

given to them or indicated by the label or otherwise. We should not expect to receive cotton goods when we ask for wool, as the Minister indicated, nor do we desire any substitute for an article we may require and may be prepared to pay for. It is unfortunate that it should be necessary to bring legislation of this description before Parliament. On the other hand, it is equally unfortunate that there should be those who are prepared to misrepresent their wares to the general public and palm off on buyers goods that do not contain the constituents allegedly embodied in them. Much as we regret the circumstances, we know that unfortunately these things are happening every day. With regard to the false advertisements, which are referred to in the second part of the Bill, there is no question that something to limit the activities of the persons concerned must be done if we are to give protection to those who have no business experience and are not well acquainted with the conditions in the commercial world, particularly in some directions in which it is essential that they shall be saved from unnecessary losses when they themselves are perfectly bona-fide, and "go-getters," as the Minister mentioned, are out for the purpose of taking them down for any spare cash they may have. Subject to the amendments I have mentioned, I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*House adjourned at 8.3 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 15th September, 1936.*

	PAGE
Question: Mundaring water, supplies and revenue ...	553
Demise of King George V., accession of King Edward VIII. ...	553
Bills: Aborigines Act Amendment, 1A. ...	554
Wool (Draft Allowance Prohibition), 1A. ...	578
Address-in-reply, ninth day ...	554

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

### DEMISE OF KING GEORGE V.; ACCESSION OF KING EDWARD VIII.

*Message from His Excellency.*

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following letter from His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor:—

Government House, Perth,  
15th September, 1936.

Dear Mr. President,—I have to inform you that the addresses passed by both Houses of the Parliament of Western Australia on the first day of the present session have been forwarded to the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs for presentation to His Majesty the King. (Signed) James Mitchell, Lieut.-Governor.

### QUESTION—MUNDARING WATER.

*Supplies and Revenue.*

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the quantity of water drawn from Mundaring Weir during each of the last two years? 2, What quantity was supplied to (a) the Goldfields; (b) Goldfields Mining Trust; (c) country towns; (d) farming areas, during each of the same periods? 3, What quantity of water was unaccounted for? 4, Will the Minister supply a tabulated statement showing the particulars of water supplied to, and revenue received from, various districts similar to that included in the annual reports of 1924, etc., for the two years referred to?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, 1934-35, 1,767,000,000 gallons; 1935-36, 1,940,000,000 gallons. 2, (a) 1934-35, 811,000,000 gallons; 1935-36, 1,018,000,000 gallons. (b) 1934-35, 321,000,000 gallons; 1935-36, 453,000,000 gallons. (c) and (d) 1934-35, 711,000,000 gallons; 1935-36, 715,000,000 gallons. 3, Nil. 4, Yes; the necessary information is now being collated.

## BILL—ABORIGINES' ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary and read a first time.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Ninth Day.*

**HON. J. NICHOLSON** (Metropolitan) [4.37]: I propose pursuing the same course as other members have followed when addressing themselves to this motion, by offering my congratulations to the new occupant of the high office of Chief Secretary (Hon. W. H. Kitson), and by expressing the hope that he will be equally successful in that office as was his predecessor, Hon. J. M. Drew. Likewise to Hon. E. H. Gray, who has now been promoted to the position of Honorary Minister, I extend my best wishes. This, however, involves reference to the retirement of Mr. Drew from the office he has occupied with such great distinction for so many years. We feel that it is almost strange to find him in a private member's seat, but we know that he has earned the rest which he is now seeking after his long years of faithful service to the State. I know his energies will not be lessened by his retirement from the office of Chief Secretary, because he will always have before him the necessity for remembering his duty to the State and to his constituents. Then, whilst one realises that there has been a change in the personnel of the Government by the retirement of Mr. Drew, one feels that it is only fitting that some reference should be made to another very grave change which has been effected by the retirement of the ex-Premier (Hon. P. Collier). He is a man who has played a very important and distinguished part in the political life of the State, and he has discharged his onerous duties in a manner which has won for him unstinted praise, not only from his opponents, but also from men who have met him in conferences and similar gatherings in other States. One and all regret that his health has rendered it impossible for him to continue in the office he has for so long filled at various times, and I can only express the hope, in which I am sure every member here joins, that he will return from his present trip benefited in health, and, perhaps, also restored to the vigour and strength that would enable him once more

to take an active part in the political sphere. Another matter, and one which is always discharged here at such a time, is to welcome the new members who have arrived amongst us, and express our good wishes to them. But whilst we extend good wishes to those new members, I trust they will not misinterpret what other members have said already, or what I may say, in regard to those members who preceded them. One finds that in the course of our association together we form friendships, and we do sincerely regret it when a member falls by the way. That, however, is no reflection at all on the new members, because we all realise that we are servants of the people and must accept the decision of the electors when they choose one rather than another. Because of that, I hope that the new members who have succeeded those who have gone will recognise that they in time, probably, will gain the same respect from their fellow members here, and as their turn comes, as it comes to all of us, then probably we or others may be expressing regret in marking their passing. I trust that the new members who have come amongst us will have every success in their career, and will give that measure of satisfaction which those who preceded them endeavoured to give, not only to this House but to their constituents. It is not unusual on occasions such as the present to refer to losses which have been sustained by reason of the death of former members. I would therefore join with Mr. Baxter in the tributes he paid to the memory of the late Sir Edward Wittenoom, the late Sir Charles Nathan, the late Mr. William Patrick, the late Mr. Joseph Duffell, and the late Senator Carroll, who were all former members of this Chamber. Each of those deceased gentlemen contributed their share of service to the public life of this State, and sought to promote its advancement. The services of the late Sir Edward Wittenoom are probably without parallel. It is well that they should be fittingly recorded. He was a member of the first Parliament under responsible Government. He became a Minister in the Forrest Government in 1894, and was appointed Agent-General in 1898, holding that office until 1901. After his return from England he became a member of the Legislative Council, and with a short interval continued as a member until 1934, when, owing to the state of his health, he did not seek re-election. During that long period of membership of

this House he filled the Presidential Chair from 1922 to 1926. In addition to a very active Parliamentary life, the late Sir Edward, in conjunction with his brother in the early years, faced many difficulties and hardships, and helped materially to settle portions of our then empty spaces, and to develop the resources and extend the commerce of this State. He as well as the other members to whom I have referred had the best welfare of the State at heart. To each of them we remain indebted for their good services. The address which has been presented by His Excellency follows precedent by reviewing some events which have occurred, and also the work done in different spheres by the Government and the people during the past year. Our House, by unanimous resolution, expressed its sincere sorrow at the death of His late Majesty, King George V. and our loyalty to His Majesty, King Edward VIII. King Edward has entered upon his responsible duties at a period of great critical unrest in world affairs. The unsettled conditions prevailing in Europe, and above all the tragedy that is being enacted in Spain, prompt one to refer to the subject, and to wonder why such a state of unrest and tragic happenings are present in some countries in Europe, whilst we who live within the British Empire enjoy a degree of comparative tranquility. I will not attempt to solve the problem. It may be that this unrest is due to the different forms of government which exist elsewhere, and the fact that the people generally do not enjoy the same privileges and freedom that we possess. Despite this, we constantly find people trying to undermine the system, or urging others to adopt some other system of government. I believe in adhering to what we have got when apparently that is good. I was attracted recently by certain views on this subject expressed by that brilliant statesman, General Smuts. He is a man who is well known throughout the world, and is closely versed in world affairs. When asked a question as to the state of Europe, some time ago, he replied—

If you ask me what is wrong with Europe, I should say the moral basis in Europe, the bedrock of the Christian moral code, has become undermined, and can no longer support all that superstructure of economic and industrial prosperity which the last century has built up on it, and the vast whole is now sagging.

There is much food for reflection in that statement. The question, therefore, arises, if we wish, as I am sure most of us do, to retain our present freedom, then we must be prepared to defend it. Those who urge a change in our form of government are doing something that might destroy that very freedom. The matter of defence, I admit, is one that comes within the Federal sphere, but I share the views of other speakers on the subject, and I refer to it in order to urge the State Government to use their utmost influence with the Federal authorities by co-operating with them in taking the fullest measures for our defence, and encouraging every capable person to be trained in the use of arms. Colonel E. F. Harrison, M.H.R., when passing through Fremantle recently on his return from England, stressed the seriousness of the position, and said—

It is not enough to rush to the colours when Australia is attacked.

In other words, he said, "Be prepared." By urging naval or military training, one does not advocate war. No one wants war. There is a great difference between urging a country to wage war against another, and urging the people to become trained to resist aggression. In view of the naval and military strength of other countries it is our obvious duty to be prepared, and thus help towards maintaining our freedom. The question of defence involves a reference to migration. This question has become more prominent by reason of the speech of Mr. Menzies, the Federal Attorney-General, at a meeting of members of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures in Melbourne, and also the later speech of His Excellency, the Governor-General. I expressed my views upon this subject last session, and see no reason to alter them. Every person who reflects will endorse fully the views expressed by the Governor-General and Mr. Menzies. Particularly must we be awakened to the fact that if we desire Australia to occupy a place amongst the nations of the world, we must have population. Would America have attained its present status if she had not encouraged migration in the earlier years? That migration is needed is also shown by statistics which prove that our birth rate is seriously declining. I have here some figures taken from the last Year Book. In 1901, the birth rate was 27.16 per thousand; in 1911, it was 27.20; it then de-

clined in 1921 to 24.95; in 1931 it was 18.16, and in 1934 it was 16.39. This means a fall of approximately 11 per cent. between 1911 and 1934, a very serious matter. A note is appended in the Year Book to the effect that the rate for 1934 represents only 60 per cent. of that for 1901, and is the lowest yet recorded. Due no doubt to the advancement of medical science, as well as to the fact that people have been taught to be more hygienic in their habits, we find that life is being prolonged. No one objects to that. Some people, unfortunately, have thought this prolongation of life balances in some degree the lower birthrate. This is quite a mistaken view. Mr. Wilson, the deputy Statistician for this State, in a recent address said we must remember that a life prolonged was of much less value from the point of view of future population than a life created. The death rate of 1901 was 12.22 per thousand; in 1931 it fell to 8.67; and in 1934 it was 9.32. Another interesting point in relation to this subject was a statement made in July last in the Home Parliament by Sir Godfrey Collins, Secretary of State for Scotland. He said that since 1870 the expectancy of life had risen from 41 to 57, the death rate had fallen by half in 60 years, and the infantile mortality had been reduced since 1900 by one-third. The death rate from tuberculosis was now less than a quarter of what it was in 1870. We have been assisted in past years in adding to our population by means of migration. Between 1921 and 1929 the migrants from Great Britain added more than 250,000 to our numbers. But for the five years following 1929 we lost in the vicinity of 20,000 persons. Thus last year a slight improvement has been shown in the form of a gain of 1,251 persons in place of a loss, but this, with our continued low birth rate, is infinitesimal and fails to make up the leeway. Increased population, I contend, would help in making Australia safer for us all. It would also help to provide a bigger local market for our goods than is possible at the present time. We have only to look at the factories which have been established here to notice that they soon overtake the available population, and when our home market is closed, then we have to look for external markets, which in these days are difficult to find. That we have to realise the necessity for finding markets for our primary pro-

