

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

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

*In Committee, etc.*

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

Read a third time and *passed*.

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 8th August, 1935.

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

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

**QUESTION—RAILWAYS, MADDINGTON CROSSING.**

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

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

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

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE.**

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

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

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

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

pests are not confined to the wheat belt. They are creating a problem throughout the State, and farmers in the Great Southern and South-Western portions of the State are suffering just as those in the wheat belt are suffering. The duty of the Government is to legislate for the whole of the community, and one wonders what would happen if a Government were formed composed of Country Party members and they gave effect merely to the views that have been expressed by speakers so far. I have felt somewhat concerned about the Country Party, as a party. True, they may be elected by the primary producers' party, but I often wonder why two parties are necessary. The primary producers' party should represent the whole of the primary production of the State, and I do not think the Country Party can claim to do that, because they have their eyes turned in one direction only. Primary producers in this State raise many commodities other than wheat and wool. Reference was made by the Acting Leader of the Opposition to reciprocal trade with other countries. He seemed to think that if we bought more freely the goods of Japan, we could sell still more wheat to Japan. What articles of great value are being imported into Western Australia from Japan? What proportion of our commodities taken by Japan are not really required by her? I do not know of any nation that is buying Australian produce for a reason other than that that nation requires it. The same may be said of the Motherland, to whom we owe so much in the way of interest commitments. The Mother Country should be prepared to give us greater preference in the marketing of our produce to enable us to pay our debts, but everyone knows that if the wheat produced in foreign countries is cheaper than Australian wheat, England buys the cheaper commodity and reciprocal trade does not enter into consideration at all. We buy a considerable quantity of goods from America, but I do not know what America takes from us in return. I think we should concentrate efforts upon securing outlets for commodities produced in Western Australia which might not already have found markets in other countries. The raising of various commodities should be fostered by the Government with a view to building up an export trade with other countries. One member of the Country Party, the member for Avon, rather complained of the enor-

mous sum of money sent to India for jute goods. What primary product do we send to India in return, apart from timber, that would justify the importation of that jute? The Acting Leader of the Opposition complained of work being provided for unemployed in the metropolitan area, and thought that a greater amount of work should be provided in the country districts. Does it matter a great deal whether the money is spent in the metropolitan area or in the country, so long as it is used to provide work and give people the wherewithal to purchase the commodities raised by our primary producers? If we can provide reproductive works in the metropolitan area on which hundreds of men might be employed who otherwise would be out of work, is not that better than having a few men scattered over odd jobs throughout the country areas? Primary production in Western Australia covers a very wide range. It does not stop at the raising of wheat and wool. It also embraces the production of timber, gold, coal, butter fat and general dairy products, not forgetting fruit and wine.

Mr. Patrick: And canned fruit.

Mr. WITHERS: That, too is a primary industry, though a small one. What we need is something along the lines suggested by the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) last night when he spoke of hens so prolific that they would lay 365 eggs a year. I do not know whether he actually complained of the hen that laid only 14 eggs and then became broody, but even that hen would have the instinct of reproducing the species.

Mr. Thorn: The incubator could do that.

Mr. WITHERS: And if the human species were reproduced sufficiently to consume the produce raised in this State, we should not have to worry so much about overseas markets, which are a great bugbear at present. Really we are at the mercy of overseas markets for the disposal of the commodities I have enumerated. Take the case of wheat. It would not advantage this country to go in for greater production of wheat if there were no demand overseas for the additional quantity. The same thing applies to butter, and also to reciprocal trade in general. England, a great consumer of butter, does not consider the position of Western Australia or that of Australia, but considers her own position. She can obtain Danish butter right at her doors, and Danish butter may suit the Eng-

