment.

Hon. P. Collier: They can meet the whole marketing difficulty as a result of the Privy Council decision without any amendment to the Constitution whatever.

Mr. THORN: I am glad to hear the member for Boulder make that statement. With his experience and his knowledge of the Federal Constitution and State legislation, he should be in a position to know.

Mr. Patrick: But the point is whether the Federal Parliament would support it.

The Minister for Works: They have not been asked to support it.

Mr. Patrick: No.

Mr. THORN: There is one other matter I wish to deal with before proceeding to comment on a matter of importance to the people of Wooroloo. I desire to bring under the notice of the Minister for Agriculture the fact that about two years ago an amendment of the Fruit Cases Act was introduced in this Chamber the object of which was to enable fruit to be forwarded in second-hand cases. After the matter had been fully discussed in this Chamber, we approved of the Bill and it was transmitted to the Legislative Council. There members discussed it at length and after they had approved of the Bill, it became law. The following season certain fruitgrowers in the South-West, who could not make use of the provisions of the amended legislation, passed a resolution at their conference in opposition to the Act with the result that what Parliament had agreed to 12 months previously was undone by means of a regulation. I protest against that procedure, and every member should join with me in my objection. What is the use of members sitting in Parliament as representatives of the people only to have their legislative decisions set aside by means of regulations?

Hon. C. G. Latham: But an Act cannot be amended by means of a regulation.

Mr. THORN: That Act, was, in effect, amended by the regulation.

Mr. Lambert: If you want to rectify that position, you must amend the Interpretation Act.

Mr. THORN: The result of the regulation was that fruit could not be forwarded over certain lines in second-hand cases, and the only fruit that could be forwarded in such cases was grapes that could be sent over the goldfields railway. Formerly we

agreed that fruit could be sent over other sections to centres north of the 33rd parallel. The people in my electorate were not interfered with, so I have no axe to grind in this matter. If Parliament passes legislation and it can be altered in its application by means of a regulation, then the decision of Parliament is over-riden, and I do not like that sort of thing. Too much is done by means of regulations. I realise it is necessary for Ministers to have power to make regulations so that they can administer Acts, but we do not expect what Parliament has determined to be altered by that means. Turning now to the report of the special departmental committee appointed to inquire the Wooroloo lazaret question, the Minister for Health has adopted a friendly and gentlemanly attitude in dealing with deputations and requests in that connection and has done his best to meet the protests of the residents of that centre. I think it is beyond any shadow of doubt that the committee was set up—apart from one outside doctor, the personnel consisted of civil servants—to justify the retention of the lazaret at Wooroloo. In a leading article in the "West Australian" the following appeared:—

It seems fairly evident that Wooroloo is to be kept as the permanent home for the lazaret in the future.

That is how it appeals to me and the residents are up in arms about it. If we can take any notice of the report presented by the committee and of medical opinion, we can come to the conclusion only that there is no need to house lepers at all, and that they should be allowed to run loose. That seemed to be the medical opinion expressed by the officials of the department, by the Commissioner of Public Health, and other medical men. They indicated that leprosy is such a common and non-infectious disease that we can allow the patients to run around quite freely.

The Minister for Health: I have not been able to find that statement in the report.

Mr. THORN: It has been made.

The Minister for Health: Not in the report.

Mr. THORN: But by medical men.

The Minister for Health: I am not speaking of that.

Mr. THORN: Did not the report state that in other countries the lepers were permitted out on parole; they were not housed but were allowed to roam the streets?

The Minister for Health: But the committee did not suggest that that should be allowed here.

Mr. THORN: No; what I said was that, on the report of the committee, we might as well allow them to do it here. Last Saturday week I went to Wooroloo and can say that the housing of the lepers is very poor indeed. Their houses reminded me of brick pill-boxes. In the summer months those people must suffer agony. I do not know how they can occupy those houses. They are located in a gully of ironstone conglomerate and are surrounded by timber, and they must suffer tremendously in the summer. The septic tank is still out of order and the stench was frightful. For a septic tank at a sanatorium to be in that condition is a crying disgrace. If it belonged to a private person he would be prosecuted. According to the report, the tank has been out of order for the last 15 years. The committee stated that the lazaret was within 200 yards of a septic tank. That was one of the complaints. It is the shortest 200 yards I have ever stepped. I appeal to the Minister to give further consideration to the requests of the residents of Wooroloo and see if it is not possible to have the lazaret removed. The committee reported that the accommodation was far from sufficient to house the patients. If the Government are guided by the committee, further houses will be built there. I hope that before the Government think of increasing the housing for the lepers at Wooroloo, they will consider removing them to a better environment. The report stated that one settler who had complained bitterly had bought more land adjacent to the sanatorium and had built another house. I have the authority of that gentleman to state that he has not bought another square yard of land, but that owing to a son marrying it was necessary to provide accommodation for him. Yet the committee tried to make it appear that that gentleman had such faith in the district that he had increased the area of his farm and built a new house. That statement absolutely misrepresented the facts. The report further stated that the residents had not come forward to give evidence, as was expected. Those who gave evidence complained bitterly of the manner in which they were treated. The chairman of the Mundaring Road Board said that he had been kept waiting in the cold for three hours before the committee were prepared to see

him. Several protest meetings had been held in Wooroloo and a very active progress association was in existence, and naturally the spokesmen were appointed at a public meeting. Was not that the right way to deal with the question? We did not want everyone in the town running along to give evidence. That would be only a waste of time. The meeting appointed accredited representatives and they tendered evidence on behalf of the residents. I hope that before the Minister decides to adopt the recommendations of the committee, he will consider my suggestions made previously in this Chamber that the lepers should be accommodated in more pleasant surroundings. I suggested a coastal area. One member of the committee asked a patient whether he would like to live on an island, and the patient replied, "No, not alone." Naturally, the patients would not like to be placed on an island. The questions put were all prepared beforehand and very pointed. I suggest that the lepers could be placed on a coastal area where they could indulge in fishing shooting and gardening. They are so enclosed and their outlook is so dull and unattractive that they were fighting amongst themselves. There are only six lepers, but they are at loggerheads because they are so confined. It would be a humane act on the part of the Government to remove them to more pleasant and open surroundings. The residents of Wooroloo who are engaged in fruit-growing dairying and similar industries feel that they are suffering in the marketing of their produce because the general public know of the existence of the lazaret in the district. I hope it will be possible for the Minister to meet the requests of the residents and move the lazaret from Wooroloo.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [5.38]: I regret that it is necessary once more to mention the difficulties confronting the settlers at Bickley. It is a remarkable commentary on the lack of sympathy by the Government to people engaged in small farming that, no matter how great their difficulties, no consideration whatever has been extended to them. I have spoken on this matter on several occasions and, although the Government appeared to be sympathetic in words, action has never been taken to alleviate the distress being suffered by those people. In the district are many people who for the past 20 years had regularly paid their road

board rates, and it is significant of the difficulties they are facing that this year most of them are unable to pay their rates. The road board will probably have to consider presenting a request to the Minister for Works to enable the rates to be written-off. That is not a good thing for the district. The problem of maintaining roads in such centres, where the rainfall is heavy, is always great, and I think the Government should have shown some practical sympathy by assisting those Bickley settlers who are in such straits to-day. It would seem that the only means whereby relief can be obtained from the Government is by a large number of people getting together and speaking with a very loud voice, but it does not follow that the justice of the case is the deciding factor. The position at Bickley definitely does call for help. The Deputy Premier and other members of the Government have spoken feelingly of the treatment received by the State at the hands of the Federal Government, and it would be well if the State Government gave consideration to the needs of those settlers, especially as a comparatively small sum would have enabled them to purchase fertiliser and provide sustenance where necessary. A small amount has been obtained for distribution by way of sustenance, but that will not overcome the difficulty. I ask, even at this late hour, that the Government should deal with the matter fairly. The provision of a reasonable sum would do an immense amount of good, and unquestionably the money should be found. The indifference shown by the Government is a very sad reflection on their regard for the small man, than whom there is no more valuable settler or citizen in the State. The small settler appears to be treated unfairly in every instance. The member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) drew attention to the subsidy provided for fertilisers. The subsidy is paid on a tonnage basis. The small farmer does not buy very much fertiliser, but he has to pay a high price for what he does use, which is a special fertiliser. The subsidy should be paid not on tonnage but on value. There is another matter relating to the outer suburban areas on which I desire to speak, and that is the poor consideration given to residents of Mundaring Weir in the matter of transport facilities. A member of the Transport Board has been approached on this matter, but he was definite in the statement that the request for a motor bus to run from Mundaring Weir through Mundaring to

Midland Junction on occasion would not be granted. The reason given was that if a motor bus were allowed to run, certain people in Mundaring would use it to the detriment of the train service. Why should Mundaring be specifically selected for this unfair treatment? It is specifically selected because there are many other centres having both train and tram facilities.

Mr. Mann: Claremont, for instance.

Mr. SAMPSON: The people of Claremont are not satisfied with trams and trains but must have trolley buses, and an immense amount of money is to be thrown into the air to provide trolley buses for them. How those responsible can justify such an attitude, I cannot understand. It is a positive scandal that money should be provided for an additional service to a district where there is already good transport service.

The Premier: A rotten service.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A very good service.

Mr. SAMPSON: Alternatively, it would be quite easy for the Transport Board to allow private enterprise to provide facilities.

The Premier: That is where your information came from.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is justification for championing the cause of private enterprise, when such a large sum of money is at stake.

The Premier: When any sum of money is at stake.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. The Government can find £84,000 for a service at Claremont which private enterprise is prepared to supply, while the people at Bickley can be in a state of semi-starvation, unable to buy fertiliser, and the Government refuse to provide them with any help. That is most unfair.

The Premier: It is a different principle altogether.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is a principle of throwing away money in one instance and refusing to assist a deserving body of people in another.

The Premier: Who is throwing away money? What a ridiculous statement to make!

Mr. SAMPSON: I say it is throwing away money when money is unnecessarily expended.

The Premier: It is not being unnecessarily expended.

Mr. SAMPSON: Private enterprise would find motor buses and give an excellent service at Claremont. Someone has said, "What about Collie coal and using our own fuel?" It is a matter possibly only of a

few months, perhaps a few weeks, before there will be a new kind of fuel used in motor buses. Already in the wheat districts charcoal is being used in gas-producer plants, and tractors are being operated by that means.

The Premier: That has been the case for six years, to my knowledge.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is being improved upon all the time. The Government should pause before approving the expenditure of large sums of money like this, particularly in view of the fact that the financial position is such as has been pointed out by the Deputy Premier on different occasions. The seriousness of that position is due largely to the refusal of the Federal Government to find the amount which previously was found to assist the State and which I think they should continue to find; although the waste of public money on the proposed trolley buses to Claremont might be regarded as justification by any authority with a sense of responsibility for refusing to advance money to the State. I feel the more strongly on this point because the Government have been so neglectful of the serious needs of the people at Bickley. Why are they not considered? Everyone knows how they are suffering, how the public have subscribed money for their assistance, and that the Lotteries Commission have found three different sums of money to help them; but their crop is not yet available, and they have not yet recovered from the effects of the storm. Would it have been a great sacrifice on the part of the Government if, instead of deciding to spend well on towards £100,000 in Claremont for an unnecessary facility, they had provided a fraction of that sum to help the striving settlers in the hills district?

Mr. Withers: This is not the question you desired to stress the last time you spoke?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have stressed it on different occasions. The member for Bunbury, who is usually fairly loquacious, has never said one word to assist me in the matter. He has in his district many settlers of importance, though they have not had the same misfortunes to face as the settlers at Bickley, following the disastrous storm. I am positively ashamed of the attitude which has been adopted by those who had it in their power, and still have it in their power, to help the Bickley people. I desire to speak about the transport facilities to and

from Mundaring Weir. There is a very meagre time-table. As a matter of fact, only a meagre time-table is justified. I would be the last one to suggest to the Minister for Railways that the time-table should be extended, that additional trains should be provided which the amount of traffic did not warrant, but the position at Mundaring Weir is most inconvenient. On Wednesday a train leaves the weir at 10.39, and another at 4.40 p.m. On Saturday there is a train from the weir at 5.15. This service is most inconvenient.