ducts and that the greater the population the greater the home market, was stressed by Mr. Menzies in his address. Likewise, increased population has this important bearing, as was pointed out by Mr. Moore when he addressed the House: it will help to lower the per capita indebtedness which already has reached the enormous sum of £200. So that the greater the population the better it is in every possible way for us. I had the opportunity recently of travelling by air over the northern portions of Australia and, like others who have visited those parts, I was deeply impressed by what I saw, apart from the meagre population. Travelling from Brisbane, I saw in Queensland certain areas comparatively recently affected by serious drought, made bountiful by beneficial rains. This pleasing picture stood out in marked contrast to the conditions which I saw later when travelling over certain parts of the Northern Territory and portions of our own State which are very badly affected by the present drought. Reference has already been made by various speakers to the serious condition created by the drought for stock owners in the North-West and agriculturists throughout many portions of our agricultural areas. I was deeply impressed by the difference in the conditions in those portions of Queensland to which I referred and those obtaining in certain parts of the north of our State as well as in certain portions of the Northern Territory, and I thought what a blessing it would be if our scientists could do something to regulate the rainfall over this wide continent so that all might participate in its benefits. It also caused me to reflect as to whether it was not an example of some balancing law in nature. Be that as it may, there is no doubt that such an experience forces one to realise the difficulty which faces us in regard to the settlement of the North and to realise also the courage and resourcefulness required of the people settled there. In view of the great work they are doing they merit the fullest sympathy and help of any Government. It is a country which brings out some of the finest qualities in mankind. Some people have been prompted to make suggestions that portions of the empty or unoccupied lands of the world should be ceded or yielded up for the purpose of solving the difficulties obtaining in some countries occasioned by surplus population. But those who make such sugges-

tions perhaps have failed to realise what experienced men in our North know to be the economic difficulties of opening up and developing by closer settlement such areas as we find there and they may probably have very little conception of the large amount of capital expended not only by the Governments concerned, but also by private individuals in achieving what has, under great difficulties, been accomplished up to date. Generally speaking, I think the North should be aided and encouraged in pastoral as well as in mining development and even then people have to realise what the difficulties are during periods of drought. The form which the proposed scheme of migration will take has not been defined but will doubtless be made known later. We have been aided by reference to the matter in the Press some time ago when it was mentioned that firms in Great Britain might be prepared to establish factories in Australia and thus provide immediate employment for those who migrate. This might be one satisfactory way of starting a scheme of migration, that is so far as secondary industries are concerned, and it will enable us also to absorb a greater number of migrants, without displacing men already in employment. We all realise that any scheme of land settlement would require to be undertaken with care and, I should say, on the advice of a board of men of proved capacity who have had experience in different parts of Australia. Doubtless the experience of such a board would establish the desirability of creating a scheme within some of the more temperate zones, leaving the younger generation, after they have become inured to the conditions, to go further afield and gain experience, and then if they so desired, settle in the North. The disadvantage and difficulties of life in the North, I venture to suggest, would be minimised to some extent by a more regular steamer service.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Also cheaper cost of transport for people and goods. But to my mind, the people who are there deserve to be helped, and if ever we are going to populate our northern areas then we must do more than we have done up to the present. The flying doctor scheme, which has been referred to by Mr. Holmes, is, as we all know, a conception of the Rev. John Flynn of the A.I.M., and he has with him fine men of the type of Dr. Allan Vickers and others. Dr. Vickers at the present time

is at Port Hedland. This, I venture to say is one of the finest services which could have been devised, and combined with the transeivers for which Mr. Traegar is responsible, has already done a great deal to remove from the minds of the people in those way-back parts the dread of the consequences in the event of accident or illness. The parent station for this State is at Port Hedland, and it is now, I think, in touch with eighteen centres where pedal sets have been established at varying distances, one of the greatest distances being about 540 miles in a north-easterly direction. Another is about 400 miles to the south of Port Hedland, and others are operating at distances from 100 and 200 to 300 miles east and south-east. The operator who assists Dr. Vickers is Mr. Hull and the pilot is Mr. Max Campbell of the MacRobertson-Miller Aviation Company. These officers work with the greatest zeal, and in travelling, one learns the extent to which the services are appreciated, and the high opinion in which Dr. Vickers and his officers are held. Besides doing medical work Dr. Vickers has magisterial and other governmental duties to perform, and with the increasing growth of the work one realises the need, and I stress this, of giving them assistance, and also providing better hospital also housing and office accommodation. If the Minister desires any particulars in this respect I can easily furnish them; but I can tell him that both the hospital, housing and office accommodation are altogether inadequate for the service there, even as it is to-day, and its development is so rapid that something will require to be done very soon. In addition to the medical and other duties which may arise at any hour of the day or night, it is necessary for those in charge to keep in touch with the various stations to receive and despatch messages by wire to persons in outback places. Those messages are increasing each month, and this involves a great amount of detail work, including the keeping of accounts and accurate records. Work for these officers, I am told, starts at about 7 a.m., that is, if they have not been up all night, and they might finish late at night with occasional emergency calls at a very late hour. Another point I wish to stress is the very great strain to which these officers are subjected, because if one man breaks down, then the whole service must be impaired.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The Government are sympathetic.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I know they are sympathetic, and that fact has been expressed to me. In the Speech, the Lieut.-Governor pointed out that the scheme in this State is subsidised to the extent of £500 and, as has been mentioned, the Government have, through their Ministers, shown the keenest interest and practical sympathy in the work. Still, in a work like this, which means so much to people situated, as many of them are, at remote distances from centres where medical aid can be found, I express the hope that the Government will reconsider the amount of the subsidy and increase it. Such an increase would be greatly appreciated. In addition to the scheme at Port Hedland, there is also the scheme at Wyndham, which has just come into being. That has been made possible by the generosity of the Victorian Aerial Medical Service, combined with contributions from the Government and from certain private people. I believe that sums were collected from squatters in the North a good many years ago, and those sums have helped to make the scheme possible.

Hon. G. W. Miles: May I congratulate you on your reference to the flying doctor scheme?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am grateful to the hon. member. I can only say that I was greatly impressed with all that I saw and heard, not only at Cloncurry, in Queensland, where the scheme was started, but also at each centre I visited. It was delightful to hear the praise of and high regard for the men engaged in the service expressed by the people scattered throughout the country. I spent a night at one of the stations in the Northern Territory and it was quite interesting to hear what the men had to say of the services rendered by those connected with the flying doctor scheme. It was that which has impelled me to take advantage of this opportunity to express the views I have voiced. I now propose to say a few words regarding the surplus referred to in the Lieut.-Governor's speech. I admit that a certain amount of modesty has been displayed in the reference to the surplus. There was nothing bombastic in the way the surplus was announced. It was an amount of £88,378. I was pleased to note that the announcement

of the surplus was followed by a statement that there would be no relaxation in economical Government expenditure. I am hoping that that will be borne in mind. One thing which I did anticipate seeing in the Speech was an expression of regret on the part of the Government that the surplus had not been greater.

Hon. G. Fraser: You should be thankful for small mercies.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I thought that the Government might have expressed regret that the surplus, for various reasons, had not been greater. That it should have been greater was evident from the speech delivered by Mr. Seddon on the Supply Bill. He directed attention, as other members have since done, to the huge increase of revenue derived from emergency taxation. He pointed out that in 1932-33, when the previous Government were in office, the amount received was only £202,336. This amount was more than doubled in the following year; in the third year it was more than trebled, and last year, which was the fourth year of the life of that tax, it was more than quadrupled, reaching the colossal sum of £827,119, as against an estimate of £685,000. Through that one item alone, there was reason to expect a larger surplus, despite all the estimates previously made. There are, however, other directions in which the Government benefited, and which should have helped to create a larger surplus. Those were, firstly, relief from unemployment expenditure previously prevailing, arising from the introduction of capital and revival of business, and, secondly, in regard to conversion of loans at lower rates of interest. In this connection, let me remind members that we were told last year by the ex-Premier that the State had benefited from overseas conversions in respect of loans totalling £14,601,513. The interest and exchange saved on that sum was £219,331. Since then further sums have been converted and further benefits will accrue. Those further conversions may not have come into account last year, but will come into account during the current financial year. The Government will appreciate, as most of us do, the great services rendered by Mr. Stanley Bruce in the loan conversions, and the further great services rendered by him on behalf of the Empire. He has merited to the full the appreciation recently expressed in the Imperial Parliament. The Budget for the current year has now been presented in

another place, showing an anticipated small surplus at the end of the financial year. I assume that the Government made their Estimates on the basis of receiving a renewal of the disabilities grant of £800,000 from the Commonwealth. If so, it is a pity that they did not previously ascertain the exact amount to be granted, because a different position would doubtless have been shown.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They could not get the information before.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: In any event, the present position of affairs shows the definite need for any Government to prepare a proper plan of their position, as was suggested by Mr. Seddon, a plan measuring wisely not only the anticipated receipts but, with equal wisdom, the probable expenditure, and using the available money to the best advantage. As I have said, the Speech announced that although there had been a surplus last year, there should be no relaxation in economical Government expenditure. Despite this, however, I, with many other members, was more than surprised that the Government had decided to invest the sum of £80,000 odd in the purchase of trolley buses to replace the Claremont trams. This tramway was reconstructed or relaid only a few months ago at no light cost, and the policy of expending that sum on trolley buses is not in accord with the policy of economy announced in the Speech. Nor is such a proposal wise in the light of present conditions, and I share the views of other members in opposing it. In my opinion it is not a justifiable expenditure at present, especially in view of the conditions prevailing in many parts of the pastoral and agricultural areas, and above all when we have existing in the State a more than serious position created by the presence of the dread disease, leprosy. Is not the eradication of that disease far more vital to us than the establishment of a trolley bus service? The strongest action should be taken to stamp out the disease. Otherwise, with the regular transport and intercourse that exists, the disease is bound to spread, and may even reach us in these southern latitudes.

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

The Chief Secretary: Can you suggest anything that should be done and is not being done?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that the most drastic steps be taken to eradicate the disease. I believe that Mr. Holmes has presented a report on his examination of conditions in the North. Closer co-operation with the responsible persons in the North would possibly aid the Government in achieving more success with regard to the disease. I wish to direct the Chief Secretary's attention to something that was said by the Secretary of State for Scotland, whom I quoted earlier. When presenting the Estimates for the Department of Health in the Imperial Parliament he is reported to have stated—

The extent and variety of the Estimates showed that the health of the people in recent years was commanding more and more interest in Parliament and in the country. Acts, orders, and regulations meant nothing if they did not mean individuals being improved in health and saved from crippling disease and untimely death. There had grown up a wider conception of what health was, and what should be done to provide and safeguard it. Health policy concerned not merely treatment and cure of disease with doctors and nurses in the home, the hospitals, convalescent homes, and other such institutions. Government policy went beyond this. It provided for protection against disease. The builder rather than the repairer was now in demand. This was a change from a negative to a positive outlook.