lish palate better than Australian butter has done up to date. Nevertheless England pays 14s. per cwt. more, on the average, for Danish than for Australian butter. Fortunately for our butter industry, an Act of Parliament was passed last session creating a board to control the marketing of the product. If the board function as anticipated, they will be a wonderful help to the primary producers of the South-West and the South, inasmuch as there will be a stabilised price for butter throughout the year, and we shall consume our own product all the year round instead of exporting butter during the flush period at a loss and then importing it at a higher price during the lean period. Something in the same direction might be done for wheat if we could stabilise the price of the commodity and adopt organised marketing, of which we heard last night. Wheat, however, is produced in such abundance that even at the figure mentioned by the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle), 3s. per bushel, we would not be justified in promoting the expansion of wheatgrowing if we had to rely on the oversea market for the disposal of the surplus. Nevertheless there is something to be said in favour of the proposal. Timber, gold, coal, butter, fruit and other commodities are all primary products: and we should not regard the primary producers solely from the farmer's point of view. Timber, as we know, has been a wonderful asset to Western Australia. The industry had its period of decline: but three or four years ago, during the peak period, before the depression, though the tonnage of timber carried over our railways was less than the tonnage of wheat, yet the revenue earned from the transport of timber was considerably higher than that received from the transport of wheat. The timber industry is coming back into its own: and that beneficial change is due to the present Government's action in reducing railway freight and royalty, thus encouraging the industry to take its place again in the markets of the world. If that can be achieved, surely it will be a national benefit. That is the national view we should take of that commodity. Again, there is coal. To-day we use locally about 100 per cent. of our production of coal. Western Australia consumes practically the whole of its own coal output. If only we could recover the bunkering trade we had 15 or 20 years ago, our coal industry, in view of the present local market, would

become a great factor in the rehabilitation of Western Australia. The fact of our having this coal, and the further fact of the Western Australian people utilising their own product, are certainly helping the other primary producers of this country—for instance, those who are producing the food-stuffs which the coal miners consume. When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition stated that the Government were not in sympathy with the farmer, I found it hard to understand whence the hon. gentleman could have derived that impression. I would like the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman in particular, to understand that although it is said the Labour Party have only the interests of the workers at heart, yet it is the first duty of a Labour Administration to see that the working-class people are found work. How can a Labour Administration do that? By industrial legislation? No. The only means of finding work for the workers in a primary producing State is to look after the primary industries—not wheat and wool only, but every primary product of the State. All such products should be fostered and assisted by a Labour Administration as much as, if not more than, by Administrations of any other political complexion, because the effect of such a policy is to provide work for the working classes.

Mr. Warner: What work would you find for the farmer who is taken off his holding?

Mr. WITHERS: We should give consideration to the farmer in common with every other primary producer in Western Australia. If all the farmers walked off their land and the State Government did not have a farming outlook and proceed to assist them, where would work be obtained for other sections? Is it not evident that we must look after the primary producers first of all, in order that the workers generally may receive consideration? In regard to gold as a primary product, none of us needs telling what a wonderful factor gold has been during the last two or three years. Fortunately for Western Australia, with the decline of one industry we have the resuscitation of another. Upon receiving a copy of the London "Financial Times" by mail yesterday, I wondered why the paper had been sent to members of this Parliament. However, the reason becomes plain when one reads the report of what Mr. John Agnew said concerning the future of Western Australian gold mining at a

dinner tendered to our Minister for Mines, Mr. Munsie, who is visiting England for the purpose of encouraging investment from the Old Land. Mr. Munsie had no occasion to skite. The truth is not skite. It is not my practice to read newspapers in the Chamber, that practice being objectionable in some circumstances; but this report is worthy of attention. Mr. Agnew is reported as saying—

There had been two Labour Governments in Western Australia in the last few years, in both of which their guest held office. During the first of those Parliaments there occurred one or two important events which, he thought, might fairly claim to have marked the turn of the tide insofar as the prosperity of the mining industry was concerned. He referred to the taking-up, on behalf of certain English groups, of the Wiluna property, and to the placing at the disposal of the Lake View and Star Company, for the purpose of trying to put that property on its feet, of a very considerable sum of money, also by the same groups. He mentioned those factors as probably being the starting point in turning the tide in the direction of Western Australia's prosperity.

Those remarks concerning the Labour Government come from the representative of one of the greatest financial institutions in the world. Credit is given by that gentleman to the Labour Government who, we are told here, have not the interests of the primary producers of Western Australia at heart. It must be realised that the visit of Mr. Munsie to London, where he has convinced a man like Mr. Agnew of what the Labour Government have done for the mining industry of this State, has had the effect of putting back into that industry thousands of men who will become consumers of Western Australian products. Is it not to the advantage of other primary producers that the mining industry should be encouraged?