Mr. Cross: How many thousands of people live there?

Mr. SAMPSON: There are not many. I am not urging that additional trains should be run. I do not know that they would be justified. What I am urging is that the case should be considered on its merits, and if the people living in the districts are able to arrange for a motor bus service, such a service should be permitted to operate.

The Premier: Just the same as if another newspaper were to be started in Mullewa, you would welcome it with open arms.

Mr. SAMPSON: There might be justification for a new paper at Geraldton. I am inclined to think there is, but although I do not desire to say one word against Mullewa, if anyone is anxious to acquire a newspaper there, my time for appointments is all day and all night. The argument used by the member of the Transport Board with whom I discussed this matter regarding Mundaring Weir is that if the motor bus which operates as far as Darlington could continue to Mundaring Weir, on its return trip to Midland Junction, it would pick up some of the Mundaring traffic. Why should it not do so? The people of Mundaring are taxpayers, and are striving to develop that outer suburb, but everything possible, it seems, is done to prevent that development. I should like to give some details in respect of the need for better transport facilities for the people at Mundaring Weir.

The Minister for Mines: I was there the other day and could not get out because of the heavy traffic.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister can go there in plutocratic fashion, but the people of Mundaring have to use the popular method of transport. I want to urge that those in control of the Transport Act should view this question in a reasonable

way. The Mundaring Weir people are not being treated fairly. They are anxious to make an arrangement whereby they may do their shopping or enjoy a visit to the city on occasions. Why should they not be permitted to do so? They can leave the Weir by train at 4.40 and arrive in the city two hours later. But they are not able to return on the same night. Leaving by the 10.39 a.m. train they arrive in the city at 12.23—that is, on Wednesday—and it is possible for them to return at 5.25 p.m., but only as far as Mundaring, which is reached at 6.39. I commend the Minister for Railways for having arranged for the morning trains to leave Mundaring at 6.43 and 7.42. Both are convenient and well patronised. But why should the Transport Board say “No, we will not allow you to have a motor bus service.”

The Premier: Because the Act gives the Board that power.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Transport Board needs to have its personnel changed. The attitude adopted by the board at present is wrong.

The Premier: If there were a proposal to pull up the railway line to the weir you would shed tears all over the Chamber.

Mr. SAMPSON: No such proposal is ever likely to be made. I advocated the early Mundaring trains and they are now a boon, but there is no justification for the autocratic attitude being adopted by the Transport Board towards the people of Mundaring Weir who are cut off from the rest of the world. I know the Premier is speaking as the ex-Minister for Railways.

The Premier: No, I am not.

Mr. SAMPSON: But he cannot seriously commend this dogmatic attitude on the part of the Transport Board. In the past I have stood up for the board, but there is no longer any justification for doing so.

Mr. Cross: Are there 50 people who daily would go to and fro between Perth and Mundaring Weir?

Mr. SAMPSON: About that.

Mr. Cross: Then one truck would shift the lot.

Mr. SAMPSON: That is so. We do not ask the Government to spend any money on it. I have never asked that additional trains be run to the weir. If the railway time-table were reviewed, money could be saved, because empty trains are being unnecessarily

hailed along different lines. If we had a better train service, or if we had the buses, more people would be attracted to Mundaring. When anything is done to suit the outer suburbs it spells improvement in the city.

The Premier: Provided it is done by private enterprise, not as a public utility.

Mr. SAMPSON: I could not ask the Premier to allow a fast steam coach to run down to Mundaring Weir, because it would not pay. We can look to that ourselves if the Minister will see to it that those in the road of progress are removed out of the road of progress.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why not run over them with your steam coach?

Mr. SAMPSON: We asked for a bus service to leave the weir at 10 a.m. on Wednesday and various other times, which could have been done without expense to the Treasury. However, I will leave that suggestion in the hope, a very faint one, that some consideration will be extended to the needs of those people. Apart from some soft words we have not got anywhere up to the present, whereas other centres have both train and bus, Claremont indeed having train and bus and tram. I have been asked to make no reflection on the train which leaves Perth at 1 p.m. for Mundaring. But there is another train, the arrangements for which show a deadly antipathy towards Mundaring. That train leaves Midland Junction at 4.5 p.m., and goes only to Glen Forrest. There the children for Mundaring, if they have boarded that train, have to leave it and make their way home. Generally they remain at Midland Junction until 6 p.m. before entraining for home. If that 4.5 p.m. train left 25 minutes earlier the children of Mundaring could be served, and the workers at Boya could be picked up on return. I am with the member for Middle Swan (Mr. Hegney) in saying the workers at Boya deserve consideration, but certainly there is no justification for the treatment meted out to the Mundaring children. A number of them are unable to attend school at Midland Junction because of this very poor railway service. I trust that those trains will be run at more convenient times. There is at Mundaring a State school, but the senior class is the 6th, and in consequence many children who should be given opportunity to attend a school with a higher-grade curriculum, cannot do so. I understand this matter of the trains is one for

the Transport Board. It is time the board gave consideration to the needs of the people. The ultimate result would be to the advantage of all concerned, and there would soon be additional population in Mundaring.

Mr. Hegney: Do you ever get requests for electricity supply at Swan View?

Mr. SAMPSON: I think the Minister knows that story by heart.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the new Minister might be more sympathetic than the old.

Mr. SAMPSON: Mundaring suffers because the Government exercise a monopoly of electricity and have not extended current to the town. So instead of Mundaring being a flourishing centre it is more or less stagnant. The Government are to blame for the lack of interest shown by the general public in Mundaring as a residential centre. In 1922, when the late Mr. Scaddan was Minister for Railways, the question of electricity for Mundaring was investigated, and it was ascertained that the change-over from steam-drive to electricity for the pumps would mean that, after allowing for interest and obsolescence charges, there would be a saving of £1,000 per annum. To-day the pumps are reaching a stage where there will need to be serious renewal. Whether the Government will put in a modern electrically-driven plant and so save money remains to be seen. If the State Government did their duty there would be more people in Mundaring. Because there are not sufficient people to warrant it, the telephone service is not available the 24 hours round, as it would be if the State Government were to stand up to their obligations to Mundaring. Mundaring is a very fine centre, one of the most attractive of all.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is very picturesque.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is indeed, yet it remains backward. I should like to congratulate the Government on the gaol.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is that the only thing upon which you can congratulate them?

Mr. SAMPSON: During last year the commitments decreased by 521 as compared with the previous year. How that came about I do not know; still it is very pleasant to know of it. Work done by the gaol prisoners during the year was valued at £9,361. This is a subject very dear to the heart of our Chairman, whom I once met in the gaol.

Mr. Hegney: How does the position to-day compare with the position when you had control of the department?

Mr. SAMPSON: The position to-day shows a great improvement. I have visited Pardelup, which is splendidly carrying out the object for which it was established. I wish to say a few words about the Hospital for the Insane, and lunacy matters generally. I am sorry to note the increase in the number of patients at the Hospital for Insane. Apart from that, there is a number being cared for outside the hospital, and in addition the Point Heathcote Home has considerably relieved the position.

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

Mr. SAMPSON: In 1931 we had 1,243 mental cases, in 1932 we had 1,279, in 1933 we had 1,287, in 1934 we had 1,319, and last year the mental cases numbered 1,353. With respect to the number of insane in relation to the number of normal persons, the figures in 1931 were one to every 331 normal people, and last year the proportion was one to 310. Apart from South Australia and Tasmania this State is best off from the standpoint of mental health compared with any of the other States. The proportion in New South Wales is one to 245, in Victoria it is one to 261, in Queensland one to 286, in Tasmania it is one to 364 and South Australia one to 373. In our State the proportion is one to 310. Unfortunately the Claremont Hospital for the Insane, which was built to accommodate 607 males and 393 females, a total of 1,000, at the end of 1935 contained 1,272 patients. During recent months the position in the female wards has been improved, but there is grave need for increased accommodation, which should be provided as soon as possible. I suggest that the Government might consider taking over for hospital purposes a piece of land between the institution and the railway line, extending in an easterly direction from the hospital. The condition of the chronic and harmless cases would be improved if they were given some useful work to perform. It might be that some suitable area of land south of Fremantle, perhaps near Jandakot, could be taken over and utilised for this purpose. No doubt good results have followed upon the erection of the Heathcote Home. The construction, however, as is the case with many Government buildings, was unnecessarily elaborate. When Mr. Angwin was a member of this Chamber, and Chairman of the Com-

mission appointed to inquire into lunacy, he reported on the Enfield Home in South Australia. His opinion was that we would be wise to consider the erection of a reception home on the lines of the South Australian institution. Efforts were made and a piece of land was obtained, but the Government were not satisfied with a home-like building, but put up one along institutional lines. The Heathcote Reception Home therefore, is a big, elaborate and costly building. I believe it cost £70,000, whereas if Mr. Angwin's advice had been followed the cost would have been in the region of £30,000. The reception home is also overcrowded and it will be necessary for the Government to provide additional accommodation there. I hope the architecture will be on simpler lines, more homely, and less institutional. These big elaborate buildings are not helpful to the inmates, and I should imagine they embarrass the Treasurer. I suggest that the increased accommodation should be on simple cottage-like lines.

Mr. Cross: What about a shack?

Mr. SAMPSON: At Heathcote 37 per cent. of the inmates have been admitted as voluntary boarders. The inmates are not certificated, and there is no taint of insanity attaching to them. I understand the percentage of cures is considerable. Many of the patients regain normality and are able to return to their work, whether in the home or in business.

Mr. McLarty: The best surroundings are at Whitby Falls.

Mr. SAMPSON: They are very good surroundings but Whitby is limited in area. It was established for the production of certain products and has done valuable work. I understand it has now been developed to its fullest extent, but if another site were chosen in the neighbourhood of Jandakot the work could be expanded. A farm would be of great value. I hope the Minister in charge will give earnest consideration to this suggestion, and that the required additional accommodation will not be overlooked. The matter is a serious one. Insanity is increasing in our midst, and those who suffer from this malady must receive consideration.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [7.37]: Whilst listening to the debate I have been amazed to note the consistency of the inconsistent statements made, particularly by mem-

bers opposite. I listened carefully to the member for Albany. In one breath he said the Government used the Fremantle Harbour Trust as a taxing machine, and claimed that they were able to get £90,000 for revenue from the Trust last year; then a few gasps later he said the taxpayers were called upon to find £50,000 for interest charges for work done on the Fremantle Harbour.

Mr. Doney: There is nothing inconsistent about that.

Mr. CROSS: His remarks in which he disparaged the port of Bunbury, in order to get some special consideration for the port of Albany, will not carry much weight with members.

Mr. Thorn: Why do you not look after the South Perth jetty?

Mr. CROSS: If he has a good case to put up for Albany he would be well advised to put it up. Even members representing metropolitan electorates would give consideration to it. The member for Tooday also had a lot to say. He made quite a good speech, but he reminded me of a certain Royal family in France which forgot everything because it never learnt anything. The hon. member displayed ignorance of the subject when he said that the exchange rate of 25 per cent. was detrimental to primary producers. He then went on to claim that because of the exchange the price of goods in London was reduced by that amount. The exchange is just as much a racket on the people of Australia as a whole—

Mr. Thorn: You are an authority on rackets.

Mr. CROSS: It is just as much a racket as the deflation and money devaluation in Europe, where some countries are trying to take advantage of other countries. When the countries of Europe see a possibility of taking advantage of someone else they either deflate or alter the currency. The hon. member forgot to mention that the exchange rate operates as a super tax on all imports and on all interest paid overseas. He forgot to mention, too, that the producers have received the greatest advantage from the exchange. The producers' organisations all over Australia have been insistent upon keeping the exchange pegged at the present rate. The rest of the people have realised the condition of our primary industries, and that

is why they have tolerated the impost with scarcely a complaint. In discussing the Estimates I deplore the fact that the Commonwealth Government have reduced our grant and our loan moneys.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Refused them, you mean.