Those words are very true, and well worth weighing most seriously. I can assure the Chief Secretary that the danger to which I have alluded as confronting us is a real danger to our State. We do not know how far-reaching it may become unless the sternest measures are taken to eradicate it. It can be done now. It is a pity that a start is being made so late. I acknowledge that the Government have been attempting to do something much more effectual than has been done before. (I am not blaming the Government in any way. I merely urge that the sternest measures be taken to stamp out this dreaded disease. In place of spending money on trolley buses or any other such undertaking, let the Government look rather to the more important, more vital things; and then they will receive not only the good will of the people but also expressions of satisfaction from all concerned.

The Chief Secretary: I am looking for suggestions as to what else the Government can do.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not claim to be an authority on these matters at all; but I say, seek aid and guidance from every man who is cap-

able in such matters. I would go to the fountain heads. For example, a doctor came out with his wife to one of the mission stations north of Broome.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Beagle Bay. They are both qualified persons.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They gained some special knowledge of this awful disease in certain parts of the world where they were previously. They are two very fine people indeed. They use stern and strong measures even at Beagle Bay in segregating children from their affected parents, and also in segregating children of unaffected people from the children of people affected. They use care that ordinarily is not used, and has not been used in the past even in regard to patients when brought into such places as Derby and Broome. The strictest measures have to be employed in matters of this kind. If it should be necessary to obtain the services of people especially well versed in the treatment of these cases, it would pay the Government to incur the expense. Let Government funds be used rather in improving the health of the people and stamping out a dreaded disease such as this. I observe on to-day's Notice Paper a Bill dealing with aborigines which is to be introduced by the Chief Secretary.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! It is unusual to anticipate discussion of Bills which appear on the Notice Paper.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am merely referring to the measure, Mr. Deputy President, for the purpose of alluding to a subject which is mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I take it that the Bill on the Notice Paper is the amending legislation foreshadowed, a Bill to amend the Aborigines Act of 1905. One realises that the Bill is the outcome of the excellent report furnished by Mr. H. D. Moseley. That gentleman I consider is deserving of the congratulations of everyone for the thorough way in which he dealt with the subject. I have received, as probably other hon. members have received, a letter from the Women's Service Guilds of Western Australia mentioning that the following resolution has been carried—

At the annual conference of the guilds held on 14th and 15th July the Women's Service Guilds of Western Australia, in conference assembled, have noted with pleasure the expressed intention of the Government to bring in amending legislation in connection with the aborigines of the State early in the first session of

the new Parliament, and especially urge that a comprehensive scheme be established for the care and training of half-castes, in the South-West especially, at properly equipped settlements.

I do not know whether the Chief Secretary has received a copy of that resolution.

The Chief Secretary: I have.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I merely discharge a duty in bringing the matter up at this juncture. I know the Government are desirous of doing all they can to deal with this highly important question. There is another matter of proposed legislation—the amendment of the Municipal Corporations Act. I am indeed glad to note the Government's intention to bring in this legislation. It has been deferred for quite a number of years. Municipalities throughout the State have from time to time urged the various Governments to introduce legislation more suited to the needs of municipalities at the present time. The existing Act was passed in 1906—30 years ago. Despite the many requests made to successive Governments, we find that only eight short amending measures have passed into law, dealing with more or less unimportant features of the parent Act. Municipalities, therefore, suffer in many ways in which road board districts probably do not suffer, as they have had the advantage of getting legislation that is more up to date. In 1933 a consolidation measure relating to road board districts passed into law. That is much more modern than the Municipal Corporations Act. Undoubtedly there is a great deal of difference between the sizes of municipalities, and in the Eastern States it has been recognised that the needs of one municipality may not exactly coincide with those of another. That has been especially recognised as regards most of the capital cities of the Eastern States. Special Acts have been passed to meet the needs of such cities. In outlying municipalities conditions differ from those of a capital city, and it might be worth while—I merely suggest this to the Government—when drafting the proposed legislation to consider whether there should not be a separate measure introduced dealing with the city of Perth, so that legislation more suited to the needs of a capital may be enacted, instead of including in a general Municipal Corporations Act provisions which would be applicable to all, but which might not meet the needs, we will say, of a



growing capital city such as this. An Act specially for the city of Perth was passed in 1925. That was a measure designed to empower the city of Perth to purchase land for street-widening and for re-subdivision. As Mr. Franklin pointed out, the present Act has been out of print for some years, and when newly-elected councillors desire to consult the Act to ascertain their legislative powers in various directions, they are forced to borrow copies from whosoever they can. That emphasises the necessity for a new or consolidating and amending Act, so that copies of the complete measure may be available for the use of everyone interested. To illustrate how archaic some of the provisions of the Act were until 1919 at any rate, I would refer to Section 237 which gives power to the council to use steam road rollers. The section provides that two persons shall be employed, one to precede the road roller and the other to assist the drivers of horses, carriages, etc., to control their animals.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And to carry a red flag?

*[The President resumed the Chair.]*

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No, that provision was omitted in this particular section, which remained in force until 1919, when it was amended in the Traffic Act. Thus we find it necessary to consult another Act in order to ascertain an amendment made to the Municipal Corporations Act. It is also interesting to find that by Section 438, although the Act was passed in 1906, power was given to municipalities to purchase motor cars. One naturally wonders why, seeing that in 1906 the authorities foresaw the use of motor cars, they did not at that time appreciate the folly of inserting those provisions in the Act regarding road rollers. If there were danger arising from the use of road rollers, there would be greater danger from the use of motor cars. Yet in England an amendment of the law was only secured when the first motor car was put on the road and was preceded by a man carrying a little red flag mounted on a pencil! That practice was quickly stopped because it was soon realised that they could not carry out the law as it then stood. In 1919 the legislature was apparently appreciative of the fact that the employment of two men to carry out their respective functions on road rollers was unnecessary. I

do not desire to weary members with a list of the sections requiring amendment, but will allude to one or two of them. Section 105 deals with the method of voting, and sets out that the person who is casting his vote shall put a cross opposite the name of the candidate whom he desires to support. An alternative method is provided in a later section by which the elector is able to strike out the name of the candidate he does not desire to be chosen. In 1919, the Act was amended, when the system of preferential voting was introduced. The result is that there are two methods of voting provided, and so when there are two candidates the elector must either put a cross against the name of the man he favours, or strike out the name of the other; and when there are more than two candidates, the individual has to indicate his choice in the order of his preference. As a result of these provisions, electors frequently make mistakes in exercising the franchise. It will be appreciated how frequently it happens that there are more informal votes than should be recorded at municipal elections. There are also matters affecting absentee voting and ratepayers' meetings. The Act provides that there must be two ratepayers' meetings annually, although the attendance is usually one ratepayer and his dog. Sometimes the ratepayers do not even take the trouble to attend meetings, and therefore the necessity for holding two meetings during the year is not apparent. One meeting should be quite sufficient during the year, but I think even that could be dispensed with in view of the lack of interest usually taken in these proceedings. I am informed that in Victoria the legislation does not provide for annual meetings. Another matter concerns the granting of power to municipalities to deal with noises. That nuisance has already been dealt with by the municipal authorities in the Old Country, and I think probably something could be done here in that regard. Amendments will be necessary to deal with buildings, the requirements respecting which have altered in late years, and, in addition, the borrowing powers for local authorities should be extended.

There are various other matters that can be dealt with more fully when the legislation is before us. One other matter to which I shall make reference is rural relief. In the course of his speech, Mr. Baxter suggested a scheme for raising funds for

the replenishment or renovation of plant, machinery, etc., when worn out, the object being to place farmers in a more satisfactory position than they are in at present. I admit there is much to commend the proposal to the House, but it is one that requires careful investigation by competent authorities before adoption. Then again, it would largely depend upon the state of the finances. I understand that the many requests made to the Government would call for the expenditure of much more money than the Government could see their way clear to provide; and here is where the system of planning, which has been referred to during the debate, could come into operation. If the planning is on wise lines, no one could have cause to grumble. Mr. Piesse referred to a proposal to place secured creditors on the same basis as unsecured creditors in connection with rural relief, and he suggested compelling even the secured creditors to be subjected to having their securities reduced by a vote of the creditors. While I have a deep regard for Mr. Piesse and those who have spoken on this subject, I do not think they have taken into account the serious position that would arise if effect were given to such a proposition. It would involve, in the first place, a repudiation, practically speaking, of the rights of a secured creditor to the security to which he was entitled, and which induced him, in the first instance, to advance money. It would mean violating the sanctity of contracts, and I will certainly never hold with that. It would have far more serious effect on credit, not only of those in country areas but of the State generally. That is the danger. What would be the position if, for example, any Government, listening to a proposal such as that, allowed legislation to be introduced to interfere with securities? Would any outside country, would London, ever advance one penny-piece to Western Australia? Never! Our credit would sink, because those people who otherwise would advance the money would say that if a Government could pass legislation to destroy the security of people in their own country, then the next thing the Government would do would be to introduce legislation to destroy the very security that might be extended to those lenders if they advanced money to Western Australia. I hope, therefore, that members will pause

before they think of putting forward a proposition of this nature and will consider seriously the probable reaction and effect of it all. The position between secured creditor and unsecured creditor is entirely distinct and we must not place the two on the same plane. A person will not advance money unless he has security. In the case of existing securities, the money would never have been advanced but for the granting of these securities and the proposal instead of improving the condition and credit of the people would be absolutely destroying it.

Hon. G. B. Wood: It is a debt of honour to the storekeepers.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Very well. Steps may have to be taken to see what can be done through the Government to help the storekeeper. The bringing into line of the secured creditor and the unsecured creditor is entirely wrong, and there is only one method of improving the position, and that is through the Government. Now I think I have said enough on that subject, and I hope that in future we shall not hear any more talk of coercing either secured creditors or the banks that have done so much to help the credit of this State. I say that the banks, by pursuing a sound method of business in the management of their affairs, have assured to this country greater credit and more stable government than otherwise would have been the result.

Hon. G. W. Miles: They saved us through the depression.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Absolutely. I admit that we have to realise the position of the storekeepers, but let it be done by a proper method. I will support the motion.