Mr. Sampson: It is very unbecoming that you should show such surprise!

Mr. WITHERS: I am surprised that hon. members opposite are not surprised. I resume quotation from the "Financial Times"—

So far as the Wiluna property was concerned, it was very nearly a virgin mine, with an extremely difficult metallurgical problem facing the company, and the mine itself was situated something like 200 miles from the nearest railway. One of the first steps taken immediately after an intensive development campaign was instituted, was to sound the Government of the day as to the possibility of the railway being extended to Wiluna. The company was advised that so soon as it satisfied the Government that it had raised not

less than £400,000 for equipment and further development, the Government would commence the railway from Meekatharra, and push on with all speed. That Government was one in which Mr. Munsie held office as Minister for Mines. The railway was commenced within a very short time, and was speedily constructed. In addition, the Government spent something like £200,000 at the port of Geraldton, a port which he was safe in saying would scarcely have had that much attention paid to it had it not been for the development and equipment of the Wiluna mine itself.

All this money has been expended at Geraldton to bring the harbour up to what it is to-day for the benefit of other primary producers in the back country. In future the primary producers of the Geraldton district will enjoy the advantage of that harbour, which would not have been available had the Labour Party held the same view as the Country Party have enunciated here during the past two days—to look after only one class of production. If we have regard for our primary producers as a whole, we must do something more than merely look after the man on the land.

At a later stage in the history of operations at Wiluna, when it was found that the company had very materially outrun the constable, it required a further £300,000, in addition to the very large sum which had been provided by shareholders. The Government of the Commonwealth was approached in order to ascertain if it would be prepared to guarantee an advance of this amount by one of the London banks, and it was only prepared to do so if the Western Australian Government in turn guaranteed the Federal Government against any loss. The Western Australian Government promptly accepted this responsibility without hesitation.

We know what happened in connection with that guarantee. There is no necessity for me to read the whole of the report of Mr. Agnew's speech. I well remember the discussion here on the subject of the guarantee. I well remember the Labour Government of the day being condemned by Sir James Mitchell and his then followers for giving a backing to this particular concession. It has turned out trumps, and had it not been for the backing of the Labour Government, the State would not have secured that advantage. I do not desire to trespass any further on the preserves of goldfields members, for I feel I have gone far enough already. As a representative of a primary producing district and being interested in other primary producing districts throughout the South-West, I claim I have every right to make out a case for the primary

producers in this Chamber and also to stress what the present Government have done to assist the men on the land. It is unnecessary to go into past history, but I could draw the attention of members to what happened in 1914, when the development of the wheat belt was in its early stages. People were advised to go on the land and they were rushed out in all directions. When the subsequent crisis developed, it fell to the lot of the Labour Party to prove their ability to serve the agriculturists by making it possible for them to remain on their holdings during that trying period. For 4½ years, the Labour Government were in office and throughout that time they continued materially to assist the farmers and prevent them from suffering undue distress. Then later on the group settlements were inaugurated by the Mitchell Government, in much the same manner as the wheat belt development was commenced. When a similar fate seemed imminent, it was again left to the Labour Government to go to the assistance of the settlers and endeavour, over a period of years, to enable them to carry on what appeared to be an almost impossible proposition. During the term of office of the Labour Government who are now in office, they have paid considerable attention to the provision of water supplies in the agricultural districts where those requisites were lacking. I think that when the Hon. J. Cunningham was Minister for Country Water Supplies, he established a record with regard to the provision of those facilities in the rural areas. I do not think any other Government could claim to have done more for the primary producers than the present Administration. Then there is the question of the disposal of poultry, eggs and all other forms of primary production that should find a place in markets overseas. It will be appreciated that quite a considerable proportion of the production of this State falls within that category. Activities along those lines are mostly confined to the Great Southern and South Western portions of the State, which largely consist of natural dairying country. I have here a copy of the latest balance sheet of the South-West Dairy Farmers Co-operative Co. That is one form of our industrial development that has received consideration at the hands of Labour Governments, for assistance has been rendered financially and this particular com-

pany was assisted to secure possession of the Busselton butter factory, in addition to other factories under its control. The balance sheet shows that during the 12 months under review butter fat advances to farmers in the South-West represented £188,943 and a profit of £30,000 was shown on the operations of the company.