Mr. CROSS: They refused to grant the amount we asked for and definitely require. A larger amount will certainly be needed this year if we are to give the necessary assistance to pastoralists and others engaged in agricultural pursuits. As a result of the present situation it will be difficult, if not impossible, to reduce taxation this year. I should like to see some changes in the incidence of emergency taxation—in particular, a change in the direction of either granting exemptions to persons on the lower incomes, or reducing the tax on them, and increasing the tax on those with incomes of £8 or more per week. Indeed, it will be necessary to take some such step. Another point of general interest that I wish to mention has reference to a section of our community to which I have drawn attention previously—certain of the "C" class men as they are termed, border-line cases not entitled to invalid pensions according to the present Federal Invalid Pensions Act, and yet, according to State doctors, unfit to work. I hope our Government will see their way clear to extend some further consideration to such cases. As you, Mr. Chairman, and other members know, there are cases which have been classified as "C" for some considerable time. The total income in such cases is 7s. per unit of the family. Now, a man with a wife and two children absolutely cannot carry on upon the small sum of 28s. per week while paying rent. The number of such cases is not large, but the State should make a definite effort to give them an increased income, because their present position is most unfortunate and invidious. Now I wish to draw attention to two or three matters connected with my electorate. I received an invitation from you, Mr. Chairman, to inspect the Fremantle bridge on Friday next. I desire to draw attention to a bridge in my electorate. To hon. members who do not know the position, I wish to quote a few figures which, I believe, will be of general interest. In 1834—102 years ago—there was an agitation in Western Australia for the construction of a



bridge in the locality now known as Canning Bridge, then one of the most thickly populated portions of Western Australia. As a result of that agitation, a crude bridge was built by convict labour in 1837. On that bridge there was a big hump, about 10 feet higher than the present hump. In 1850 the bridge was rebuilt, and again in 1894, as the result of tremendous agitation, the Government reconstructed the bridge, reducing the hump and practically making a new bridge, at a cost of £1,190.

Mr. Thorn: How long have you been a member of the Historical Society?

Mr. CROSS: That bridge was satisfactory, and answered the purposes of the people for a few years. But in 1906 there was great agitation against the hump on the bridge; and not only that, but the bridge was not strong enough to carry the traffic. In 1908 the Government constructed a new bridge, at a cost of £2,059. That bridge, which was built to carry a maximum load of four tons, exists to-day. Connecting Perth with Fremantle is one of the best roads in the State, and it goes without saying, and without risk of contradiction, that the connecting Canning bridge, with its bottleneck entrance, is totally inadequate to deal with the volume of traffic passing over the structure daily. Incidentally, the previous Minister for Works, Mr. McCallum, promised to improve the approach at the eastern end. I am hopeful that the present Government will give consideration to the construction of a new Canning bridge which will reduce the hump still further. At the present time a bridge could be built at a reasonable cost in keeping with the requirements of the growing volume of traffic. Whereas the existing bridge was built in 1908 to carry a maximum load of four tons, nowadays trucks carrying over five tons frequently cross the bridge. The Government have done good work as regards reconstruction of bridges—at Bassendean and Guildford, for example, where the volume of traffic is far less than that at Canning Bridge. This last-named bridge deserves the consideration I ask for.

Mr. Marshall: Then we shall be able to do without the new Fremantle bridge.

Mr. CROSS: The bridge might prove of considerable importance. If a calamity happened to the Fremantle traffic bridge such as happened to the Fremantle railway bridge, the structure at Canning Bridge would be the only connecting link between the city

and the port. I do not desire to detract from the need for the construction of a new bridge at Fremantle, but I certainly consider that the present death-trap at Canning Bridge requires attention. It is especially important in view of its geographical position. There is another matter affecting my electorate that I desire to mention. We have heard a great deal about transport arrangements from the city to Mundaring. South Perth has a population about 250 times as great as that of Mundaring, and also has probably the worst transport service in the metropolitan area. I say this with particular regard to the number of people resident in the suburb of South Perth. As a sort of hardy annual there appears on the Estimates an amount for a new ferry boat. I trust that this time the amount will be left on the Estimates and will be spent to provide a new ferry boat. A new boat has been recommended for years, and the amount of money already spent in repairs to the old ferry boat would more than cover interest and sinking fund on the cost of a new boat. In connection with the Railways and Tramways Vote, and on the Loan Estimates, I shall have a good deal more to say about the transport facilities of South Perth. Let me add that I shall keep on urging these matters until definite improvements have resulted.

MR. SEWARD (Pingelly) [7.56]: I consider it a distinct advantage to have the Budget presented so early in the session, but it is a pity that we could not have with the Budget the Auditor General's report. It appears as though we have a balance sheet without an auditor's report. That report, if available with the Budget, would assist members materially. As regards the Agricultural Department, three years ago I introduced a deputation to the then Minister for Agriculture requesting that an up-to-date laboratory be provided in this State. So far nothing has been done in that direction. For the agricultural industry this is a most important matter, because Western Australian agriculture is being denied benefits which would be available if better laboratory facilities were provided here. The chairman of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research has stated on more than one occasion that if Western Australia had an up-to-date laboratory, the funds of the council and the advice of its experts would be available to our agriculturists. Last year the then

Premier said that the Government intended to investigate, at all events, the possibility of the erection of new headquarters for the Agricultural Department; and the hon. gentleman indicated the possibility of placing them on the Esplanade or in that vicinity. He did not, however, indicate exactly what was meant by "headquarters of the Agricultural Department." If the intention was to transfer the whole of the present staff at headquarters to the proposed site, it was to my mind a wrong proposal, because there is no necessity to have the laboratory work and other work of that description carried out in the middle of a congested city. The laboratory should be situated outside the city area, where the small number of stock necessary for experiments could be carried, and where also plants could be grown in furtherance of experiments. To do these things in the middle of the city would be wrong. It is urgently necessary that the Government should give some indication when a laboratory will be provided for the Agricultural Department. As I stated in previous sessions, it is not fair to expect of our Agricultural Department that they should carry out their highly important work under the conditions with which they now contend. We have highly qualified men, whose work is quoted, as the Minister for Agriculture stated recently, in the publications of the Agricultural Departments of other countries. Those other countries know the abilities of our scientific men, and naturally they will make them offers which, in the light of the conditions under which they work here, they cannot be expected to refuse. Already I have heard of one of our young men who has left the State and will not return. Probably there will be more of such cases. Consequently I appeal to the Government to take up the matter and see whether the laboratory cannot be provided. One of the speakers to-day indicated that a sum of £80,000 can be found for a trolley bus service in an area already well served, a system which will compete with existing State railways. I regard this other matter as of much greater importance to the State, in view of the value of our agricultural industry. The next matter I wish to touch on is financial emergency taxation. That taxation is beginning to yield much greater returns—no less than £800,000 being estimated for the current financial year. As hon. members are aware, the tax was introduced a few years ago for the purpose of

providing employment for those of our citizens who unfortunately were deprived of their means of livelihood when the depression came about. That was a very laudable objective but, with the passage of time, the need for the tax and for the provision of employment must necessarily have been reduced. I hold that the time is over-ripe for a close revision of the situation as it is at present. There is plenty of work available in the country districts, yet labour cannot be obtained. We all deplore the possibility of a greatly reduced harvest owing to the prolongation of the dry season. On the other hand, it will be a means of relieving the Minister for Employment of much worry because had we had a normal harvest this year, the farming community would have been at their wits' end to secure the labour necessary to take off the harvest. That was the position last year. I had not previously seen so much hay left out until after the stripping period as was the case last year, because the farmers could not get the necessary labour.

Mr. Tonkin: Unfortunately a lot of the men who worked for the farmers were not paid.

Mr. SEWARD: That is a lie.

Mr. Tonkin: That is the truth.

Mr. SEWARD: It is not.

Mr. Tonkin: I ask for a withdrawal. What I said was no lie but the absolute truth. I can produce the facts. The member for Pingelly is distinctly out of order in stating that I lied.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for North-East Fremantle has asked for a withdrawal.

Mr. SEWARD: I withdraw. I am sorry if I offended the member for North-East Fremantle but that hon. member must realise that when he makes a statement that is offensive—

Mr. Marshall: The hon. member must withdraw unreservedly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Marshall: The member for Pingelly is out of order because he must withdraw without any reservation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: He did not make any reservation.

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Chairman, I ask that the member for Pingelly be made to withdraw unreservedly. I am made to withdraw unreservedly, and I intend to see that other members are treated in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the member for North-East Fremantle satisfied?

Mr. Tonkin: Up to date, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the member for Pingelly will proceed.

Mr. Marshall: Others must do as I am made to do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. SEWARD: Mr. Chairman, I was not aware that I made any reservation.

Mr. Marshall: I was.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You would be.

Mr. SEWARD: All I said was that I was a farmer, and, from the standpoint of a farmer, regarded the interjection as offensive.

Mr. Marshall: The hon. member is again emphasising his reservation.

Mr. SEWARD: That is no reservation at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask hon. members to keep order.

Mr. SEWARD: The point I was making was that the statement that farmers had not paid wages to their workmen was offensive to me as a farmer, and consequently I resented it.

Mr. Tonkin: It is also a matter of offence to the farm worker who cannot get his wages.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Do not take any notice!

Mr. SEWARD: Farmers are only too ready to pay good wages, provided they can get good work in return. At the present time it is almost impossible to secure labour of that type. I say "almost" because there are some good men available if their services can be procured. I know my own experience and I often wish I could put a galvanised iron fence around my property so that people could not see how badly the fields have been seeded, with gaps here and there. There is a limited supply of cheap labour, but that is not what the farmers really require. At present it is most difficult to get competent labour for the farm. The reason for that is, I presume, that the department dealing with unemployment relief provides work close to the city areas, and many of the competent men are employed there. Then again, others have gone to the goldfields, or have embarked in various avenues of employment. If the farming industry is to continue satisfactorily, it is necessary to secure competent labour, and the unemployment relief authorities should assist in that direction.

Mr. Tonkin: And it is necessary for the competent labour to be paid.

Mr. SEWARD: That is one of the great difficulties confronting farmers.

Mr. Withers: Should not the farmers at least make employment more attractive?

Mr. SEWARD: If the member for Bunbury can tell us how that can be done, we will willingly listen.

Mr. Fox: Shorten the hours, and provide better pay.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Whether the industry can afford it or not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask members to maintain order.

Mr. SEWARD: The officials of the Labour Bureau have a duty to perform in that respect. A week or two ago I engaged a man, and he told me that when the list of farming positions was called out, the men at the Bureau walked out in a body. That is not fair. If employment is to be found for those men, they should be made to take what is offering. There is plenty of work available in country districts, and farmers are only too pleased to pay good wages to good workers.

Mr. Cross: What do you offer a married man?