**HON. L. B. BOLTON** (Metropolitan) [6.4]: I desire to express regret at the death of His late Majesty, King George the Fifth, and also my satisfaction at the accession to the Throne of King Edward the Eighth. I am sure members will join with me in hoping that by his tactful speeches, his fearless visitations and collaborations with other leaders of Europe our new King will be able to maintain the peace that we so much desire but which, unfortunately, does not look too promising at the present time, and in order that he may earn that title which his beloved grandfather had, namely "Edward the Peacemaker." For personal reasons I desire also to refer to the death of two members of this Chamber with whom I have

had the honour of sitting ever since I became a member. I refer to the late Sir Edward Wittenoom and the late Sir Charles Nathan. Very soon after my arrival in this State as a youth in 1887 I remember the name of Wittenoom, and I followed the career of Sir Edward through the whole of my lifetime. I was very proud indeed to be a member of the same House as the late hon. member. I am sure the good work he did for the State will be remembered for many years. As to the late Sir Charles Nathan, I met him on his arrival in Western Australia many years ago. I remember the first position he was in at Fremantle, in the same street as that in which my father was in business. I have been proud to be a close personal friend of Sir Charles Nathan ever since that day. He was a man of wonderful ability, and I know that every member of the House feels that his loss is not only a loss to this Parliament and this State, but also to the Commonwealth as well. Like other members, I desire briefly to refer to the retirement of the Hon. J. M. Drew, who has rendered wonderful service to his State and to the House. When first I joined the House the hon. gentleman told me that if at any time there was anything I desired to know about the procedure, although I did not see eye to eye with him politically, I had but to approach him. It was a wonderful promise and the hon. member nobly fulfilled it. I can only hope that we shall have Mr. Drew amongst us for many years to come. Following on that, I tender my congratulations to Mr. Kitson on his appointment as Chief Secretary. Mr. Kitson was my first political opponent, and from that day onwards I believe we were better friends than ever before. Also I desire to tender my congratulations to Mr. Gray on his appointment as Honorary Minister. At the same time I should like to congratulate the two new members, joining with previous speakers in regretting the defeat of Mr. Yelland and Mr. R. G. Moore, the last-named being a very old friend of mine. Nevertheless I tender congratulations to the two new members, and remind them that the same fate will come to all of us some day, although I hope it will not be for a long while yet.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: But you are all right for a lengthy period.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes, in that connection I should like to express my gratitude to the electors of the Metropolitan Province

for having returned me to the House for a further term. I do not intend to go at length through the whole of the subjects in the Governor's Speech, but I do propose to deal with several items and to address the House at somewhat greater length on one or two subjects about which I feel I may have some knowledge that will be of interest. First I desire briefly to refer to the position of the State to-day, and to say that while without doubt the position is much better than it was, and is still improving, yet as a business man and a manufacturer I appreciate that we are not yet out of the wood, that we still have to be very careful for many months to come. That, of course, has been brought about largely by the unfortunate position of the farming community to-day. I propose a little later to refer specifically to the position of the farmers. In my opinion the progress we should be making is not being made, due largely to the fact that with our return to prosperity our local industries are not getting that measure of support which they should have. Of course it is an old cry, this of local production, but old as it is it is the cry we have to be continually uttering in order to remind our people of their duty. It may surprise members to know that for the 12 months ended the 30th June last this State achieved record figures of imports from the Eastern States. That is very much to be regretted, and I had sincerely hoped that with the work that had been started by the local Chamber of Manufactures some years ago, supported by local products leagues and helped materially by the wonderful work done by the Economic Council, and the sympathy and assistance rendered by successive Ministers for Industry, particularly the work done by the ex-Minister for Industry, Mr. Kenneally, and the wonderful work now being done by the present Minister, Mr. Hawke—one would have thought that with all the propaganda at least we could have prevented such an increase in the imports from the Eastern States as appears to have taken place. I do not propose to refer to a lot of figures, but I can assure members that they will be astounded to know that our imports for the last financial year were valued at no less a sum than £11,030,206, a record for all time. In 1929-30, the peak year prior to the depression, the amount was £9,900,000, and last year it was £10,145,000. Now the exports during the 12 months ended the 30th

June, 1936, amounted to £1,523,078. Members perhaps will not be astonished at those figures, but they will be sorry to know that a large proportion of exports were made up of returned empty motor car body cases and beer casks.

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

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Before tea I was dealing with the industrial position of the State, mostly as it affected our imports. I was pointing out that unfortunately these had constituted a record for the State during last year. Our imports from overseas during the same period reached a total of approximately £5,000,000, whilst our exports amounted to £17,021,000. Unless our people can be brought to a sense of responsibility and will support more than they have in the past our local factories and industries, we can never hope to put back in work, as we are aiming to do, the whole of our unemployed. I am associated with one of the largest industries in the Commonwealth, that of motor body building. The figures appertaining to this industry are a little short of astounding.

Hon. A. Thomson: They are alarming.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I agree. In 1926 the total value of motor bodies imported into Western Australia from the Eastern States was £86,076. In 1928, the peak year prior to the depression, the figure reached £142,148. For 1935, when we had made some little progress towards prosperity, the figure was £266,204, to the 30th June of that year. Alarming figures were reached at the end of June this year, when we find that the value of imported bodies was no less than £415,310.

Hon. L. Craig: You mean imported from the Eastern States?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes.

Hon. L. Craig: Is that due in a great measure to the restrictions on English bodies?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I would not say that, but it may have helped. Later on I will deal with the Federal trade policy. I ask members to imagine what it would mean to the allied industries of this State if all that money, or a considerable portion of it, could be spent here. It is alarming to think that no less than £415,000 is spent on importing motor bodies from the other States.

Hon. J. Cornell: Does the hon. member think that the motor boom has reached capacity in this State?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON. No, but I think we are gradually reaching the peak period. If we go on as we are doing, our position here will become very serious. It is all very well to say that we are purely a primary producing State, but, unless we endeavour to develop our secondary industries as well, our primary industries will suffer. I recently attended on behalf of this State a conference of the Chambers of Manufactures in Melbourne. One of the motions submitted there was that the Federal Government be asked to give special encouragement to the secondary industries of the three smaller manufacturing States—Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia. The Federal Government may give that encouragement and they may not, but it is certainly very necessary for this State. I suppose I am justified in quoting my own industry, because I can claim to know something about it. I can give instances of motor vehicles running in this State that are being used by the Commonwealth authorities, and have been wholly built in Victoria. All these bodies could well have been built in this State. If we continue along these lines our secondary industries, instead of advancing, will fall into a more deplorable condition than they are in today.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Can you compete in the matter of price?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Yes, in respect to commercial vehicles, which I am now discussing. I do not see that this State can hope to compete in pressed bodies, the standard lines or more popular American makes. Our volume of business is ridiculous compared with that of the other States. We never can, particularly in view of the establishment of the wonderful factory in Melbourne, hope to compete with the other States in that direction. In commercial work, however, we can, with an up-to-date factory such as has been recently built in the city, successfully compete with the other States. That is the class of work we should be doing locally, instead of having to import the bodies as we are now doing. A big proportion of that work is now being done in the other States. I wish to refer now to the pastoral and farming industries as I see them today. It is unfortunate that just when we are likely to benefit from a recovery in prices, both in wheat and wool, this State should be suffering from what appears to be the driest season we have ever experienced. I recently had the opportunity of

visiting the Murchison, and to see the deplorable condition of affairs there. I do not suggest that the Government have failed to see the seriousness of the position, but I implore them to do what they can to assist both these industries that are passing through such a bad time. This, of course, applies to the agricultural as well as to the pastoral areas. In many parts of the State, unless we have rain at an early date, the outlook will be black indeed. This is most unfortunate, seeing that wheatgrowers are likely to secure at least a reasonable price for their commodity during the coming season. I can claim to know a little about farming, having been associated with the industry for the last 26 years. Farmers always seem to have a grouch, either against someone or against some particular pest. I have, nevertheless, great sympathy for the man on the land. I feel, however, that probably the lower prices we have been receiving for our farm products, and the tightening up of conditions generally, have had a good effect upon the industry. It has been the means of pushing off the land a certain percentage of men who should never have been put there in the first place, and, secondly, who should never have been given the latitude or the assistance accorded to them. I sometimes think that after all the Agricultural Bank, from its very inception, was not the blessing to the farming community or the development of the State that we hoped it would be.

Hon. J. Cornell: Some of the biggest impossibilities have turned out to be the best farmers.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: That may be so, but a large proportion of them should have been removed years ago before the capital cost of their holdings was built up to the extent it is today, and before so much capital had to be written off by the State. The conditions have at all events helped to keep on the land only the best type of farmer, those who farm correctly, and those who under the adverse conditions have been able to make wheatgrowing a payable proposition. If a farmer can get from 3s to 3s. 4d. a bushel, and if he farms correctly and in safe districts, wheat farming can be made a payable proposition. A lot of criticism of private banks has been passed. My experience of those institutions is that they have kept their clients more up to the mark than have Government institutions. For that reason they have on their books

the best of the farmers, and they see to it that only the best of the men are allowed to remain on the land over which they hold sway. It has been said by some members that the Government would need to spend money in providing water for many of the districts that are now suffering from a shortage. Heaven knows what will happen in some parts of the country next summer for lack of water for stock and domestic purposes. I hope the Government will take this very necessary work into account. One member suggested that the millions of gallons of water that go to waste annually over the Mundaring Weir might be utilised in the country by tapping the pipeline in suitable places. I heartily endorse that. I believe that could be done at no very great expense compared, of course, with that involved in the sinking of dams or providing water by other means, and I commend it to the Government for their consideration. Much has been said regarding the reduced bonus on emus and foxes. Fortunately, in my own particular district, I have had very little experience of emus, but I have a tremendous sympathy for those farmers who are affected by the pest. In my recent visit to the Murchison I had an opportunity of seeing what I had never seen before—hundreds and hundreds of emus in flocks, doing inestimable damage to the crops in those districts, and I certainly advocate that some other means than have been utilised by the Government in the past should be adopted to eliminate such a pest. It is useless to put a very small bonus on the head of an emu, but if the Government could find the money to increase that bonus and make it a payable proposition for some of the unemployed to go and shoot the emus, I am certain that in some districts at least it would be greatly to their benefit. In many districts the fox menace is assuming large proportions. In my own particular district, for a number of years, we were so overrun with rabbits that we would not think of shooting a fox, because we believed the foxes helped to keep the rabbits down. In the last two years, however, we decided on a policy of netting against rabbits. We practically cleaned them out over an area of about 4,000 acres, but we now find that we have a return of the foxes, and this year in my own place I lost more lambs through the depredations of foxes

than at any time previously since they made their first appearance in the State.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You have rabbit-netting but it is of no use against foxes?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: No use whatever. If something is not done to combat this pest, it will become almost as serious as the rabbit pest was before an attempt was made to deal with it. The unfortunate farmer, faced with pest after pest, has my greatest sympathy. Regarding the position of group settlement and the Agricultural Bank, when the Bill was before this Chamber more than one member predicted trouble if Clause 51 was allowed to go through. Unfortunately, the Government stood by that. It might eventually turn out to be the correct policy, but at the present time the trouble that most of us anticipated is taking place, and while I have a lot of sympathy with the Commissioners—I believe they are endeavouring from their angle to act in the best interests of the State—I also have a tremendous sympathy for the unfortunate groupie. But there again, I have said in this House, and before I became a member of this House, that that scheme was entirely wrong. I suppose it is no use crying over spilt milk, but 50 per cent. or 75 per cent. of those men should never have been put on the groups, and when years ago it was seen that they were making a failure, they should have been removed. They should not have been allowed to go on so far and to feel that they had places for life whether they worked or not. I have sympathy with both sides, but think something will have to be done to overcome the seriousness of the position in connection with group settlement. The representatives of the mining constituencies will pardon me for referring to the mining position. I had an opportunity of visiting that famous town of Wiluna. It was my first visit and I was astounded at the wonderful progress which had been made, and the wonderful future that it, together with many other districts in the State, has. I commend the Government for the wonderful assistance they have rendered, and are still rendering, for the further development of the mining industry. In the Minister for Mines, Mr. Munsie, the Government are fortunate in having a man who is sincere in his job, which he knows from A to Z, and a man in whom the mining community have the utmost confidence. While

Wiluna and other parts of the State have been helped by the Government, however, the progress made in the mining industry has probably been more due to the high price of gold, and the fact that the introduction of the gold bonus assisted, at least in the commencement, in the rehabilitation of the gold mining industry. I think that, like the farmer, the gold miner is entitled to everything he gets out of the ground. He is the most optimistic person I ever met in my life, and the miners are certainly justified in taking up the attitude they do. I sincerely hope, particularly after the remarks of some of the members representing the goldfields, that not too many of the investors, as they think, will be disappointed by the faith they have shown in the State. No other industry has been the means of the introduction of so much capital to the State as the gold mining industry, and not only does it affect the mining towns and districts, but great benefit is felt by the city, and the gold mining industry has been the means of keeping this State going through the very hard periods we have endured. I would like to offer my congratulations to the Government on the completion of that wonderful edifice the East Perth Girls' School. It is a credit to all who have had anything to do with its construction, because it has definitely proved that our materials and skilled artisans are equal to any in the world. I have no objection to the Education Vote when it is used in this direction, but I am in agreement with the remarks of Mr. Parker in connection with University education. I think that altogether too much money is spent on higher education in this State. At the opening of the East Perth school on Friday the Director of Education told us that the Education Vote for the year amounted to something like £630,000. I would advocate that a much greater proportion of that amount should be devoted to manual training and technical education of the youth of the State. If more money were spent in that direction, it would better fit youth for the hard battle of life that is before them. One member mentioned that he would favour the raising of the leaving age from 14 to 16, devoting the other two years to manual and domestic training. In that he has my sympathy because I believe it would be much better for the State as a whole if this were done.