Mr. Brockman: How many factories did that refer to?

Mr. WITHERS: The company controlled five factories. Out of the profit of £30,000 a bonus was paid on the turnover for the 12 months and the butter fat bonus paid out in that way represented £29,684. That was a very nice little sum for the producers to have handed to them at the end of the season.

Mr. Brockman: Would it not have been better if the money had been paid to the producers month by month, so that they could top dress their holdings?

Mr. WITHERS: I do not desire to enter into any controversy on that question. It will be conceded that all farmers are not always thrifty. If monthly payments were made to them, it is quite possible that the money would be frittered away and at the end of the 12 months they would not be any better off. On the other hand, if the money accumulated and was handed over to them in a lump sum of £50 or so, it would represent quite a nice egg for those to whom it was paid. In my opinion the dairy farmers, or at any rate a percentage of them, cannot be regarded as thrifty enough to warrant the monthly payments suggested by the member for Sussex (Mr. Brockman). However, that is apart from the main question; it is a matter that purely concerns the South-West Dairy Farmers' Co-operative Company and their shareholders. Surely it will be realised that the operations of the company and similar organisations have been beneficial to the State. A further reference to the balance sheet shows that on the transport of cream £12,739 was spent, while marketing expenses amounted to £11,756; cartage, metropolitan cartage, insurance, butter cutting and grading, and so forth accounted for another £12,000. The whole of the expenses amounted to £29,532. Administrative expenses, which related to the staff, accounted for £8,500, the total expended under all headings being about £64,000. That will be accepted as a large amount of money to be distributed by this

one concern in one section of industry in the South-West. Butter sales, including the bounty and equalisation charges, amounted to £283,059, which is a very fine record. When we realise that we have such an industry in the State creating so much work, it must be generally considered that it is of great benefit to the State. Before concluding my remarks regarding the attitude of the Labour Government towards the men on the land, I think I am justified in referring to the Labour Party as a whole. Members of that party subscribe to a general political platform, and ever since I can remember, that platform has always included our agricultural policy. That was done long before there was any such organisation as the Country Party.

Mr. Needham: And Labour has given effect to its agricultural policy.

Mr. WITHERS: That is so. Many of our proposals have found a place on the statute book and if other measures had been allowed to pass by the Legislative Council, the position of the agriculturists would have been much better to-day. I know of at least two planks of the Country Party's platform that were copied from the agricultural section of the Labour Party's platform. I have before me a copy of the proceedings of a conference that took place in 1911 in the Bedford Hall at Bunbury. Among those who attended was at least one member of this Chamber, the Hon. W. D. Johnson, and quite a number of old stalwarts of Labour. Even as far back as that, Labour had the welfare of the men on the land at heart, and realised that it was essential to provide for the well-being of the farmers in order that the general prosperity of the State might be promoted. Dealing now briefly with the Railways, I have been inclined in past years to be critical of railway administration because of what I considered its lack of initiative, particularly with regard to the neglect to cope with the motor competition in the early stages and finally having to come to Parliament for an Act to enable them to deal with the position. I am pleased that on this occasion my remarks will be in a somewhat different category. I realise that the Railways are making strides with the help of the Transport Board, to the work of which I shall refer later on. From the commencement of the depression, the policy during the Mitchell Government's regime was to postpone every item of expenditure that was possible.