Mr. SEWARD: The position is exactly the same with regard to domestics. It is almost impossible to get domestics in the country areas. Last week a girl in a country town adopted the usual method of notifying the public that she required a position, and put a notice in the stationer's window. The next day she received 55 replies, including four reply-paid telegrams. That will give members some idea of the dearth of domestics in the country areas. These are matters that should concern the Government departments dealing with the employment of labour. There is another point. The other day I came across a man in Pingelly who wanted a job. I found he was a most capable man, one anyone need not hesitate to recommend. I claim that the department should tabulate the names of men who are known to be capable, and then when a farmer required the services of a first-class man, he could write to the department and be sure of getting the right type. It is time this phase was gone into carefully because I am of opinion that not 30 per cent. of the work provided now is necessary in view of the jobs available in country districts. I regret having to again deal with not only the Pingelly water

supply but the water supplies affecting the Great Southern in general. The position at present is rather alarming. The member for Katanning has disclosed to us the position at Katanning where a dam with a capacity of over 30,000,000 gallons contains not more than 2,000,000 gallons of water now. From another point of view, the Pingelly water supply is absolutely impossible. It cannot be made fit for consumption. The water supplies at Brookton and Narrogin are also unsatisfactory. In these circumstances I have no hesitation in saying that the main problem in the Great Southern areas to-day concerns water supplies. It behoves the Government to take that matter in hand. I say that because last year an advisory committee was appointed to consider and report to the Government on country water supplies. Unfortunately, according to the Minister, the question of town water supplies in the country areas was not referred to the committee, who dealt with country water supplies, irrespective of town requirements. To give members some idea of the position in country areas, I would refer them to the Auditor-General's report for last year. If they peruse the report, they will see a list dealing with various country water supplies, and will find that serious losses are made every year. Take the Pingelly scheme. It cost £11,031 to put in, and last year a loss was made of £708, while to date there is an accumulated loss on the undertaking of £7,418. The Brookton water supply cost £20,982. Last year there was a loss of £663, and there is an accumulated loss on the scheme of £5,383. The position at Narrogin is not so bad. A loss of £1,200 was experienced last year on the scheme, which cost £53,000, and there is an accumulated loss on the undertaking of £2,190. Taken in the aggregate, 19 country schemes cost, in round figures, £782,000, and show an accumulated loss of £139,000. That result may not condemn the schemes altogether, because it is very likely that they confer benefits that far exceed the monetary loss. The trouble, however, is that in many instances there is not only that monetary loss, but the water supplied is unfit for human or animal consumption. We cannot use the Pingelly water even for our gardens. In these circumstances, some

other scheme should be investigated so that a supply of water may be provided suitable for requirements. One difficulty is that some of the water supplies are becoming affected by salt, and will be of no use whatever. The Brookton, Pingelly, Narrogin and Katanning reservoirs will be of no use in a very short time. The reason for that is that it is almost impossible to secure earthen reservoirs in the Great Southern districts that will not go salty in time. That being so, it is wrong to allow the annual losses to continue. The position should be investigated by competent engineers to determine whether the present schemes can be turned into payable and suitable propositions, or whether an adequate water supply can be procured under conditions that will not result in the water becoming salty in time. If that is not possible by using existing reservoirs, some other scheme should be considered. It would be possible to use the Collie scheme by conveying water from the Wellington dam to Cuballing, which, I understand, is the highest point in the Great Southern. From there the water could be gravitated to various parts of the Great Southern, and to districts to the east of that area, and also as far as Merredin. That scheme could be adopted if necessary to augment the Mundaring supply to serve the agricultural areas. This week I received a letter from a farmer who has a holding east of the Great Southern and he informs me that he has already started carting water for his stock. Those operations will have to continue throughout the season, because it is hardly likely that we will have any further rains this year capable of filling the dams, unless there is some phenomenal downfall. That is so because the ground is so dry that it absorbs the water quickly. I hope the Government will take up this matter, and investigate the possibilities of the Collie scheme. Something must be done to provide an adequate water supply for the towns along the Great Southern line. Another matter I wish to refer to relates to wire-netting supplies for rabbit-proof fencing. A few days ago I asked questions regarding the quantities of wire-netting available, and the amount on hand for the purchase of supplies. In that regard I wish to clear up a possible misunderstanding which might arise from the Minister's

replies. The rabbit menace is so serious in the southern parts of the State in particular that it is absolutely necessary for farmers to net their properties. So far they have fumigated and poisoned to the limit of their possibilities. Many farmers have practically eradicated the rabbits from their properties only to find that they have to start all over again because the pests have established themselves again from adjoining holdings, many of which are unoccupied. When I asked the Minister to indicate if any moneys were available for the purchase of wire-netting, he replied that the money available amounted to £18,107, of which £10,000 had been allotted for the purchase of netting, and £8,000 had not so far been allotted. In reply to the question regarding any uncompleted contracts, he replied that there were to the extent of 84 miles, but the Agricultural Bank or Government held no wire-netting. While perhaps neither the Agricultural Bank nor the Government hold supplies of netting, that reply conveys a wrong impression, because I subsequently found out that the manufacturers have considerable quantities of wire-netting on hand, which is really contracted for by the Government.

Hon. C. G. Latham: In storage?

Mr. SEWARD: No, an uncompleted contract. In March, 1935, a contract was let for 800 miles of netting, and delivery was to be effected at the rate of 100 miles a month. After the first three months, the Government reduced the rate of delivery to 50 miles per month. Had the contractors continued to deliver at the rate of 50 miles a month, the 800 miles would have been delivered to the Government by April of this year. At the request of the Government, they did not deliver it. They are still liable to deliver netting to the extent of 249 miles. It seems extraordinary that settlers should be clamouring for netting and that there should be an uncompleted contract of 249 miles which the manufacturers have to deliver, and which they could have delivered to the Government at the end of last April, even at the reduced rate of supply. Owing to the Government not taking delivery, the manufacturers have had to reduce their staff to a certain extent. I would draw the notice of the Minister for Employment to this because he and his predecessor urged the people to provide as much employment as possible for our own industries. That was quite a proper policy to advocate. But

here is a firm of manufacturers having to reduce their staff because the Government will not take the quantity of wire-netting contracted for. There is not the slightest doubt that a demand exists for the delivery of the netting. In my opinion the Agricultural Bank Commissioners are imposing conditions that are not exactly fair. I agree that they should impose conditions to ensure that the payments for netting are maintained. Only last week a friend wrote to me asking if I could do anything to get him wire-netting. He is not a client of the Agricultural Bank—I believe he is financed by one of the trustee companies. The Agricultural Bank wanted a first charge on his security. This the trustee company were quite willing to give, but the Bank wanted guaranteed payments. It was pointed out that under the Act controlling their operations the trustee company were not allowed to give the guarantee for payment, but still the Bank insisted, with the result that that man cannot get wire netting. It is generally felt in the country that the Wire Netting Act is being used really for the benefit of Agricultural Bank clients. The Minister, in reply to my question, stated that out of 82 successful applicants last year, 65 were clients of the Agricultural Bank. Considering the fight the farmers are having to wage in order to keep the rabbits down—the only alternative is to leave their properties—I ask the Minister to take this matter up with the Agricultural Bank and see whether the conditions cannot be liberalised so that the farmers can obtain netting. Towards the close of last year the Minister for Lands, on his return from the Eastern States, reported that he had made a strong appeal to the Commonwealth Government to continue to provide the money for the purchase of wire netting. Until last year we were getting £30,000 a year, but the Commonwealth Government did not renew the agreement. At this time, almost 12 months later, we have no less than £18,000 unexpended, and it might reasonably be imagined the Commonwealth Government thought that if we could hold that amount of money, there could not be any great demand for wire netting. That might have actuated them in deciding not to continue the grant. I appeal to the Minister to take up the matter with a view to making more liberal terms available to the farmers. The only other point upon which I wish to touch—and it is with regret that I mention it—

is that of the treatment meted out to the farmers of the State, in the southern parts particularly, owing to the failure of the Government to take any action towards the erection of terminals for the bulk-handling of wheat. By the irony of fate, through the adverse season, it is quite possible that one of the zones not equipped for bulk-handling will have as much wheat as any other part of the State to shift this year. That particular zone has not been equipped with bulk-handling facilities, although at the beginning of this year I took the matter up with the Government, and urged that if it were not possible to provide the terminal facilities at Bunbury this year, they should be erected at Fremantle and the wheat transferred to Fremantle pending the erection of facilities at Bunbury. The area I am referring to is in what is known as the Bunbury zone. However, nothing was done. On the return of the then Premier from the Loan Council in the middle of the year, he intimated he had not been successful in getting money for the erection of bulk-handling terminals. That was unfortunate, but it was not necessary for the then Premier to get money for the terminal elevators. The company operating the system were prepared to erect the terminals if the Government would allow them to do so. The Government, however, would neither allow the company to do it, nor would they do it themselves. I appeal to the Government to give the company and the farmers a fair deal. They are doing a big work for the State. They are a company of which we can be proud. Their methods have been investigated closely by the other States, who have reported favourably on the system inaugurated in this State. Consequently I consider the Government should assist them as much as possible, because it is only reasonable that the company cannot extend to the limit they desire until such time as they know what is going to happen to their wheat on its arrival at the ports. When the bulk-handling measure was before us last year, the company were subjected to a certain amount of adverse criticism owing to damage which might have occurred to some of the wheat, but had the terminals been erected and fully equipped to deal with the wheat, that damage would not have occurred. I appeal to the Government to take up the matter at the earliest possible moment, so that the terminals will have been erected at the various ports to handle the 1937-38 harvest. It is

necessary for the company to have the assurance that the terminals will be erected by that time in order to enable them to extend the bulk-handling facilities to the whole of the State for the harvest after the present one. Those are the only matters upon which I desire to speak, but there are one or two others which I shall take opportunity to mention when the departments are under consideration.

**MR. HEGNEY** (Middle Swan) [8.23]: The Estimates submitted to us by the Deputy-Treasurer are informative, and set out exactly the financial position of the State. While members for various electorates might submit requests for the consideration of the Government and urge that money be spent in this and that direction, it must be realised that the funds at the disposal of the Government are very limited. The estimated revenue this year is just over £10,000,000, and out of that amount the cost of servicing public utilities has to be met. For carrying on the affairs of the State an amount of £6,700,000 odd remains. Of that amount interest charges, exchange and sinking fund represent £4,090,000 odd, so that the revenue left for the other activities of the State amounts to only £2,638,000. That is all the Government have at their disposal with which to carry on the various services of the State. It has been suggested on the one hand that some of the taxes should be reduced on the ground that they are excessive and harsh in their incidence. There may be substance in that argument. On the other hand we have been told that other avenues of taxation should be exploited. I think the gold profits tax should receive consideration with a view to trying to get a little more revenue from that source. Last year the gold profits tax realised £77,000, and if the Act were examined, it might be found possible to get a little more without imposing too great a hardship on the industry. It would be possible also to increase the rate of the financial emergency tax on the higher incomes. The rate of tax stops at 9d. in the pound on £8 per week. I think the rate could be advanced, and thus we could get additional revenue from that source. Undoubtedly the financial emergency tax is not an equitable tax, because it does not take into consideration all the difficulties confronting a taxpayer, though, as has been pointed out from time to time in this Chamber, it would be impossible to find a tax that was absolutely fair in its incidence to every-

body. The Government might consider the question of raising the exemption, particularly to benefit those on the lower incomes, say those receiving £5 per week. If the exemption were raised for married persons with families, the relief would be appreciated. The amounts that those in receipt of incomes of £8 a week and more would have to pay under the increased rate would be small as compared with the relief that taxpayers on the lower incomes would receive. The difficulties confronting the State are considerable. Whilst the revenue available for all purposes is under £3,000,000, we have to find interest payments on both the overseas and internal loans, and because of that taxation is necessary. The interest payments represent our greatest difficulty. From an ordinary man's observations of our economic difficulties, it seems that this is going to be the great problem of the future. Assuming that the economic position has improved somewhat, and that there is likely to be further improvement, we know that the interest rate on loans has advanced a little. When the Loan Council again seek to float a loan, we are told that the interest rate might have to be increased. It may be that the next loan will have to be issued at 4 per cent. in order to induce investors to take up the loan. Then it may not be long before we have to pay 4½, 5 or even 6 per cent.—rates equivalent to those making the burden under which we are labouring to-day. From the details of interest payments, we find that we have to provide £1,730,000 for interest on overseas loans, and £1,498,000 for interest on Australian loans, a total of £3,229,961 for interest alone. The mean population of the State at the 30th June, as disclosed by the returns, was 447,892. These figures disclose that the interest debt in this country is £7 per head. That is a staggering burden for the taxpayers to bear. In exchange we have to find £454,250, which works out at about £1 a head. Our friend from Toodyay said that the farmers did not benefit by that; that when they sold their products in the world's market the actual prices of those commodities were reduced. I do not think that is quite sound. Sinking fund repayments total £338,471 or 15s. per head of the population. Requests are made to the Government to do this, that or the other thing, but the position is that they would require millions of pounds to finance all the propositions advanced. How is the position to be improved? How are we to

get out of the difficulties which confront us? One possible way would be increased production and increased population. With increased population, these debts per head would be reduced, but where can we absorb an increased population? Can we absorb them in the primary industries at the present time?

Mr. Thorn: Not unless you make them more profitable.