Hon. G. Fraser: Provision would have to be made for keeping them during that period.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: They would subsequently be more fitted to keep themselves and obtain and retain a position if they were given that training. I listened more than once in this Chamber to the late Sir Edward Wittenoom declaring that too much money was being spent on the higher education in this State. I have come to his way of thinking. During a recent visit to Wiluna, together with other hon. members of this Chamber, I had the opportunity of seeing the manner in which the unfortunate children of that district were receiving their education. The Chief Secretary was with us, and I was glad to see that he made a note of the existing conditions in the two schools that were inspected. There we found that on the seats that were intended for two, there were three children seated, and on the seats intended for one there were two seated. Perhaps I did not use the correct term in describing them as seats, for they were made from jam cases or ordinary boxes, and were totally unfitted for the purpose for which they were being used. We were told that new seats were on order, and I think we were also told that they had been ordered from the State Implement Works, but that unfortunately, up to then, it had not been possible to have them delivered. I suggest to the Minister for Education that the department should purchase the seats elsewhere, and that it might be possible to get them at half the price charged by the State Implement Works.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Similar conditions apply at some of the country schools.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: It is very difficult, I admit, for the department to keep pace with the growing requirements of the State, and particularly those of mining towns such as Wiluna, but if the optimism of the mining communities can be depended upon, many other schools in other mining towns will be equally badly off at no distant date.

Hon. J. Cornell: Children at Yellowdine have been taught in a lean-to for the past eighteen months.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I hope members will hammer away at the Government until the conditions I have described have been amended. Another matter I deplore is the number of skilled officers who are leaving the service of the State. Every now and again we hear of some valued officer being taken away from our State by another State, and that in some instances it is merely a ques-

tion of pounds, shillings and pence. Probably a small increase in the remuneration of these officers might be the means of the State retaining their services. I hope that the Government will find the means of preventing the departure from the State of officers whose services we cannot afford to lose.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Many are taken from us by the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: And many have been taken from us by other States. I know of two instances of officers having left Western Australia to join the Queensland State service. There is another matter to which I wish briefly to refer and although it does not come within State jurisdiction, I feel justified in making reference to it—I allude to the new trade policy of the Federal Government. We must regard the new tariff as a genuine attempt on the part of the Federal Government to establish the motor industry in Australia, if not to divert as much of the trade as possible to Great Britain. Naturally I desire to support the policy of assistance to our industries, but from my knowledge of the position, I consider that the introduction of the policy is at least ten years too soon. The restrictions placed on the importation of motor chasses means more proportionately to this State than to any other State of the Commonwealth. Even now, few chasses are assembled in this State, and the small proportion of bodies manufactured has already been mentioned by me. The new policy of the Federal Government must have the effect of giving absolute control to one or two big firms, and they naturally will manufacture their product in the cities of either Melbourne or Sydney, where the whole of the work will be completed, and even our small proportion of to-day must eventually be wiped out. If this state of affairs is permitted, it will be necessary for the Government to protect transport users against possible exploitation. Unless that is done, it will mean that there will be a large increase in the cost of transport within the Commonwealth, and as this State still has large tracts of country to develop, as compared with the Eastern States, it will mean that once again we shall be the greatest sufferers. With Australia's comparatively small population, the volume of trade will not be sufficient for any company to undertake the manufacture of many types of cars, thus definitely limiting the choice,

with the result that sales must fall off and one of the greatest industries of the Commonwealth will be crippled or will receive a setback from which it will take years to recover. Much has been written regarding the manufacture of bodies for English chassis which do not sell so freely as do the more popular American lines. I need hardly remind members that the smaller volume of bodies cannot be built at anything like the price of the large quantities of bodies sold for the more popular American cars. Very costly dies and huge presses are necessary for this work. The only chance the smaller States would have of competing for this type of work would be for the Federal Government to admit fabricated panels suitable for the various English cars free of duty, even if this were done for only a limited term. This was practically decided upon by the Federal Parliament, but for some reason unexplained—some reason which it would not be difficult for me to explain from my knowledge of the position—the proposal was amended and the situation remains as before. If the duty had been removed, members can realise the huge increase in work it would have meant for this State. Western Australia and the other smaller States would have had an equal opportunity to compete for this class of work with the larger factories in Melbourne or Sydney, for the simple reason that the volume is not nearly so great. Unless we have a huge volume of one particular type of work, it does not pay to expend up to £30,000 for a set of dies. For some of the latest cars, the dies alone cost as much as £30,000 a set to make. That is a mere trifle if it can be spread over the manufacture of 10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 cars, but in the smaller States, where the sales are lower, this work has to be done by hand.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Nor in years, because the fashions in cars change so rapidly.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: In the matter of motor cars and body building, there is no such thing as years. There is hardly a model that lasts years. In nearly every year there is a new model, or something fresh, and a set of dies created for the manufacture of one particular type of body needs to be spread over the first production, because in nine cases out of ten 50 to 75 per cent. of the dies would be perfectly useless for the next model. Members therefore can see what a chance the smaller States would

have had if the duty had been removed, as was advocated. It has been suggested that under the new policy, not only will the more popular type of car be manufactured in Australia, but also the English car. Is there any member who would suggest that any of that capital will be spent in Western Australia? I say absolutely no. The factories would be opened in the larger States in the East, and this State would again be left lamenting.

Hon. J. Cornell: That position applies in the United States of America.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: In many instances the policy of the Federal Government, as it affects manufacturers, is largely or wholly directed to the larger States.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How do you account for a small State like South Australia developing the motor body-building industry?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Probably that was due to the enterprise in the first place of one man, Mr. E. W. Holden.

Hon. L. Craig: And to General Motors Ltd.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Only in the last year or two have General Motors been associated with Holdens. In the early stages of Holdens Motors, their biggest competitors were General Motors. Although General Motors, I understand, had quite an interest in the factory of Holdens, they certainly had not a controlling interest, but in view of the trend of affairs, and knowing that probably they would be squeezed right out in the matter of body building, they were wise enough to amalgamate with Holdens and create the firm of Holdens-General Motors Body Builders, which is in existence in South Australia today. I think Mr. Miles will realise that it is only a matter of time when there will be very little left of Holdens Motor Body Building works in South Australia. That is the reason why South Australia is putting up such a fight—a fight to which I shall refer later—for some of the aviation work that probably will be let in Australia at an early date. South Australia sees slipping from her grasp the great industry in which she has maintained the lead in Australia for many years. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that that business will eventually be transferred to Victoria. In circles in which I had the opportunity to move during my attendance at the conference referred to—it was at a time when most of the Cabinet and Federal



members were in South Australia—I formed the opinion that in the event of Great Britain being drawn into a European war in the near future, we cannot hope to rely on the Motherland for any assistance. Great Britain will have her hands more than full in defending herself, and the people of the Commonwealth should wake up to this fact. Unless we are prepared to defend our country, we cannot hope to hold this great and glorious land. Let me refer to one other matter that has been exercising the minds of the public for a considerable time. It is a matter on which I have some knowledge, although I approach the question with diffidence, as I am to some extent an interested party. I refer to the proposal to extend the trolley bus system to Nedlands and Claremont. In my opinion, the present bus service supplies, or could be made supply, if the restrictions were lifted, all the needs of the travelling public in those districts. Surely the unexpected change in our financial position, due to the Commonwealth's having reduced the disabilities grant by no less than £300,000, will induce the Government to reconsider their decision to spend £84,000 on an absolutely unnecessary work! It would be a wanton waste of public money to create a service already catered for by private enterprise and actually not wanted by a large majority of the residents of those districts. As one of the representatives of a city province, I feel that I should be lacking in my duty if I failed to enter an emphatic protest against the threatened disfigurement of three of our most beautiful streets. From all visitors one hears expressions of praise for the magnificent thoroughfare of St. George's-terrace. They also say how favourably King's Park-road compares with certain avenues in other cities, to say nothing of the beauty that Malcolm-street will possess when the improvements agreed upon by Parliament and the City Council have been completed. Yet we have a Government who are anxious to turn all this beauty into something hideous to look upon. Fancy standing in King's Park and viewing, as one must with feelings of disgust, the unsightly poles and overhead wires necessary for the equipment of the proposed installation! All Perth citizens are proud of the streets of our city, and particularly of St. George's-terrace. To me the suggestion to mar its amazing beauty seems little short of sacrilege. I may perhaps be pardoned for again referring to something of a personal

nature. I happen to be interested in a factory recently erected in the city of Perth. It was necessary almost before a reasonable entrance to that factory could be obtained, to remove no less than two of these unsightly trolley poles. Even to-day as one goes around that quarter of the city, the overhead wires and innumerable trolley poles, placed as they are, jar on one's nerves. I think most hon. members will agree that to create such a state of affairs in the beautiful thoroughfares of St. George's-terrace and King's Park-road would be nothing short of a tragedy. My main reasons for opposing the system are, first of all the wanton waste of public money, secondly the creation of a Government service for needs already well met by private enterprise, which pays huge fees and, in addition, taxes and revenues from which State concerns are exempt.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And private enterprise is prepared to pay sufficient to meet interest and sinking fund on the tramway line, I understand.