The effect of that was to throw out of employment thousands of men who were formerly with the Railways. Members will realise what an effect that must have had, in turn, on the primary producers. When the Labour Government assumed office at the end of that Government's term, they were met with much the same position as they encountered in 1904. The rolling stock was out of repair, obsolescence was apparent everywhere, rails required attention, and, taken generally, the Labour Government were forced to spend thousands of pounds to bring the Railways back to the standard of efficiency the public were entitled to expect. During the latest three years of the Mitchell Government's regime the same condition again applied, and railway rolling stock and plant lapsed again into a state of disrepair. The Government reduced the loss on the Railways from £170,000 in 1922-23, to one of less than £100,000 in 1934-35 and provided, in addition, £1,000 to overtake arrears. That is a big achievement. I am pleased to see by the department's report that tenders have been called for rail cars to replace mixed trains on country lines. That is one of the improvements I have advocated in this House from time to time. It is a step in the right direction, and as a result country people will get a better service, while the Railway Department will be amply repaid the expenditure. For many years have I been concerned at the method of letting tenders for refreshment rooms on railway stations. I have had long experience of using the tea and coffee refreshment rooms, which generally are well patronised by passengers on the trains. But I am sorry to say that along the South-West line we appear to have but the one successful tenderer and the same service is meted out to us every time he secures a tender. I understood that change had taken place, but when I visited the refreshment room at Pinjarra I found there the same old unsatisfactory service. If nothing better can be provided by private tenderers it is time the department itself took over the refreshment rooms and gave the travelling public a decent service.

The Minister for Railways: There is likely to be an improvement now.

Mr. WITHERS: I am glad to hear it. During the previous term of the present Government we went in largely for reballasting, regrouting, relaying and resleeping the railways. That was of great advantage

to the department, because in consequence the engines could haul much greater loads. During the present regime of this Government the same policy has been carried out, providing useful work for a large number of men who would otherwise be unemployed. The alterations and repairs being carried out on the Collie line will make an enormous difference, for they will do away with the congestion previously experienced, and one engine will be able to haul a load that previously required the power of two engines. That is a very big improvement, and there is no denying that the work should have been undertaken by previous Governments. Wheat carried on the railways this year amounts to 27 per cent. of the total haulage, while timber represents  $11\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. We are hopeful that in future wheat and timber will both increase, for each is of considerable value to the State. It is pleasing to note in the Speech that the Education Vote has been increased by £60,000, as against the expenditure in the last year of the previous Government's regime. Not only that, but the expenditure on school buildings has been increased from £10,000 to £54,000, exclusive of the £70,000 being spent on the new girls' school at East Perth. Just compare that with the attitude of the previous Government, who cut down expenditure in all directions, closed the Teachers' Training College, and suspended long service leave of the teachers and also their goldfields allowances. Although we have so largely increased direct expenditure under the Education Vote, we have also restored those privileges to the teachers and re-opened the Teachers' Training College, so that we may have sufficient trainees to take the place of older men when they retire from the service. There are certain phases of education that appeal strongly to some of us. For instance I have always been in favour of the boys getting some manual training, and the girls a domestic course. Both those advantages have been provided in the metropolitan area and the bigger centres and now, through the sympathy of the Minister and with the assistance of the Acting Director of Education, those privileges are to be extended to the larger centres in country areas. Some teachers are now being trained in domestic science in order that they might take up schools where domestic science is being taught.

Mr. Doney: Domestic science has been taught in country centres for years past.

Mr. WITHERS: I should not think you would call Narrogin a country centre. I thought it was a town. Of course we have had that advantage in the bigger towns for years past, but the smaller centres have not had it. What is good for the child at Narrogin is equally good for the child at Mukinbudin or Kondinin.

Mr. Seward: They cannot get it in Kondinin.

Mr. WITHERS: It is, I understand, a mere matter of money. The principle has been started of training girl teachers who are prepared to take the domestic science course and give the children the advantage of their training on one day a week. If the money can be made available, no doubt we shall see that system continued.

Mr. Doney: Tell us what new domestic science centres have been opened up in the country.

Mr. WITHERS: There is one at Harvey. I cannot recall them all, but I know I have been advocating the extension of the principle to Capel and Boyanup. I am assured that if the local authorities are prepared to equip the schools with the necessary sheds and that sort of thing, the Education Department may provide teachers capable of giving instruction in domestic science.

Mr. Doney: That is quite a different thing—letting the local authorities provide the equipment.