Mr. HEGNEY: As a matter of fact, in the primary industries there are fewer people working than there were 20 years ago. It is almost hopeless trying to improve our position from that point of view. The question of immigration is being discussed. I noticed that some time ago the Federal Attorney General, Mr. Menzies, spoke at a luncheon in Melbourne and urged a vigorous policy of migration. He said:—

Some people will say that we ought not to talk about immigration when there are still some Australians out of work and when we still have inadequate markets for what we are producing. I am sometimes astounded at the innate conservatism of an Australian public opinion which fosters the notion that we can stand still in our tracks or that we can go on constructing some pretty little paradise for the people we have now.

Amongst other things he stated that to consider migration for the purpose of putting the immigrants on Government farming settlements, such as the group settlements of this State, was unthinkable. The only alternative was that we should try to develop our secondary industries to absorb the increased population. He urged that we should increase our population to about 20,000,000 souls. Our population now is just under 7,000,000. Recently Professor Fisher, professor of economics at our University, returned from a tour abroad and made some observations on the statements dealing with migration. Amongst other things he said that in a discussion of any problem one must realise the advantages of a study of the historical background, for all events led up to a particular problem. But the historical outlook often tended to be dangerous. Men continued to think about problems in terms which were suitable to the past, without realising that the conditions lying behind them might have radically altered. Of course that is the position to-day in Australia. Conditions are radically different from those which obtained when other migration schemes were conceived 15 or 20 years ago. Referring to

the suggestion of the Federal Attorney General that the population should be increased to 20,000,000, he asked what was the largest rate of population increase which could possibly be conceived. To talk about creating immediately a population of 20,000,000 by a vigorous migration policy, as a noted Federal politician had recently advocated, he said was a fantastic romanticism. Prof. Fisher has just returned from Europe and is going to be an advocate for the re-opening of migration. I understand from what I have read that this Government, together with other Governments of the Commonwealth, are going to be asked to collaborate with the Federal authorities in the matter of an influx of population. This country could possibly look after many more millions if they were here and settled but to talk about fetching them here is absurd. Mr. Menzies dismissed the idea that because there are a few unemployed, migration should not be discussed. But to those who know anything of the economic conditions in this State and throughout the Commonwealth to talk about trying to increase the population is ridiculous in the extreme. Some of the difficulties of this State at present are due to the fact that we were committed some years ago to a policy of immigration and we are now reaping where we have sown. We are paying for our investments in the group settlement areas. Five or six million pounds have been written off there together with interest. There is no doubt that the interest problem is going to be one of the difficulties of the immediate future. There may be people in this community definitely opposed to change who will fight against progress, but if the Government or the powers that be throughout the Commonwealth are not going to try to encourage reforms and improve the conditions of the people, many of the difficulties that have beset European Governments will beset Governments in Australia. It is well that we should take stock of our position in time. Hundreds of people in and around Perth and throughout the State are trying to eke out an existence under the present system and they are having a difficult struggle indeed. It is remarkable how they tolerate existing conditions. The member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) spoke about the progress of communism in Australia and tried to tack communism on to the Labour Party. She did not go the whole hog and tell the truth about the position. The Labour Party and the Labour organisations

are the only bodies whose members are pledged to be members of this party and of no other party. Neither the National Party nor the Country Party has such a pledge. In days gone by certain people supporting the National Party have been a greater menace to the well-being of the community than any communist by their harsh treatment and exploitation of employees. They were the type of people who gave rise to the people known as communists, who were forced to protest against the rotten economic conditions which prevailed. It is all right for those with plenty of money and other amenities to talk, but there are thousands who are living under inhuman conditions. My view is that the only way to keep solvent is to meet the monetary situation. The Commonwealth Bank should be made a people's institution and should function in the interests of the people and not in the interests of the bankers. The profits made by the bank should go towards liquidating the national debt and towards creating a national reserve. In connection with the Australian notes issue, three-quarters of a million of money is derived by way of profit. Prior to the existence of the Commonwealth Bank, the private institutions got all this profit, but to-day it finds its way to the treasury coffers. The Commonwealth Bank should go out after business, but we know how the operations of the Bank were hamstrung by the Bruce-Page Government whose desire was that it should remain an institution similar in its activities to the associated banks. If the Commonwealth Bank were made to function in the interests of the people considerable improvements would be effected in the position of the workers and others.

Mr. McDonald: Have you any other suggestions?

Mr. HEGNEY: I have no doubt that if the Commonwealth Bank were functioning more in the interests of the people as it should do, there would be considerable improvement all round. There is a world-wide agitation for monetary reform, and economists are pointing out that the existing monetary system has broken down and that a system working in the interests of the people will have to be inaugurated. It was considered unthinkable that Great Britain should repudiate her debts, but she had to say that she would not pay America the enormous sums that were owing, and for a time they remained unpaid. What applies



to America applies to other nations. All economists are urging monetary reform. Reginald McKenna has suggested various schemes, and Professor Keynes has written a book on the subject.

Mr. McDonald: They all suggest different schemes.

Mr. HEGNEY: Yes, but out of those suggestions some workable plan will probably be arranged. We in this State are certainly in great difficulties. Our public debt represents over £7 per head of population, while the taxation collected represents £6 2s. 2d. per head of population. The fact that the taxation is not meeting the debt shows the difficulties in which we find ourselves. The Government last year were able to present a small surplus, but, of course, under the capitalistic system the Government are enmeshed in the same difficulties as any other State Government, in that they have to submit to financial dictatorship from the Loan Council. The Loan Council goes into the problem of how much money is required for the activities of the States and the Commonwealth and, in turn, the Loan Council submit their proposition to the Commonwealth Bank, where it is examined and a note taken of the various proposed works to be carried out. Then the Commonwealth Bank tells the Loan Council to go back and apply the pruning knife, that it will not be possible to raise so much money as was required by the Loan Council. Then, of course, in turn the State Premiers have to reconsider their plans. So it will be seen that the Commonwealth Bank for the time being is master of the situation. The Government of Western Australia is in exactly the same predicament as other State Governments, for undoubtedly we have unification in finance. I do not know how much longer the people are going to tolerate the existing rotten conditions. The State Government have done everything possible to meet the position of the workers, for each member of the Government is sincere and honest in that direction. Since this Government took office they have immeasurably improved the position of the workers.

Mr. Hughes: There are men in East Perth getting 1s. a day.

Mr. HEGNEY: I am quite sure that, if the Government had the necessary finance, they would still further advance to a con-

siderable degree the position of all the workers. Let me give an instance showing how the Labour Government have assisted the workers. The Mitchell-Latham Government when in office refused to pay the men 6s. per day camping allowance to which they were entitled under the Public Works scale. So the men took the Government to court and were awarded an allowance of 5s. 3d.

Mr. Hughes: They are not getting it now.

Mr. HEGNEY: I want to make it clear to the member for East Perth that the previous Government denied the workers that camping allowance, and denied them the terms of the agreement respecting holiday pay. The men used to be stood off for a day during the month, which, of course, broke their time, and so by a subterfuge they were defrauded of their holiday pay. As for the financial emergency tax, a married man getting £2 per week has to pay the tax. When it was suggested that those men on the basic wage should be exempted, the proposal was defeated and members of the Country Party and of the National Party said that everybody on £1 per week or more should pay the tax.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But the tax was only 4½d. then.

Mr. HEGNEY: But members of the Country Party and of the National Party laid it down that every person getting £1 per week should pay the tax. Under the present Government the exemption rate was raised from £2 to £3 10s. per week. That was in the first year of the Labour Government's regime. Now that the basic wage has been raised slightly, when the Bill comes down again the exemption rate will have to be raised accordingly. We tried to give single men an exemption up to £2, but another place contended that everybody getting so much as £1 a week should pay the tax. A compromise was made, the effect of which was that the exemption for single men was raised to 30s.

Mr. Hughes: There is too much compromise.

Mr. HEGNEY: I agree with the hon. member. I believe another place is long overdue for reform and review. The Government should give immediate considera-

tion to a review of the franchise of another place.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You want to alter that franchise?

Mr. HEGNEY: Yes. I do not know whether the hon. member would support us in that. If he is unwilling to support us in that proposal I may inform him that his confreres in Victoria have made a definite attempt to amend the franchise of the Legislative Council there and to provide that when the Assembly for the second time passes measures that have the backing of the people, those measures become law notwithstanding the attitude of the Legislative Council.

Mr. Patrick: There will have to be a dissolution, I think.

Mr. HEGNEY: Perhaps so. Let me read to the hon. member the observations of his confrere in Victoria. Mr. Dunstan is reported to have said as follows:—

The Bill for the readjustment of the Council's electoral boundaries would not further be dealt with at the present juncture. Probably it would be held over for a week or two. In the meantime the Government's second Bill for the reform of the Legislative Council would be introduced. In addition to making provision for liberalising the qualifications for membership of the Council it would contain machinery to cope with situations such as that created by the obstructionist tactics employed in dealing with the present measure. The Premier indicated that the Government were growing tired of the farce being staged by the Upper House Tories, and proposed to put an end to parading the Bill from one Chamber to the other.

What applies in Victoria applies with equal force here. The time is long overdue for a review of another place.

Hon. C. G. Latham: If you will attempt to stop the conferences of managers, I will be with you.

Mr. HEGNEY: If members of another place are going to continue their tactics in dealing with measures from this Chamber, the Government ought to try to review that place. I have advocated that ever since I came into this Chamber. I believe the country would be much better governed if we had a single Chamber instead of the bicameral system. No matter which Government may be elected, they ought to be given opportunity to translate their legislative programme into effect. Unemployment is a world-wide problem. In the peak days of Australia's prosperity the lowest number of workers without employment was 60,000. That is a considerable number for a place like Australia, yet those are the figures taken

from the "Year Book." Whilst the Government, any Government, will try to improve the conditions of the workers, all such improvements are only palliatives to help the people to get work. As against that, during the depression the Government were called upon to find work for all those men displaced because the profits of private enterprise had broken down, and so private enterprise was no longer able to make profits out of the exploitation of labour. Consequently, the workers came back on the Government. In the years ahead the Governments of Australia will have to find work for a larger army of workers than hitherto. In years gone by Governments have raised loan funds and the Works Department have carried a certain number of men during each year, but as the years advance the number of men the Government will be expected to supply with employment will keep on increasing. The question of a shorter working week is of paramount importance, not only to workers in Australia, but to workers throughout the world. A few years ago the Commonwealth Government sent one of their Ministers—he was in the status of Under-Secretary for Labour—to represent the Commonwealth at Geneva. On his return he submitted a report which was very favourable to the introduction of a 40-hour week in Australia. Evidently that report was too informative and not quite to the liking of the present Federal Government. Consequently no action was taken on that report nor will be taken until the next elections, when no doubt the various parties will promise that, if returned, they will introduce the 40-hour week. Some industries in Western Australia have introduced the shorter working week. Unless the principle is adopted all over the Commonwealth, it will be difficult to extend it, even in this State. We shall be up against many difficulties if the Government introduce the 40-hour week in this State whilst other States continue with the 48-hour week. This problem of the shorter working week will be one which the workers of the country will advocate as the years go by. Employment is also affected by the mechanisation of industry. Perhaps no industry is more affected than that associated with farming. Many of our problems arise from the use of implements on the farms, and the fact that motor power has displaced horses in so many cases has multiplied our difficulties. I do not suggest that farmers should go back to the

old type of operation, but would point out that the mechanisation of this particular industry has displaced a considerable amount of labour. The member for Pingelly said it is difficult to get farm labour at present. Yesterday I was at the State Labour Bureau where a man had just come back from doing work on a farm. He was opposed to going back to that sort of thing. Evidently he had worked on a farm for years. I did not know the man. He said he was picked up in a country town to work for a farmer for £2 a week and keep, but when it came to paying him, he received only 35s. He complained about that, but the farmer said, "If you do not like 35s., you can go." The authorities at Marquis-street do not desire to put a man into industrial employment if he is accustomed to farm work. This particular man said that owing to the experience he had had, he had no desire to go back to the farming industry. It is very difficult for farmers to pick up good men exactly when they wish to do so. The same thing applies to those who want mechanics. Industries often displace mechanics from employment, although a good man will generally get work. There are always men not as well qualified as others, and it is difficult for them to get employment at all times. It is only when there is a scarcity of labour in a particular industry that these men can get jobs. As soon as the supply has been met and the industry has got out its orders retrenchment occurs and these men are put out of work again. The same thing applies in the farming industry. Most of the farms are conducted as one-man farms, and very little extra labour is employed. At the best, it is only a seasonal occupation. Labour is engaged for seeding, then put off, then taken on again for the harvest. Only on the big farms is labour employed all the year round. Some farmers pay reasonable wages, and look after their men. It is asking too much to expect that men will be available whenever they are wanted. There should be more co-ordination between those who need labour and those who are looking for work. On various occasions attempts have been made to abolish private exchanges. The time is long past for that to be done. More work should be concentrated on the State Labour Bureau. Yesterday there were no decent jobs offering for farm labourers. The man I am speaking of will be put on sustenance for a week or two until a good job is available for him. There is a scarcity of good employment. The authori-

ties do not want to send married men to a farming job.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They would not get enough pay.