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: Probably that is so. I shall try to give figures showing the House the loss which will result if private enterprise is eliminated. Thirdly that better use could be made of the money in many directions, particularly to provide water for the famishing country districts, or to provide additional school accommodation on the goldfields, in such places as those suggested by Mr. Cornell. This morning's "West Australian," to my mind, suggests even a better way of spending this money. We have had before us for some time the question of building a new bridge at Fremantle. In case members have not seen the "West Australian" subleader of this morning, I consider it worth repeating, as to my mind it suggests a much better way to spend this £84,000—

Mr. J. B. Sleeman, M.L.A., in a letter addressed to the Fremantle Municipalities, has suggested the possibility of the Government undertaking shortly the construction of a timber bridge at a cost of £75,000 if that would be acceptable to the local governing bodies of the district. The alternative was the construction of a steel and concrete bridge at some time in the indefinite future, to cost £650,000. As a new bridge to replace the present outworn and unsightly structure must be ranked as a need of some urgency, it seems evident that the municipalities would be wise to accept the offer of a wooden bridge if that offer is made. The expenditure of £650,000 carrying interest at the rate of £38,000 per annum, would plainly be far beyond the Government's resources in the near future. That sum would go too far in

providing employment locally for the spending of most of it outside the State to be considered in existing circumstances. There is much to be said for the construction of a timber bridge that would meet the needs of the next 25 years. No one can clearly foresee what changes in our transport system and its requirements will be brought about within that period. A timber bridge would draw upon local labour and materials, and provide a very useful contribution to the State's employment problem. Timber bridges built by modern methods can be made more durable than those erected in the past. The Government would certainly be far more justified in spending £75,000 for a bridge at Fremantle that is really required than in wasting more than that sum in installing unwanted trolley buses at Claremont, most of the money for which must be spent outside Western Australia.

*[The Deputy President took the Chair.]*

If I may digress for just a moment, as regards those trolley buses there is, I understand, a great possibility of steel bodies being used. If that should prove to be the case, the bodies would have to be imported from England, which would mean that so far as our industries and our workers are concerned, only a small proportion of the money would be spent in our own State. Another reason is the disfigurement of the beautiful thoroughfare through which the trolley buses would pass. Summed up, it appears to me that this transport tangle has revealed a looseness in the present system of administration which should be remedied before harm is done to the State's finances and to the interests of the people. There needs to be an improvement on the system under which the wishes of the large body of taxpayers directly concerned can be ignored. A review of the facts shows that a Government transport service between Perth and these districts is superfluous, and is not wanted by the residents of Nedlands and Claremont. The position of these suburbs between the capital of the State and the chief port ensures for them a permanent, frequent, and more than adequate service by private interests, if the people are allowed to avail themselves of it. To date they have not been allowed to do so, because of the Government's running of trams. The trams were instituted about 18 years ago, and, compared with the private motor services, are cumbersome, slow, inadequate, and in a word obsolete. The Government said they would not pull up the tram line, but they did so. Then, in order to widen the road

they put the tram line down again, instead of leaving it up as they should have done. By regulations the residents of the surrounding districts were prevented from using the buses and taxis which ran past their doors every few minutes, and were compelled to use the unsatisfactory, slow, and obsolete trams. The residents began an intensive public campaign, and bitterly complained against this anomaly, which was due originally to restrictions placed on residents between Loch-street and Bellevue-terrace. The restrictions meant loss of time to them, and put them to great inconvenience and discomfort. I understand the Transport Board informed the Government that unless the State service was improved, the board would consider the claims of private enterprise. Then the Government decided to pull up the tram line again. However, they further decided to institute trolley buses in place of the trams, and to continue to fetter the Nedlands and Claremont people with transport restrictions. By doing this the Government have ignored the wishes of the people, and have overlooked the fact that once the tram line is pulled up, there are many reasons, economic and otherwise, why the remaining services should not be passed over in favour of a superimposed and less adequate service to run beside them. The Government have chosen to instal trolley buses where they are not wanted. The Government are proposing to embark needlessly on heavy capital expenditure for which the possible return is problematical. They are doing all this, out of step with everybody, without apparently having had a thorough and authoritative inquiry made into the present justification and the future effect. The Government may change hands in a few years, but by then the State may be committed for an indefinite period to a policy already shown to be mistaken. It should be of interest to hon. members to know and realise the huge amount of capital invested in our omnibus services operating in the metropolitan and suburban areas, as well as the large number of employees in the industry. On the 30th June last the number of buses licensed was 154, and the amount of working capital invested £300,000. The number of employees directly engaged in the business of transport was about 500. It is interesting to note from the returns of the Tramway Department

recently laid on the Table of the House that there are 121 trams and three trolley buses engaged in our tram service, while the number of employees is 582. The importance of the business to garage workmen, the body-building industry, fuel and tyre suppliers, and suppliers of spare parts and accessories is obvious. The figures I have given do not, of course, include any of these. Most of the services were built up in advance of settlement, and were a material factor in the development of several districts. They were commenced to fill a much-needed want in the absence of Government transport facilities. Most of them started in more or less sparsely settled districts, and as a result of their activities a volume of traffic has grown up, the rewards of which should be retained for their benefit. The approximate amount paid to the Transport Board by these services last year was £20,000, while the traffic department collect from the omnibus companies yearly fees amounting to about £6,000. It must be remembered that transport has provided the whole of the money for the main roads of the State. This is not to be wondered at when we find that the amount paid by the same concerns in petrol tax is approximately £25,000. The very first transport service was commenced by Mr. Fred White between Fremantle and the Peel Estate, in 1921. This was followed by Mr. Spicer's service between Fremantle and Perth, which now has grown to the huge undertaking known as the Metro Bus Co. Ltd. Two other services which can claim to have materially assisted in the development of certain districts are the South Suburban Bus Co. Ltd., operating in originally sparse settlement south of the river. This service began in 1924; and the Federal Bus Service, which materially assisted in the growth of West Leederville and later of Bassendean, also began in that year. When the West Leederville service commenced, no transport facility other than the railway was in existence. Before leaving this subject, I wish to make it perfectly clear that my remarks and criticisms are not directed against either the Transport Board or the railway or tramway officials. I have to admit candidly that the Transport Board have done and are doing an excellent job—much better than I had expected when the Bill constituting that body was before Parliament. There are, of

course, many anomalies and some hardships; but these things, unfortunately, will always occur. Regarding railway and tramway management, in face of the difficulties encountered during the past few years, my opinion is that the present Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Ellis, and the manager of the Tramway Department, Mr. Taylor, have carried out their respective tasks wonderfully well. The railways are on a better footing than for many years past, and I am quite sure that if these two officers are left in control of their departments, the improvement will continue. I trust that the figures I have given to the Chief Secretary and to the House generally will induce the Government to consider the position further before they embark upon the expenditure of £84,000 on trolley buses for Claremont, seeing that the expenditure is absolutely unwarranted, and that, if the financial position of the State enables the expenditure of that amount of money, it can be spent better in other directions. One other matter I intend to touch upon was mentioned by Mr. Baxter during his remarks. I refer to the assistance, or lack of assistance, rendered by the Government to the Boys' Employment League. Now that the Youth and Motherhood Appeal Fund has been allocated, the Boys' Employment League and other movements aimed to promote the interests of our lads will have to realise that the assistance they can expect from this source is very slight. I hope the Government will go seriously into the question of providing additional assistance for the league. From the inception, the league have placed about 8,000 youths in positions. The Honorary Minister may not quite approve of some of the jobs, but I can assure the House that the work carried out by the Boys' Employment League compares more than favourably with that of any other similar organisation in other parts of the Commonwealth. The cost of placing the lads in jobs has been practically 3½d. per position, and the whole of the work has been carried out by means of voluntary contributions apart from £100 that was granted by the Government some time ago. I hope the Government will review the position soon.

The Chief Secretary: How much did you say the Government had provided?

Hon. L. B. BOLTON: I mentioned £100, which was, of course, apart from the services of the secretary, who was provided by the

Government who presumably pay his salary, and also the use of a room in the Treasury Buildings.

The Chief Secretary: And nothing else?

HON. L. B. BOLTON: I do not know of anything else, unless it be the use of a telephone. There is ample scope for the Government to render additional assistance to the league. I must apologise for delaying the House, but I felt that the information I had at my disposal was such that I should place it before the Government in the hope that they would be induced to refrain from the contemplated expenditure on trolley buses for the Claremont district.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [8.35]: In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, I join with His Excellency and hon. members in expressing sorrow at the passing of our late Sovereign and loyalty to his successor, King Edward VIII. The recent elections caused alterations in the personnel of the House, and I desire to add my welcome to new members and to express to them the hope that their experience here will be both pleasant and profitable alike to them and to the State. Some were defeated, but that is all in the game of politics. Those who have lost their seats were good sports, and doubtless have taken their defeat in the right spirit. I hope that in due course they will again offer themselves in the service of the country, so that the experience they have gained may not be lost to Western Australia. Then again we sustained the further loss of our Leader, who has been in charge of the business of the House for so many years. It was always a pleasure to sit in the Chamber while Mr. Drew was Leader, and while he was a private member. On no occasion did I approach him on any subject, pleasant or unpleasant, that he did not extend to me every consideration and the best assistance at his disposal. He served his party and the country for many years, and in retiring from his position at this juncture he displayed that sound judgment that has stood to his credit during past years, both as politician and private individual. We know the great strain imposed upon the Leader of the House during a session, and we will all agree that if he had carried on for another year under such conditions, it would probably have made an invalid of him and thus spoil the later years

of his life that should be spent in happier circumstances. I wish Mr. Drew long life and happiness, and much pleasure in the work that he will perform amongst us in the years to come. On top of that, there has been the loss to politics of the former Premier, Mr. Collier. I am very sorry that his ill-health has caused him to retire from that position, because the value of the services he rendered to his party and to the State is unquestioned. His efforts in the past must have commended themselves to every section of the community. With Mr. Collier, too, I trust that the closing years of his life will be spent in good health and in occupations that will not be too strenuous for him. These changes have involved others and now we have a new Chief Secretary in charge of the House. Mr. Kitson is certainly not entirely new to the work, and I congratulate him upon his elevation to full Cabinet rank. I trust that his health will continue to be satisfactory, and that he will be able to carry out the work ahead of him for many years to come. To Mr. Gray, the new Honorary Minister, I also extend my congratulations on his step forward, and I wish him every success in his new office. As regards the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, the question of finances is dealt with in a manner that indicates conditions have improved considerably during the past few years, with the result that we have had a surplus in lieu of a deficit. That matter was dealt with explicitly by Mr. Nicholson in his remarks, and also by Mr. Seddon, who expressed the hope that every care would be exercised in the future regarding the finances, and that the accumulated deficit would be wiped out within a reasonable period and before any further extravagant expenditure was embarked upon. I was glad to hear Mr. Drew give a definite and clear assurance that the House could depend upon that being done by the Government. If that be the position, we can congratulate ourselves upon the surplus and trust that the Government's predictions for the current financial year, despite the reduction in the Federal Disabilities Grant, will be as successful as they were at the end of the last financial year. We learn that we are to have presented to us a Bill to deal with the aborigines. In view of the report submitted by the Royal Commissioner who inquired into the conditions of the aborigines, the Government have done well in promising to place that measure before members at such an early

stage of the session. The public have expected the introduction of such a Bill, and would have been seriously disappointed if the Government had delayed matters in that respect. I trust that the Bill will be so framed that we shall be able to accept it without amendment, and that its provisions will be brought into operation at an early date so that these unfortunate people may take up their place in the community. I trust it will be the means of giving the half-castes and quarter-castes an opportunity to live under the conditions enjoyed by the white population, for I am sure they are capable of assimilating our ways quite easily. I note from the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that we are also to deal with the financial emergency legislation. My view is that the word "emergency" could be removed from that form of taxation.