Mr. WITHERS: It is entirely a matter of finance, and the Government have already increased the Education Vote by £60,000. I hope the time will come when the department will be able to do everything necessary in the matter of domestic science. In my electorate are many small schools, and I say they are all entitled to consideration in that direction. I should like to refer to the hospitals tax. Members know that when originally the Hospitals Tax Act was passed, it carried an exemption of £232: that is to say, everybody had to pay the tax, but those in receipt of less than £232 would not be asked to pay hospital fees if unfortunately they had to enter a hospital. But the member for York, when Minister for Health, brought down an amending Bill which he said was simply for the purpose of catching the man with the bank account who had not earned so much in the previous year. Those people, he said, should be asked to pay the tax. I agreed with that, but I said the Bill would catch all those whom it had been

intended to exempt. The Minister said it was not so, but we have since learnt that apparently he did not understand his own Bill. As the result of that amendment, everybody who enters a hospital is asked to pay the fees. I am not blaming the Medical Department for this, but I am blaming the House for having passed a Bill that has put so much work on the department endeavouring to collect fees from people who have no means of making payment. Then those harassed people come to the member for the district, and he has to explain the whole position to them. The Act says that everybody has to pay the tax and, if necessary, pay hospital fees also. In my view, the men on the lower rung of the financial ladder should not be called upon to pay hospital fees after they have paid the hospital tax. We are told that the payments are for the maintenance of hospitals, which means, in effect, that although you have paid the tax, if the department think you are in a position to pay hospital fees, they insist upon your doing so. That position requires to be investigated with a view to an amendment of the Act which would give us a line of demarcation, so that those below the financial mark will not have to pay.

Mr. Thorn: At present they have to prove they cannot pay.

Mr. WITHERS: Yes. When the member for York, as Minister for Health, put through the amending Bill, he declared it would not have this effect, but we know that it has. When the Transport Co-ordination Bill went through this House, we were told that the magistrates and courts would not press this or press that. We accepted those remarks made by the Minister in charge of the Bill. Those who are appointed to administer an Act have to do so according to the Act. In connection with this particular piece of legislation, there have been many pin pricks. Many things have been done that, in the opinion of members, may never have been thought to be intended. The board in question is apparently all-powerful; private individuals perhaps cannot get into touch with that tribunal, and have to go to their member so that he may make the necessary representations. In many cases, a good deal of explanation is required. The board may state that Section 33 of the Act says such and such a thing and that it is impos-

sible to go beyond that. I do not think it was intended that the board should function entirely as it is now functioning. When Bills come before us, I trust we shall see that we are more definite about the meaning of certain clauses before we are perhaps gulled into passing them. I admit the Transport Board have done wonderful work and that the representation upon it is all it ought to be. When we pass a Bill giving people certain power, we should see that the powers do not exceed those we thought were given. Possibly the same thing applies to the Agricultural Bank. Last night both the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) and the member for Toodyay (Mr. Thorn) referred to this matter. As regards my own district, the settlers seem to be at sixes and sevens because of the way the Act functions. Last night the member for Toodyay said the commissioners had placed a brick wall around themselves. It was this House which put the brick wall around them. We passed the Bill, and have kept ourselves out. That affords another instance of how necessary it is to look ahead. The Act may relieve members of Parliament of the responsibility for all time of going to the commissioners, when there should be officers of the Bank capable of doing the work that members were doing. I hope the commissioners will be in the position before long to prove to the settlers the value of the Act, so that those who come to curse will remain to praise. I trust that those who survive the Act will after a while be thankful to Parliament for bringing down such a piece of legislation. At any rate, the Bank is now outside all political control. I feel that my speech on the Address-in-reply would not, after a period of 12 years during which I have occupied a seat in this Chamber, be complete without a reference to the Bunbury harbour. I have, however, a different tune to produce this time. In 1930-31, I was responsible for asking certain questions in the House. For once I knew what I was talking about. I possessed certain knowledge which prompted me to ask those questions. I asked first what engineer, if any, was responsible for seeing that the Bunbury jetty was maintained in a safe condition to carry railway rolling stock. Secondly I asked what inspection by any engineer had been made during the previous 12 months, and, if any had been made, what