Mr. HEGNEY: If a farmer cannot pay a worker, he should not engage him.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A farmer can pay a single man more than the Government are giving him for half-time employment, taking into consideration board and lodging.

Mr. HEGNEY: That may be so, but many single men have complained to me about the position. In one case, two boys in one family were owed £60 and £40, respectively, and could not get the money. I asked the then manager of the Agricultural Bank, Mr. McLarty, if he could get the boys their money. The mother afterwards became dependent on the Child Welfare Department. I was told that one of the boys was on a one-man farm. That farmer should never have engaged labour.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Why did he stay so long to have accumulated so much wages due?

Mr. HEGNEY: He was there a matter of 12 months.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Would he not draw wages from time to time?

Mr. HEGNEY: Country Party members should tell the farmers that when they want workers they should get into touch with the State Labour Bureau. I know the policy of that department. The officer in charge of the relief section is always anxious that a man experienced in farming should keep to farm work. If the Labour Bureau were kept advised, workers could be sent out as required. I have had some experience of private labour exchanges. I know of two young men. One had worked in the South-West, but left there because he could not get on with his father. He came to Perth with a few pounds and obtained employment in the South-West through a private exchange, and for this he had to pay 15s. When he reached the place he found he had to sleep next-door to the calves; so he left the job. The would-be employer again got into touch with the same exchange, and another lad paid 15s. but also relinquished the job when he found where he had to sleep. The two young men met, and were on their way to Kalgoorlie on foot when I gave them a lift as far as Midland Junction. They told me how they had been treated. They were about 20 years of age.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You do not judge all farmers by that example?

Mr. HEGNEY: I am talking about the labour exchange. This exchange received two payments for the one job. The Leader of the Opposition has heard the ex-Minister for Works talking about the abolition of labour exchanges. I urge upon the Government to bring down a Bill for that purpose so that the activities of the State Labour Bureau may be increased. The position is not at all satisfactory. The Government are in a worse plight than they were when the Budget was brought down. They are minus £300,000 that was expected by way of a grant. They are in difficulties because of the bad season in the wheat areas, and because of the two years' drought in the pastoral areas. The position of the Government will be acute for the next few months, and they will require all the financial resources they can get hold of. I wish to refer to some of the railway crossings in the metropolitan area. I know that it is intended to place warning signals at certain places. The four dangerous crossings are Maddington, Rivervale, Greenmount and Hill-street, East Perth. I have often agitated for a subway at Rivervale. A warning signal there may be all right, but a subway would solve the problem for all time. It would also give employment to a number of people whilst it was being erected. This crossing is on the main highway, and motorists surely contribute sufficient by way of traffic fees to warrant the Government in spending the money. It is an exceedingly dangerous crossing and has been responsible for the loss of many lives. Only recently a husband and his wife were killed there. Apart from the fatal accidents that occur, there are very many narrow escapes. The Belmont people complain of that. Country people are often not aware of the danger, and run into trouble. If a subway were built, the crossing would be safe for all classes of travellers for all time.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [9.14]: I look upon the Estimates as a means of showing the financial position of the State from the point of view of revenue and expenditure. So far only one speech, that of the member for Roebourne, attempted to analyse the Estimates as they are. Seeing that other members have taken advantage of the opportunity to discuss all manner of subjects, I wish to reply to some of the remarks of the member for Albany to-night. I wish he were in his seat, for it is difficult to reply to statements if the member who has made them is not present to listen. •

Hon. N. Keenan: Did you tell him you were going to speak?

Mr. WITHERS: No. It is not necessary for me to tell him, after listening to him all night.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Not all night.

Mr. WITHERS: I was listening to him most of the time, anyway. In connection with this trade question the member for Albany went to a good deal of trouble to collect data dealing with expenditure on various harbours of the State. He raised the subject on the Address-in-reply and recently he has been asking questions regarding it in this Chamber—as to expenditure on the Bunbury, Fremantle, Geraldton, and Albany harbours. This evening the hon. member, while quoting the percentages of cost, did not state the amounts of revenue received from the various ports to justify the expenditure incurred. For many years I have said in this Chamber and elsewhere, and I repeat now, that I am not one whit jealous of Albany as Albany. If there is anything in respect of which I could feel jealous of Albany, it is Albany's beautiful harbour, that splendid harbour with which Nature has endowed the town. Nature was not so generous to Bunbury in regard to a harbour, but it was most generous to the Bunbury district in the fertility of the land adjacent to the port. The question arises, what is the good of an oasis in the desert? Undoubtedly an oasis is a nice thing; but what is the use of an oasis if it has to depend on a desert for its trade? The member for Albany, in justifying expenditure on the Albany harbour, could have left every other harbour of the State out of the picture. There was no occasion whatever for the hon. member, so far as the interests of Albany are concerned, to mention Geraldton, Fremantle, and other harbours. If he has a just case to put to the Government for further expenditure on the Albany harbour, to facilitate the trade of the port, there is no need for him to quarrel with any other Western Australian port. Let the hon. member look after his own affairs. I do not know whether the member for Albany is aware that within 30 miles of Bunbury there is the largest agricultural population settled in any one district of Western Australia. Such a remark cannot be applied to the Albany district. I may quote some figures tabled in connection with the report of the Bunbury Harbour Board. During the 12 months ended on the

30th June of this year, 17 vessels loaded wheat, lifting a total of 55,935 tons, as compared with 98,021 tons in the previous year. The reduction was due to the fact that less wheat was produced in the State generally. Here perhaps there is a bone of contention for the member for Albany, who may be claiming that some of the wheat shipped from Bunbury should have been shipped from Albany. But wheat is merely a small item in connection with cargoes going to and from the port of Bunbury. There is, for instance, timber. Surely the member for Albany will not contend that there should be a huge expenditure of money to build a railway connecting Albany with the timber centres. Those centres are within at most 80 or 90 miles of Bunbury. Starting off with Mornington mill, this, one of the largest mills in the State, is within 30 miles of Bunbury. Yarloop mill is within 45 miles of Bunbury; Holyoake and Dwellingup are within 70 miles of that port; Lyall's mill within 45 miles; Kirup within 40 miles; Manjimup within 80 miles; Pemberton within 100 miles; Nannup within 90 miles; Argyle within 21 miles; Sussex within 70 miles; Muja within 50 miles; and Harnetts within 30 miles of Bunbury. Nannup and Sussex mills do not really belong to Bunbury, but belong to Busselton. However, they are within 90 miles of the port of Bunbury. Surely the member for Albany would not expect all this timber to be shipped away from Bunbury, hundreds of miles, because there is another port, Albany, which is capable of catering for and accommodating deep-draft vessels. The question of draft has very little effect as regards the loading of timber. Anyone who understands shipping will agree that there are to-day hundreds of vessels waiting for charters. All the year round vessels on the high seas are waiting for charters to call in at ports. When a shipping firm or a timber firm requires to load a full cargo of timber from Bunbury, shipping agents are notified that a boat is wanted to lift so many thousand loads at the port of Bunbury. The shipping agents immediately get into communication with ships at sea. They do not ask for a boat of 30ft. draft to go to a harbour having a depth of only 26 feet. They get in touch with ships drawing 26 feet. For years no vessel has had to pass Bunbury because of lack of depth of water. The type of vessel required for that class of shipping is sent to that port to load. The only trouble

is that Bunbury does not get its just due in regard to export of fruit, and possibly in the future will not as regards export of lambs. Bunbury gets only facilities and services suited to the country surrounding the port. If the port has not those facilities and services, what is to be done? Are not the people of the port justified in asking the State to expend the necessary money to create a port giving the adjacent producers access to it? The member for Albany has repeatedly raised the question of the establishment of superphosphate works at Pictou Junction. What concern of ours is it what a private firm does? The hon. member stated to-night that 80 per cent. of trucks left empty from the Bunbury zone and that 90 per cent. of trucks were hauled empty from Albany. The same percentages would be there whatever the number of trucks. The hon. member, while stating the percentages, omits to mention the number of trucks concerned. One reason given by the management of the superphosphate works for establishing themselves in the South-West is that the very fact of that district having so many empty trucks running back would operate to induce the Government to give them a zone concession. They came to the Bunbury district in order to take advantage of the empty trucks available. If the same concession had been available at Albany, this huge concern would certainly have established itself there in preference to Bunbury. In the area adjacent to the port of Bunbury, there is more superphosphate used within 40 or 50 miles than there is within 100 or 150 miles of the port of Albany. Immediately the superphosphate leaves the works, it is being distributed for the purpose of top-dressing in the agricultural area bordering upon the port of Bunbury. The same thing cannot be said of the port of Albany. I hope and trust that when the hon. member rises in future to put up a case for Albany, he will have a good case to put up while leaving other ports out of the picture. For years I have been listening to remarks and reading articles by the member for Albany on this subject. I was not prepared to enter into a controversy with the hon. member before his election to Parliament, because I realised what foolish statements he was putting up—statements so futile that it was not worth while to answer them. But when the hon. member repeats those statements here, I am only doing my duty

by my constituents in putting the position as I know it before the Chamber. Consider the coal trade. The coal bunkering trade showed an increase from 2,706 tons in 1935 to 4,595 tons in the year just closed. Eighteen steamers were bunkered; and, of these, seven called for bunkers only. Surely the hon. member would not expect those steamers to go to Albany to get bunkers simply because there is a deep-water harbour at Albany. The member for Kanowna might equally well claim that steamers should go to Esperance to be bunkered because Esperance has a beautiful harbour. As regards fruit shipments, the report states—

The board again notes with concern that this trade continues to pass the port; but, as previously pointed out, the absence of facilities to handle the cargo and deep berthing accommodation precludes the capture of the business.

Fruit export, and the shipment of lambs, are the only factors that will require a greater depth of water at Bunbury. Now I wish to draw attention to the direction in which the bulk of the shipping from Bunbury goes. The geographical position of the two ports of Albany and Bunbury has the effect, naturally, of causing ships bound for the Eastern States to go round Albany way. Bunbury has loaded timber as follows during the financial year just closed:—

	Loads.
South Australia .. ..	9,810
Victoria .. ..	7,284
New South Wales .. ..	461
New Zealand .. ..	4,127
United Kingdom .. ..	11,096
South Africa .. ..	18,415
India .. ..	2,393
Mauritius .. ..	720
Persian Gulf .. ..	5,220
Egypt .. ..	11,078
China .. ..	8,058
Europe .. ..	735
	<hr/>
	79,397

With the exception of shipments for South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand none of the vessels lifting timber would go via the Eastern States. Why should all those vessels have to be sent round the Leeuwin just because there is deep water at Albany, and why should we send train-loads of timber and so forth to Albany when the shipping can go to Bunbury and be loaded there? I do not wish to labour the question any further. I think I have made out a case once again for the Bunbury har-

bour as against the Albany harbour, if it is necessary to do so. I do not like doing it, because comparisons undoubtedly are odious. I only say that what has been done for Bunbury is justified because that port is giving the surrounding district a service to which it is entitled. If the member for Albany has a case to put up to the Government showing that the port and the district of Albany are not being fairly treated as regards obtaining the shipping facilities to which they are entitled, it is his business to put it to the Government in such a way as to secure equitable treatment. If he has the harbour but has not received the treatment he desires, why is it so? It is not right, however, to have these comparisons between ports and I hope my remarks will have a steadying influence on the new member for Albany.