Hon. A. Thomson: You consider it is more in the nature of a permanency?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I think some more equitable form of taxation could be substituted. I notice that another attempt is to be made by the Government to legalise the operations of the State Insurance Office. I recognise the temper of this House and realise what it was when this important question was submitted to members previously. I think it is a waste of time bringing such a Bill before us.

Hon. G. Fraser: You will not agree that progress has been made during the last year or two?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I allow for the alteration in the personnel of the House, but I am nevertheless satisfied that members will not accept that Bill. The Government intend to submit a measure dealing with trade descriptions and false advertisements, both of which have been very objectionable to the community for years past. I congratulate the Government upon their determination to submit legislation along those lines in an endeavour to introduce more healthy conditions, such as obtain elsewhere under similar legislation. I hope Western Australia will be successful in the effort. In South Australia a similar Act has been on the statute-book for some time, but it has been found there that the legislation has not proved to be of benefit to the community to the extent anticipated, because those engaged in other States have made use of the post office and other avenues to carry on practically the same business in South Australia as if no legislation were in opera-

tion there. I mention that point so that the Chief Secretary may look into the matter to ascertain if our legislation can be made watertight in that respect. My attention has been drawn to the suggestion that the Minister for Agriculture is undertaking to develop the control of the chick sexing in the poultry industry. It may seem somewhat absurd for me to be speaking on a question of this sort, because it may not be regarded as of value to the State. But I can assure members it is of very great value to the State and it is just a question whether this chick sexing, if carried out to the fullest extent, would not react in some measure against the best interests of the State, because the poultry industry is very valuable to the State, and it is mostly through the males or cockerels that the trade is maintained. If chick sexing is going to be successful, then, of course, the cockerels will not be as plentiful as they ought to be, and so we shall lose a valuable section of the industry. I may say that 75 per cent. of the poultry trade is of the cockerel class.

Hon. L. Craig: But it is not a payable section.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Yes, it is, if handled properly.

Hon. L. Craig: Then why do the owners screw the birds' necks now?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The persons who screw the necks of the cockerels are chiefly egg-producers. It will reflect itself this way: If they sell these day-old chicks, properly sexed, the cockerels will not be there to be raised outside. The people who kill the cockerels go in mostly for egg production, where the cockerels are of no use. Then we shall have to re-enact the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act. I am looking forward to this because of the recognition of the fact that the distributing side of the industry must have some representation on the board. I am satisfied that the board will never function satisfactorily unless those people have representation on the board. When such a representative is given a seat on the board, the consumers' side will be protected and there will be a great improvement in the industry. There are still many points about which a representative of the distributing side would be able to render the board good advice. During last year the board, under the amendments which this House passed, made themselves much more active with regard to the cream distri-

bution. One of the difficulties that have arisen is this: Cream is not like milk; it will hold in satisfactory condition for a few days, and is sold in a way totally different from the way in which milk is sold. But the board in its wisdom decreed that when anyone is dealing in cream in the various districts of the metropolitan area, he must take out a license for each district. Since there are 12 or 14 districts in the metropolitan area, one can understand that the cream man will have to pay quite a fair amount in license fees, which of course will not be a help to the cream trade. It is also decreed that the man trading in cream will have to pay to the producer the fresh-milk rate for the milk which he proposes to turn into table cream. This, of course, is very good for the cream trade in the Eastern States, for in those circumstances we are not able to compete here with the cream that comes over from the Eastern States. So the action of the board is reacting against the intention of the board to increase the turnover in cream. Recently I saw two small tins of cream sold for 6½d. the two; and shortly afterwards another storekeeper went one better by selling four tins for 1s. The fresh-cream trade has no chance of competing on that basis. So the board, in an attempt to advance the interests of the producers, has definitely placed them at a disadvantage and handed over this cream trade to the Eastern States. Cream, as members know, when sterilized will hold on the shelf for an indefinite period. What is wanted is a practical man on the board, in order to give the board some advice about these matters.

The Chief Secretary: But they must have all this technical information.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: They are acquiring technical knowledge.

Hon. L. Craig: The cream trade is improving.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: No, it is dropping off. Now I should like to compliment Mr. Bolton upon his very exhaustive and well-thought-out speech, and the way with which he dealt with the proposed trolley buses at Claremont. He deserves every credit for his views on that subject, and even if he be challenged as one interested in the question, I say he is fully justified in his remarks. A member should speak his views even if he be interested in the industry under discussion. However, I am not concerned in the industry, nor have I any shares in any transport interests. Yet

I say that for the Commissioner of Railways, or rather the Government, to direct the manager of the trams—I believe that is the course the instructions followed—to take up that tramline and supply a trolley bus service, is lacking in business principle to an unparalleled extent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Surely the Government will not allow the Commissioner of Railways to dictate to them?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The point remains that, when a new service is proposed, the first reason for it is that it will adequately serve a sufficiently large number of persons. But all the persons in that area are already adequately served, or would be, by the Government merely extending the powers of the working buses and taxis running over the route. A large part of that traffic, all that section, from the police station to Bay View-terrace, is particularly well served now, and could easily be extended without a penny of cost to the Government. All that the Government have to do is to remove the obstacles in the way. I am quite sure that the people concerned will be well satisfied with the frequent and fast service offered them by the buses and taxis. Only the other morning I went down to the mail boat to meet a man. Going along Stirling Highway I saw groups of people waiting by the roadside for the trams, just as we read about them in the Press. On the rise by the Stirling Hotel there were three tramcars, the leading one being full of people, while the other cars carried practically no passengers; and all three were held up by waiting for a tram to come on to the loop on its way to Claremont. The tram is a very much slower means of transport than is the bus or the taxi. Therefore I voice my opposition to the carrying out of this project of pulling up a tramway with a view to replacing it with trolley buses at a cost of £84,000. And this notwithstanding the very excellent bus and taxi service already on the route. I agree that that £84,000 should not be spent for that purpose; because an even better service can be given to the people without any Government expenditure at all, and then the £84,000 can be used to much better advantage. I suggest that it should be used for the suppression of leprosy in the North-West, to which Mr. Holmes referred, and so do all that is required to enlarge the leprosarium as to make it capable of receiving every leper in the North. Then the spread of the disease amongst the aborigines

and the coloured races of the North could be definitely dealt with. However, if the chassis of the trolley buses are already ordered, I suggest that they be used, not on the Claremont route, but on some other route where they are sorely required. For instance, there is a route in my own province, the extension of Walcott-street down the North-West end. There we have a big area of about three-quarters of a mile where many beautiful houses have already been built, and others are being built, yet there is no transport service of any kind for the convenience of the householders. I feel sure the Chief Secretary will tell his colleagues that if the Government want something to do with the chassis to which they are committed, there are other places requiring such services and where they could be put to good use. The Main Roads Board are making a wonderful job of Stirling Highway. When completed it will perhaps be one of the finest thoroughfares in Australia, for its length. I wish, however, to protest against the disfigurement by the posts and overhead gear used for the trams. If one goes along the Leederville-road past Mr. Bolton's factory, where trolley buses are running, one can come to no other conclusion than that the whole thing is a ramp to benefit the State Sawmills. Along Stirling Highway it is proposed not to leave a few poles up, but to erect a perfect forest of poles, and thus disfigure the whole thoroughfare. The same thing will apply to the Leederville route. I did not realise until recently how disfiguring the overhead gear really is. Having had to make frequent visits to the St. John of God Hospital I was able to examine some of the overhead network. One would assume it was intended to prevent the swallows from coming down on to the street or that its oval mesh was oval enough to keep rabbits out of Mr. Bolton's property. This overhead gear is far more unsightly than an ordinary rabbit-netting fence. There is a bulky, ugly look about it, and it constitutes a menace to the safety of the public. I protest against this work being carried on, and I trust that with the support of the House the Government will be induced to reconsider their decision. There is another injustice that should arouse indignation in the breasts of nearly every member of the House and every member of the community. What is it intended to do with the trolley bus extensions? Is it proposed to take them up to the police station at the top of the hill

where Claremont junctions with Cottesloe? I understand also that the trolley buses will run along King's Park-road into St. George's-terrace. I would point out that the charabancs have built up the whole of that business, and have done so under very difficult conditions. What do the Government propose to do with the owners of the buses that have pioneered this route? It will be a grave injustice to those people if they are displaced by the trolley bus service. Surely the Government have in mind some equitable treatment of those people.

Hon. A. Thomson: The trolley buses will drive them away.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I should like an assurance from the Chief Secretary that equity will be meted out to those who have established that form of transport. I would point out that through the Federal petrol tax the bus owners have provided a large sum of money for road construction on this route during the years they have been running. These people have also been allowed to build up large fleets of buses with which to carry passengers between Perth and Fremantle.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The employees must also be taken into consideration.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The business cannot be looked at favourably from any point of view.

Hon. A. Thomson: If the Government treat the bus owners as they have treated motorists in the country, they will simply shut up their concerns without any compensation.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: That is so important that it should come specially before Parliament, and members should ascertain whether the Government are right or wrong in their action. Most people think that the proposals of the Government are on a par with some other things that have happened in the last few years.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Dictators! Parliament has no say.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Generally speaking, the Speech gives some assurance of recovery, especially in most primary lines. That is supported by production generally, and by the income figures quoted in the last quarterly Statistical Abstract. As Mr. Bolton has said, we are not out of the wood yet. There is a drought in the North-West and the middle North, and according to the

latest reports, our wheat areas are also suffering badly. I can hardly express myself concerning the gravity of the position for those concerned in the North-West. In that part of the country we have many fine Western Australians who are pioneering and developing it, although cut off from the comforts of the city. They have suffered many hardships, and during the last two or three years have been stricken with drought. Notwithstanding all these disabilities, they have hardly complained once about their position. The two speeches which impressed me most on the Address-in-reply were those of Mr. Angelo and Mr. Holmes. The former dealt with the piracy of the white whalers and the Asiatic people who are encroaching on our rights and privileges in the North. He also dealt with the menace of invasion that is practically staring us in the face. Mr. Holmes dealt with the drought and leprosy cases. He had to restrain himself during his speech lest he alarm the community by giving full details. He wrote a report, but that is not yet available. I stand foursquare with members representing the North. One member said he had no desire to trespass on the territory of others, but I must stand behind the members for the North to assist them to secure for that part of the State the treatment it deserves. Our responsibilities towards it are great. We do not want to be charged with neglect of that territory, in the same way as the secessionists have charged the Eastern States with neglect of Western Australia. They are our own people in the North, who are suffering for their attempts to develop the North. We have charge of one-third of the whole of the Commonwealth. It is open to invasion, and the only safeguard we have is to people it. Unless some definite action is taken that part of the State will suffer still more severely, and sooner or later we shall lose it. If it is beyond our financial ability to do for the North what should be done, we should endeavour to arrange, either with the Federal Government or the British Government, to assume the responsibility.

Hon. G. Fraser: You will be getting a lot of recruits.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I now turn to the Statistical Abstract, which contains a good deal of useful information. I wish to stress some of these points, because many people in my province are badly affected, and have not received the support which

other sections of the primary producing community have had meted out to them. We find that the acreage under agriculture generally is better now than it was in 1927. Despite the bad years, we are not far behind the figures for 1934-35. In respect to areas under grass, we have shown an improvement from 128,000 acres in 1927 to 578,000 acres to-day. There is also an increase in the area of land cleared for agriculture. The figures for fallow are much the same now as they were last year. In the case of other crops, the area cleared is on the increase. For growing crops, the area of  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million acres is the same now as in 1927. Despite the low prices prevailing and the drought, the area under oats has increased to 447,000 acres. There has been an increase in the acreage every year since 1927.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That was necessary for stock purposes.

Hon. J. MACFARLANE: The acreage under barley has increased from 13,000 acres to 31,000 acres. There has been an increase every year. One hears many tales of the bad conditions for the agriculturists, and of the claims made upon the Government, but it is clear that things should not be quite as bad as they appear. These statistics show there has been an increase in the production of sidelines, which has been very helpful.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Barley values have been very low.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The increase in acreage proves that barley growing has been profitable.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Grain crops have been affected by the drought, and the State-wide average has fallen from 12.8 bushels to about  $9\frac{1}{2}$  bushels. In the case of oats, there has been an increase in the number of bushels to the acre, and the same has occurred in the case of barley. The yield of hay has averaged more than a ton to the acre over the last two years. Potatoes have increased. These sidelines are helpful to the wheat farmer. But the members for these districts have been making objections to the extension of river reclamation and water supplies which are a distinct necessity and have been saying that they have not been properly treated. We find that agricultural production has:



been very good, though in recent years it has decreased. In 1929-30 it amounted to over £12,000,000, while in 1934-35 it was between £8,000,000 and £9,000,000. In the pastoral areas production has dropped from £5,000,000 to £4,000,000. With regard to wheat there is a note in the table from which I am reading which indicates that the amount received includes £714,200 bonus on wheat produced in 1931-32; £436,145 in 1932-33; £639,493 in 1934; and £755,580 in 1934-35; a total of over £2,500,000 paid to the wheat farmers in bonuses. Compare this with the position of the pastoralists during the past two or three years who have been in a very parlous position, whose revenue has been cut to the bone.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is supplied by the Federal Government.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: But largely because the wheat industry has been making a great noise and has had those behind it who would see that they got the attention they sought. I want to ventilate the condition of another set of primary producers, many of whom are in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, namely the poultry, pig and milk producing interests, and compare the assistance meted out to them with that given to agriculture as represented by the wheat, hay, barley and oats farmers who have had railways built and have been given railway freight concessions in respect of fertilisers and the carriage of wheat, at the expense of people in the North—the pig, poultry and dairy men and goldfields settlers. The freight rates of the goldfields are so high that the markets there have gone almost completely to South Australia, owing to the fact that they are able to deliver their goods into Kalgoorlie at a much cheaper rate over the 1,000 miles of Federal railways and the 200 odd miles of South Australian railways at a less rate than we can from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie.

Member: The Commissioner of Railways denies that.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: We have only to go on the line to see it.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The goldfields people prefer South Australian products to ours for some reason or other.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: The wheat-growers have enjoyed favourable conditions at the expense of the people I have mentioned, particularly settlers on the goldfields

who have had to pay higher freight rates to enable the railways to pay. For 12 years wheat farmers averaged 5s. 6d. per bushel, reaching as high as 9s. I have every sympathy with them in their experience since 1931, but surely they can be expected to appreciate all that has been done for them in comparison with other primary producers of the State who have made frugality see them through, producers who, like those of my Province, have been always affected by the increased price of wheat, bounty fed by State and Federal Governments.

Member: The wheatgrower has not had the expense of producing wheat for six or seven years.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I agree. Are we not bolstering up that industry to an extent which is beyond reason? If there is no disturbance in Europe there will be the same amount of wheat produced and the same unprofitable conditions. It does not seem reasonable that railways should be extended and the production of wheat increased.

Hon. G. B. Wood: Do you suggest that we should withdraw the settlers from the north-eastern wheat belt?

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: I did not make that suggestion.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You will have to do one thing or the other.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: With further reference to the Milk Board. In "The Australian Milk and Dairy Products Journal" there are some "Milk Notes from here and there" in which, amongst other things, is set out the position in England. It shows that the English Milk Marketing Board declared pool prices for May as follows:—

Region.	Regional pool prices per gallon on account to nearest farthing.		
	d.		
Northern .. ..	8½		
North-Western .. ..	8½		
Eastern .. ..	9		
East Midland .. ..	8½		
West Midland .. ..	8½		
North Wales .. ..	8½		
South Wales .. ..	8½		
Southern .. ..	9¼		
Mid Western .. ..	8½		
Far Western .. ..	8½		
South Eastern .. ..	9½		

Under the heading of "Problems of Quantity" occurs the following:—

At the annual meeting of the English Board the chairman, in reviewing the second complete

year of the scheme, said that there had been an increase of 78½ million gallons in the volume of milk sold, and an increase of 4,106 in the number of contracts in operation. This tendency towards increasing supplies was a serious matter, and caused to some extent by the fact that stock-raising and cattle-feeding areas were turning over to dairy farming. This would create a real problem in efforts to hold the balance of agriculture in Great Britain and accumulative shortage in supplies of store cattle and dairy cows could be foreseen within a few years. Unless store cattle and beef producers could be encouraged to develop their own industries under a long-term Government policy, the milk-marketing scheme could not carry the burden of depression in British farming and continue to pay remunerative prices.

What applies to Great Britain applies to Western Australia because the placing of milk production on a highly profitable basis by the board would have its repercussions in over-supply and the position here would be the same as in England. Another matter is that of rural relief. Here again is an instance of unequal application, for while it is affording relief to the agriculturist, and rightly so, where it is necessary to hold a competent farmer who has met with adverse conditions on his property, it is doing great injury to another rural worker in the form of the country storekeeper. The storekeeper has to accept 2s. to 4s. in the pound for goods supplied which have actually enabled the favoured settler to remain on his holding for the years he has been there. Having established this form of compulsory repudiation, we find that the next suggestion is to apply the same conditions to secured accounts. A member of this Chamber headed a deputation to the Minister to put it into effect, and the secretary of the dairy section of the Primary Producers Association wrote to the Minister to fix the interest on Government accounts with settlers at a figure below that at which the Government can borrow. These are facts. I invite comparison between the position of the producers in the North and those in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. Recently two tragedies took place in one day among hard-working families engaged in egg production, and I have been assured that the increase in their costs was due to the higher price of wheat. There was no chance of the families making ends meet. I merely mention this to complete the comparison, and, if possible, secure some publicity and assistance for those to whom I have referred as having to carry on without obtaining that support they should have

after presenting their case to the Minister and the public.

Hon. G. B. Wood: The price of eggs needs to improve to make up for it.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Some of the conditions under which poultry raisers are working are better than before. London has been taking large quantities of eggs, and this has enabled a better price to be paid during the glut season, but owing to costs and other conditions such as the prices of wheat and offal, the industry has been rendered quite unprofitable and producers have been left in a very sad plight. So far they have received no assistance of any value that would give them encouragement for the future. As a final word, I wish to refer once more to the North-West. I regret to note that a new State vessel is about to be built. As one who is opposed to State enterprise, I strongly object to the Government building a new vessel, because their action is wrong in principle. I am satisfied that a subsidised service could bring immediate relief, whereas it will be necessary to wait 12 months before the new State boat can be put on the coast. Certainly an adequate service is required in order to retain the population in the North-West. It has often been said that the population of the North is diminishing, and the lack of a frequent and adequate service of well-found ships must contribute to this condition. I note that the returns of electoral enrolments for this Chamber show a loss of 69 electors in the North Province between 1934 and 1936. That is a very serious loss.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: There cannot be many left.

Hon. J. M. MACFARLANE: Such a loss in the number of valued citizens, such as electors of this House represent, is very significant, and we should all be prepared to assist the members for the North in any proposition they have to offer for the benefit of that area, which is a very great responsibility of the State. I support the motion.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

#### **BILL—WOOL (DRAFT ALLOWANCE PROHIBITION).**

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

*House adjourned at 9.34 p.m.*

# Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 15th September, 1936.

	PAGE
Address-in-reply, presentation ... ..	579
Motion, urgency—Grasshopper menace ... ..	579
Questions: Ports, expenditure, etc. ... ..	583
State insurance ... ..	583
Wire netting ... ..	583
Bills: Electoral Act Amendment, 1A. ... ..	584
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1A. ... ..	584
Wool (Draft Allowance Prohibition), 3A. ... ..	584
Petroleum, 2A. ... ..	584
Estimates, Com. of Supply ... ..	588

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

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

### Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to announce that, with the member for Kalgoorlie, Mr. Styants, I attended upon His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech. His Excellency replied in the following terms:—

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament. (Sgd.) James Mitchell, Lieutenant-Governor.

## MOTION—URGENCY.

### Grasshopper Menace.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the member for Mt Marshall (Mr. Warner):—

I desire to inform you that it is my intention at the sitting of the House to-day to move, under Standing Order 47A, "That the House do now adjourn" to call attention to the inadequate measures being taken by the Government to cope with the grasshopper menace, particularly in the north-eastern wheat belt.

It will be necessary for seven members to rise in their places to support the proposal.

Seven members having risen in their places,

MR. WARNER (Mt. Marshall) [4.36]: I realise the seriousness of the step I am taking in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss this matter, but I will endeavour to explain my action clearly, without detaining the House unnecessarily, but at the same time showing that I am

justified in the course that I have adopted in calling attention to the grasshopper menace. It is not only in the north-eastern wheat belt where the grasshopper plague is taking its toll, but I shall content myself with dealing with the inadequate measures being taken by the Government in the Mt. Marshall electorate, leaving the members of other districts to voice their views as to satisfaction or otherwise concerning their districts. The grasshopper plague is a far greater danger than the public in general are aware of, and a greater menace than the Government are prepared to admit. I desire to acquaint members with facts to prove that the measures being taken to deal with the pest will prove a hopeless failure, and also that the peculiar attitude of the Government is tantamount to telling the farmers to deal with this national menace, though it is beyond their capabilities to do so. I am not inclined, nor do I desire, to be offensive in any of my remarks, but I do intend to let the House know the manner in which the Government are being criticised by the farmers for sheer neglect in dealing with a matter that may mean a loss of millions of pounds to our State, which loss could be avoided if proper methods were adopted. There is no excuse whatever for the Ministers concerned to say that they are not in possession of the facts. I have before me a file containing copies of inward and outward correspondence dealing with the matter over a period of a year. This matter has been taken up not only by me but also by the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle), the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie (Mr. Lambert) and also the members for East Province, Messrs. Baxter, Hamersley and Wood. There are numerous letters and copies of resolutions passed by various bodies such as road boards, agricultural societies, branches of the Primary Producers' Association and the Wheatgrowers' Union, and the executives of the two last-named bodies. The correspondence before me and that which has passed through the hands of Ministers, plus the various Press items, prove that the Government are well aware of the position, and yet they treat the matter with such small concern that the Minister for Agriculture has been left with the paltry sum of, I believe, £2,000 to deal with the pest this year. Had the amount been in the vicinity of £20,000, it would not have been too much to expend in the endeavour to cope with the menace. The grasshopper pest might mean the