Mr. Cross: He merely complied with an election promise.

Mr. WITHERS: It is futile to make such comparisons between one port and another.

**MISS HOLMAN** (Forrest) [9.31]: On looking through the Estimates I was delighted to note that the Education Vote has again been increased this year. The Government are entitled to much credit for seeing that they have increased the vote each year they have been in office. They are doing splendid work for the youth of the country by the fostering of educational facilities. The vote this year has been increased by over £24,000. I am sorry, however, that a greater increase has not been made for the provision of material and furniture. I have heard many complaints regarding the desks used in schools. I know the Government are endeavouring to make amends in that direction and in my electorate several schools have already received new desks, but more should be done in that direction. It is time the Government took heed of the fact that the provision for manual and sewing materials is inadequate. Many of the teachers have to spend their own money in providing those requirements. We are almost back to pre-depression expenditure and that being so, we should revert to pre-depression conditions regarding these matters. The sewing material allowance was reduced from 9d. to 4½d. and there has been little increase in that direction. I congratulate the Government upon the construction of the new school for girls at East Perth. The building represents a monument to them and it will be greatly appreciated by the girls of the State. No

child could pass through that institution without being greatly influenced; it is a really fine building and a creditable piece of work on the part of the State Government. There is one small drawback and that is that there is not sufficient ground surrounding the building. The Government should look up likely sites for schools because land will become dearer and vacant areas more scarce. If they were to purchase or resume suitable blocks now, much expense would be saved later on. New schools that are established should be surrounded by five to ten acres of ground, which would provide ample space for playgrounds, pine plantations and whatever else may be considered necessary. The country people are not jealous of the metropolitan area because of the construction of the new girls' school at East Perth. But we hope that as time goes on beautiful schools for girls and boys will be established in the country towns as well. I suggest that a move should be made to provide a hostel for both boys and girls who may be sent to the city from country areas in order to continue their studies. Many inquiries are made to various teachers as to where parents can procure suitable board, lodging and supervision for their children who have to continue their education in the metropolitan area. Country children suffer many disabilities owing to lack of continuation schools. They attain a certain standard and sometimes the teachers in their own time take their education a little further. Very often, however, parents wish their children to continue their education and it becomes necessary to send them to the city. That involves finding a suitable place for their children to live, where they can be looked after and be boarded cheaply while continuing their studies under suitable supervision. If a hostel were provided under Government supervision the children in the country districts would be catered for under proper conditions. I have had some experience in this matter because several mothers have asked me where they could place their children. On one or two occasions I have been able to find places for them, but they have not been ideal. So I advocate the provision of a hostel where country boys and girls may be lodged and continue their studies under supervision. Naturally there are several small complaints that can be made against the Education Department, and one is that the authorities adhere rather strictly to the letter of regulations and do not

allow for any latitude in interpretation. I will give one instance to indicate what I mean. The department pays examination fees for children who gain the right to go to a high school for three years. On one occasion—I suppose there have been many such instances—a child was particularly forward and was told to take the Junior public examination at the end of the second year. The child passed in seven out of ten subjects, proving that the course adopted was not rash. The departmental authorities contended that they did not send children to high schools in order that they might rush through their examination in two years, and therefore refused to pay the examination fees. Pleading and requesting proved unavailing in an endeavour to move the departmental authorities from that attitude, notwithstanding that it entailed hardship upon the parents. The father was on part-time employment only and he had to provide the fees. In such instances surely the departmental authorities need not stick to the strict lettering of the regulation, particularly when, as in this instances, it was not the wish of the child or the parents that the examination should be taken before the end of the third year. With regard to domestic science, references have been made to the necessity to make domestic service more attractive, and probably something more will be heard in that regard during the course of a future debate. I contend that all concerned should make domestic service more attractive, and elevate it to the status of a profession. It should be brought under the scope of the Arbitration Court so that hours of employment might be regulated. The young women who enter domestic service should be treated more on the basis of professional workers such as nurses, and be made to realise that they belong to a profession that is worth while. If that were done, more girls would follow up that class of work. The new Perth Girls' School is a model of what domestic science buildings and equipment should be, but there are not many schools of that type throughout the State. In some country districts manual training rooms are used for domestic science purposes as well. That practice should be utterly condemned. Such rooms are not hygienic and are certainly not suitable for the teaching of domestic science. Under such conditions the standard of work established is not such as should obtain. I sug-

gest that in the country districts girls from the sixth standard upwards should be franked over the railways to the nearest domestic training centre. If that were done, the girls would be made more familiar with various phases of domestic science and would have a greater appreciation of the work. I have had many requests for new schools in my electorate and I wish to thank the Minister for providing some, including the school at Willowdale. I hope, however, that he will be able to do something more there than has been done so far. The school will be opened in the near future but in its present state is not quite satisfactory, and I trust the Government will be able to do a little more for us. I want another new school at Treesville. At the present time the hall that is used for school purposes is situated between four railway lines and is dangerous. The lighting is bad and there are not the conveniences that should be available. I hope the Minister will be able to make some better provision. I realise I run the risk of being regarded as parochial in meeting matters affecting my district, but as I do not trouble members over much, I shall continue being parochial for the time being. The State should not be called upon to bear the whole of the cost of the educational facilities for the youth of the State. The Commonwealth should assist in that direction and also in connection with health matters. So far the Commonwealth appear to have taken over all the paying services from the State and left us to find the money for the non-paying services. The educational facilities available could be considerably augmented if we were to obtain assistance from the Commonwealth. We could have had a great deal of assistance from the Commonwealth particularly regarding the provision of radios for which schools at present have to pay license fees. I represent a large constituency traversed by a number of roads. The Government have done a lot of work in that respect and we have a new road to Dwellingup from Pinjarra, and another from Waroona to Nanga Brook. I understand that the Government are to provide £1,000 for the road from Nanga Brook to Dwellingup. We want a bitumen-surface road from Mundijong to Jarrahdale and recently I received a letter from the Preston Road Board asking me to support them in their request for bitumen surfacing on the road for two miles south of

Donnybrook. The fruitgrowers complain that the corrugations prove disastrous to the fruit that they have to cart over the road, and they want the extra length of road treated with bitumen. The present proposal does not go as far as Donnybrook. I have another little grouch regarding water supplies. For many years I have been asking for a water supply at Brunswick Junction. Various Ministers have visited the town, the first having been the present Leader of the Opposition, who, however, did not provide a water supply.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I gave you lots of things, though, even if they were only promises.

Miss HOLMAN: The hon. member gave a lot of promises. Since the Labour Party came into power, I have been on the track of Ministers again asking for a water supply for Brunswick Junction.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Have you not some drains running through the town?

Miss HOLMAN: It seems like suggesting the carrying of coals to Newcastle to ask for a water supply for Brunswick Junction, but I assure members it is nothing of the sort. A water supply is very necessary. There is a large irrigation scheme at Brunswick and there is also a stream running through the town. In the stream is the pump which lifts the water into the railway tanks for the town supply. I suppose members have heard of people being accused of drinking their bath water. That is literally true at Brunswick Junction during the summer months. The streamlet diminishes to a small pool and even that might be dry this year on account of the light rainfall. The water supply is pumped out of the pool where the children bathe, and then reticulated to the people to drink.

Mr. Raphael: Do they have mixed bathing there?

The Minister for Employment: There are some fine physical specimens there.

Miss HOLMAN: Sometimes the people cannot get even that water to drink, and then the Minister throws open the irrigation channels and the irrigation water is made available. That is probably worse than the bath water because on analysis it has been found to contain all sorts of dirt. It flows through open channels to which animals have access. For several days at a time the water has stopped running and it has been necessary to convey water to the town by railway. The latest information I have on



the subject is a letter from the Under Secretary for Water Supply dated the 30th September as follows:—

I have to advise you that in connection with the investigations regarding proposed Olive Hill scheme, in connection with the Brunswick town water supply, the hon. the Minister has approved of a further £100 being made available to complete the necessary inquiries.

It is considered that if, as a result of these inquiries, a sound scheme can be evolved, then the Harvey Road Board (functioning as a water board) should be able to borrow all the money required to finance its construction and levy rates within the provisions of the Water Boards Act sufficient to pay working expenses, interest on the capital and provide suitable sinking fund for repayment of the loan.

The Harvey Road Board have applied to the Government for a part of the money from the Commonwealth at a cheap rate of interest, but I have not heard the result. There might be a lot of applications for that money, but Brunswick was amongst the first and is entitled to a water supply. According to the report of the Conservator of Forests, the timber industry has shown a substantial improvement. The paragraph reads—

During the past 12 months the timber industry in this State has shown a very substantial improvement. The volume of sawn timber and hewn timber produced amounted to 13,133,000 cubic feet, the value of which is estimated at £1,700,000. This represents an increase of 18 per cent. over the production for the previous year. Two of the large mills that had been closed down for some time, owing to the trade depression, reopened during the year, and a number of new mills for the cutting of fruit cases and sleepers commenced operations. There are now 53 sawmills drawing log supplies from Crown lands and from 30 to 40, principally fruit-case mills, operating on private property.

The Conservator goes on to give the quantity of timber taken to the mills from the forests. It is a fact, as the unemployment figures reveal, that the mills are in a much better position than they were a few years ago. I was rather taken aback to hear the member for Subiaco (Mrs. Cardell-Oliver) the other night characterise the State Sawmills, amongst other State utilities, as State interference.

Mr. Cross: She does not know much about sawmills.

Miss HOLMAN: The State Sawmills were the only mills which kept the men working during the bad years. True they were working on part-time, but all the private mills, which operate only to make large dividends for their shareholders,

closed down, and the State Sawmills were the only mills that continued to work right through the depression. The State Sawmills also are the only ones working the 44-hour week. I think the member for Subiaco should give the State Sawmills her whole-hearted support because she is in favour of a shorter working week. The State Sawmills have been working the shorter hours for the past four years, and for five years of the last Labour Government—that is nine out of twelve years—have been making a success of it, too. The State Sawmills should receive not criticism but the utmost support for the good they have done for this State. I do not wish to belittle other State utilities which, in my opinion, are of the same standard as the State Sawmills. The Conservator of Forests states that 76 per cent. of the total production of hewn sleepers for the year were obtained from private property, and adds—

It is questionable how much longer this source of supply will last, and suitable areas for the operation of sleeper cutters on lands under the control of the department are very limited indeed.

Then he proceeds to make a curious remark, which, in my opinion, rather contradicts itself—

A recent development which promises to assist considerably in maintaining the sleeper output and in finding work for men who have followed the hewing industry for many years past is the establishment of small portable milling plants specially designed for the production of sawn sleepers.

I cannot see how small portable milling plants specially designed for cutting sawn sleepers will provide work for men who follow the hewing industry. I consider that the sleeper cutters should be given a good deal more consideration than they are receiving. Of course sleeper cutters who have been registered with the department since 1918 are the only ones who are allowed to cut on Crown lands. This race of men must be getting fewer in number and they should be given work. Members might have noticed that on the 22nd September I asked the Minister for Railways several questions about the use of tractors in the bush. We all realise that we cannot stay the progress of machinery, but the installation of tractors in the forests will put quite a few men out of work. Also it will lessen the quantity of horse feed, etc., required by the men with the teams. I appeal to members on this side of

the Chamber, at any rate, to give the men in the timber industry the same support as they gave to the lumpers at Fremantle when the bulk handling of wheat was under consideration. We felt that bulk handling must come, but we also felt that some consideration should be extended to the men, and some provision made for them, so that they would not be put out of work when the system was introduced. The same thing applies to the timber industry. Let us advance with the times by all means, but let us not put numbers of men out of work without extending to them any consideration whatever. I asked my questions on the 22nd September and curiously enough on that date nothing was known about the tenders which were to be called for tractors. I have since received a notification from the mills stating that they were informed that tenders would open on the 25th September, three days after I asked my question, and close yesterday, the 5th October. Thus only a few days were allowed and tenderers were not given sufficient opportunity. Reasonable time should have been allowed, and I hope that the Minister will extend the time. Quite a lot has been said about housing. Much could be done to help the people by instituting a scheme for cheaper houses, costing about, say, £400, and this in turn would help the timber industry. What should be provided are houses that would not cost for rental and instalments of capital more than a proper proportion of the week's wages. In Queensland and Tasmania I have seen beautiful houses of wood, and I feel that more could be done in providing wooden houses here. Instead of declaring so many brick areas, the people should be encouraged to build houses of wood. The time is opportune for the launching of a housing scheme. New Zealand is spending approximately £3,000,000 a year on houses. Of course the Dominion is in a different position, but we could take a lesson from New Zealand and do something along those lines. The unemployment position is not as serious as it was. The conditions are improving, but I should like the Minister to institute an intensive local products campaign once more. A little while ago all the shop windows displayed goods of local production, but now imported goods are being displayed. I feel that this tendency should be checked if we are to provide employment for our people. I endorse the remarks of a previous speaker regarding the provision of huts and con-

veniences for relief workers. They should have better accommodation than the tents they have been occupying for so long. I should like arrangements to be made whereby the children of pensioners should receive relief work, or an allowance. At present pensions are taken into consideration and the children have to suffer. I agree with the member for Middle Swan also that private labour exchanges should be abolished and that only the Government Labour Bureau should operate. I should like the Minister for Health to revert to the original intention when the hospital tax was imposed. The intention was to devote the money to the provision of hospital accommodation and medicine, and not to buildings only, a policy that was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You tried to persuade me to use some of the funds for building in your district.

Miss HOLMAN: I tried to persuade the hon. member to use revenue, not hospital tax. We have a new railway between Collie and Brunswick in connection with which there has been a considerable deviation and resumption of land. I would like to see the department hurry up the payment of compensation. There are people who have been asking for compensation for some years past. I think one family has been requesting it for almost two years, and finality has not yet been reached. The railway is not yet finished and the people cannot obtain their compensation. The particular farmer I am thinking of has been most industrious. He has made a beautiful farm and won a living from the growing of vegetables. The interruption to his work through the railway deviation has been enormous. This farmer is really a marvel because he does not complain.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is why you know all about it.

Mr. Cross: He is the only one who does not complain.

Miss HOLMAN: This man says that the country must progress, and he does not want to interrupt that progress. I would like to take the Minister responsible to look at his place.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Take him there and keep him there.

Miss HOLMAN: I do not want to keep him there, but I would like to show him the place, in order that he might get an accurate idea of what this man has done.

Mr. Raphael: Is that an invitation?

Miss HOLMAN: I do not think I need answer the hon. member. I am not taking any invitation from him either. I would like to see compensation paid more quickly to these suffering people, and to see a lot more done, but I realise that the Government are labouring under difficulties. I do appreciate the good work they have done, and the great improvements we have had since a Labour Government has been in office again after the tragedy we experienced during the regime of the other side.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Vociferous cheers!

Mr. Raphael: That will wipe the smile off your faces.

Miss HOLMAN: I hope the Government will be able to find some way out of the present difficulty.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I move—

That progress be now reported.

Motion put and negatived.

**MR. RAPHAEL** (Victoria Park) [10.5]: At the last elections the Government made certain definite promises and we, as supporters of that Government, also made promises from the hustings of the improvements that were to take place in the conditions of men on sustenance and those on relief work. The 5th October was the date set for the redemption of the Government's promises, and we are led to believe that certain improvements have been set in motion regarding men on relief work. I should like, however, to impress upon the Minister the urgent need of those men who, through ill-health, are unable to accept any employment at all. Those men have been certified by the Government doctor as being unfit to work. I congratulate the Labour Government upon placing a medical man at the service of those men to decide whether they are able to work or not. Their position, however, is deplorable. For many years—some of them for from four to seven years—they have been drawing 7s. per week per unit of the family. With two people in the family, the sum allowed them has been 14s. Compare that with the Federal Government's allowance to old age pensioners of 19s. It is up to this Government, and especially because it is a Labour Government, to see that an increase is given in the amount allowed to these men. With others—and we have had the support of the Minister in this direction—I have endeavoured to get these people transferred to the in-

valid and old age pensioners' list. That is little enough, but it is a step in the right direction. They are now under the Child Welfare Department, but despite the fact that there has been a slight increase in the basic wage, no increase has been made to them. I appreciate the difficulties under which the department works. I think, however, that the man in charge of that department is not fit to be there, and some of the inspectors are not fit to inspect the homes to which they are sent. A little human sympathy should be given. I appreciate that their task is difficult, but a little tact and kindness would go a long way, and it is very often missing in the administration.

Mr. Sampson: It is very easy to criticise.

Mr. RAPHAEL: It would be easy to criticise the hon. member, if he wanted it.

Mr. Sampson: You are most unfair.

Mr. RAPHAEL: In many instances people receiving 9s. a week—that is, for the wife and child of a pensioner—have had the amount reduced to 7s. The reply usually given to a protest has been that if the circumstances of the case or of the family are altered, consideration will perhaps be given to granting an increase. I do not know how these people live on 7s. a week with the cost of commodities rising the whole time. Despite the fact that the Federal Government have clipped the wings of the Labour Government in this State, by reducing the amount allocated under the disabilities grant, I hope that the Minister will give serious consideration to an increase to these people, bringing the amount up to at least 9s. per unit. If after having made promises on the platform at election time default became necessary, it would be far better to default in payment of interest than in payments to these poor devils.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No Government could give effect to all the promises made.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I say that the conditions of the unemployed men have been improved by the Labour Government, and there is to be a further improvement. I am not discussing the men on relief work now, but I am discussing those who cannot work, and the women and children receiving relief from the Child Welfare Department. It is ridiculous to expect people to live on the amount which they are receiving. The member for Canning (Mr. Cross) has given notice of a Bill that will wipe out many anomalies existing for years in this State in

connection with distress for rent. During the past 12 months the Perth City Council has employed a man solely on the job of walking from house to house and delivering summonses at 6s. per service. This man earned in the vicinity of over £400 last year.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Is he a "C" class man?

Mr. RAPHAEL: No, he is generally at the civic receptions, drinking whisky. It is wrong that any civic body or any outside person—landlord or anyone else—should be able to tack on 9s. to the rates a man may owe, especially a man on relief work, without first going to the court. Without taking the case before a magistrate, a solicitor may send out a clerk with from ten to 20 distress warrants, and anything from 9s. to 12s. may be added to the amount claimed. The courts of this country exist for the specific purpose of giving justice. I do not think it is justice for a landlord to be able to walk into a man's home while he is at work, make a list of the goods and chattels and assure the man's wife that she is liable to imprisonment if any of the furniture is removed.

Mr. Fox: Those courts are not concerned with justice.

Mr. RAPHAEL: They are created to dispense justice.

Mr. Fox: They are not.

Hon. C. G. Latham: They are there to administer the law.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I do not think the law should be passed on to landlords and solicitors to administer.

Mr. Cross: That sort of thing was abolished in 1689.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the hon. member is not going to continue along those lines, for he certainly is not permitted to anticipate a Bill.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am dealing in a general way with unemployment and with what the unemployed have to put up with from the landlords. I am not dealing with the Bill at all in the true sense of the word. If the unemployed man to whom I referred is unfortunate enough to be sharing a house with another family, those families are responsible for the arrears of rent. Their goods and chattels are not worth much, but they should be protected by the courts of this country. I want to bring under the notice of the Minister for Works the switchback that runs from country districts through Victoria Park to Perth. The Causeway in its present condition is not far be-

hind a switchback. There are about five different levels on it, and it is high time the Government gave consideration, not only to the Fremantle bridge—to which I wish good luck—but also to putting a decent surface across the Causeway. I notice the Minister for Health has increased the subsidy to the dental hospital. I hope the Minister will give further consideration to the request for an additional amount for the services of school dentists. The health of the children is at stake, because the dental hospital cannot cope with the work awaiting it to-day, and so the children's teeth are neglected. I hope that three or four more school dentists will be added to the team already at work. I should like to draw attention to the danger arising from the way in which motor cars rush past schools. Those cars are a great danger to the public.

Mr. Marshall: No, it is the drivers of those cars.

Mr. RAPHAEL: There are many schools in back streets away from main roads, and the traffic shoots past those schools at 40 miles an hour. During the last few months there has been a number of fatal accidents to children in Victoria Park. A very bad railway service is given from Perth to Rivervale and Victoria Park and its environs. Railways and tramways are State monopolies and should not have to enter into competition with buses. I congratulate the Government on their firm stand regarding trolley buses and their determination to see that the State trams are not cut out. The member for Claremont with others clamoured for the tram service, and were satisfied with it until the private buses driven by American petrol came along, when they wanted the Government to scrap the trams. However, the Government have to preserve the people's rights, and very properly they decided to put State trolley buses into active competition against the private buses.

Mr. North: There is no competition.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I am pleased to hear that. The Government should have sole control of the traffic. I want to draw attention to the dangerous conditions prevailing on the Albany-road, Victoria Park, where we have the largest school in the State, except for the Perth Boys' School in James-street. And we have two other large schools in the same district. The traffic is very dangerous. What with the trucks of the White Rock Quarries and the trucks of the Blue Rock

Quarries, and the trams and the buses, we have there a tremendous menace to the children of the district. It is quite startling to see a huge truck carrying 10 tons of rock and doing 40 miles per hour along the Albany-road.

Mr. Sampson: They don't do 40 miles.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Well I myself was doing 40 when one of these trucks, fully laden, rushed past me.

Mr. Sampson: You talk a lot of balderdash.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I hope there will be no reduction in taxation until such time as the whole of our unemployed are in full-time work. It should be the policy of the Government to see that before any relief is given to taxpayers, all men are on full-time work. Just now there is a movement to secure an abolition of the amusement tax. Surely to goodness those who can afford to go to the pictures can afford to pay a few more pence in order to help a lame dog over a stile. I hope there will not be a reduction in this tax by ½d. until such time as the whole of the unemployed are back in full-time work.

Vote put and passed.

This concluded the general debate.

*Votes—Legislative Assembly, £2,566; Joint House Committee, £1,278; Joint Printing Committee, £5,264; Joint Library Committee, £265—agreed to.*

Progress reported.

#### BILLS (2)—RETURNED.

1. Land Act Amendment.

2. Cue-Big Bell Railway.

Without amendment.

#### ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL SHOW.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. M. F. Troy—Mt. Magnet) [10.28]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Thursday, the 8th October.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Thursday, 8th October, 1936.*

	PAGE
Questions: Married Women's Protection Act ...	1031
Kangaroo skins, royalty ...	1031
Bills: Pearling Crews Accident Assurance Fund, 3R. ...	1032
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1032
Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 2R. ...	1036
Petroleum, Com. ...	1048
Annual Estimates: Votes and Items discussed ...	1046

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

#### QUESTION—MARRIED WOMEN'S PROTECTION ACT.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Justice: What was the number of men sent to Fremantle gaol under Section 16 of the Married Women's Protection Act, 1922, during the years ended the 30th June, 1934, 1935, and 1936 respectively?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: Commitments for maintenance: 1934, 38; 1935, 33; 1936, 45. The Fremantle gaol records do not show any segregation of persons committed under Section 16 of the Married Women's Protection Act, but the figures quoted above are in respect of commitments for non-compliance with maintenance orders.

#### QUESTION—KANGAROO SKINS, ROYALTY.

Mr. WELSH asked the Premier: 1. Is he aware that a royalty is charged on kangaroo skins in the Nullagine district of the Pilbara electorate, while Port Hedland and Marble Bar districts of the same electorate are exempt from this royalty? 2. As kangaroos are a menace to pastoralists in the North and are classed as vermin, will he take steps to have this royalty removed from the Nullagine district?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes, but the question of re-imposing the royalty on the districts now exempt is under consideration. 2, The Government are not in a position to forgo this revenue at the present time.