he had reported; and thirdly I asked that if no inspection had been made, whether the Chief Secretary would see that an inspection was made at an early date, and that the report was made available. To the first question the Chief Secretary answered that the Engineer-in-Chief was the consulting engineer for the Bunbury harbour, or in his absence the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers, attached to the Public Works Department. The answer to the second question was in the negative. In answer to the third question, the Chief Secretary replied in the affirmative, indicating that an inspection would be made if a request was preferred by the Bunbury Harbour Board, or by the State Railway Department. I would point out that the Railway Department do not control the jetty, and therefore perhaps could not ask for a survey of it to be made by the Engineer-in-Chief. The Chief Secretary is now the Leader of the National Party in this House. At the time when I asked the questions, some men had been put off maintenance work on the jetty. That was one of the reasons why I brought up the matter. I thought it a foolish policy on the part of the Bunbury Harbour Board or the Government to put off five men from work that was crumbling into decay. I knew what I was talking about, and I asked the questions with a view to protecting the rolling stock of the Railway Department. I was told in the House that I was only washing dirty linen. I was castigated by the local Press, and was told I was only trying to get at the Bunbury Harbour Board and certain reputable and respectable citizens in Bunbury. I was asked why I was doing this. Eventually I had a committee of inquiry appointed. Three gentlemen visited Bunbury and investigated the matter. I received a report to the effect that the Bunbury jetty at that time was in a better condition than it had been for years. If that was so, it must have been in a bad state before. Quite recently, some three years after, I was told that an engineer was in Bunbury making a survey of the jetty. I asked why this was so, and was almost told to hush the matter up, because if the Railway Department knew the position they would not run rolling stock over the jetty. The Mitchell Government were not prepared to look after the jetty, as was suggested. Not only should the five men have been kept on doing the maintenance work, but

others should have been put on so that it might have been maintained in a decent condition. When an investigation was made recently, so bad was the position disclosed that the Minister controlling the department was informed of it. The Government then had to find £27,000 to rehabilitate the structure, a structure which I was informed was in wonderful condition three years ago. I merely mention these details to justify my action on that occasion. Provision has been made for the expenditure of £4,000 to the end of June, and it will take about three years to restore the jetty to its proper condition. If the five men had been kept on and a few other men employed, and a little money spent in maintaining the jetty, it would not cost the country nearly as much to put it in repair to-day. Every time the Labour Government take office they are confronted with the task of cleaning up the mess that has been left for them by some other Government. I could say a lot more in congratulating the Government upon what they have done for the benefit of the State. I have no desire to use this occasion for electioneering purposes, and merely wish to extend my gratitude to the Government for what they have done for my district. I hope that in the future Western Australia will receive the same consideration that every section of the community has always received at the hands of the Labour Government.

**MR. CLOTHIER** (Maylands) [5.40]: I congratulate the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) and the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox) upon their election, and the Minister for Agriculture (Hon. F. J. S. Wise) upon his promotion to Cabinet rank. I know the school at which the Minister was educated in Queensland. I have been told by correspondents of that gentleman's ability. Members opposite need have no fear but that he is the right man in the right place. I listened attentively to the Speech, and noted the difference between it and the last Speech concerning the progress of the dairying and mining industries, and the relief of unemployment. I am at a loss to understand the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition the other night when he said he noticed no difference at all.

Mr. Wilson: He could not see the difference.

Mr. CLOTHIER: He must know that 2,000 men have been taken off relief work and absorbed into private enterprise. Surely that is of importance to the State. From the statistical figures we find we are getting back to the 1929 position. I am at a loss to know why the hon. member made those remarks. The Government have effected remarkable improvements in the last two years. We know that the deficit last year was reduced to £167,000 odd. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may laugh, but that is the truth. Two years ago the Press made unemployment their principal topic, but to-day it is hardly ever mentioned. In fact, one of the leading articles of the "West Australian" congratulated the Minister for Employment on the work he was doing. As a new member, I took particular notice of the position. I am sure that at the next elections members of the Country Party will have very little to say against the Government. Last session was practically a primary producers' session. We have only to remember the number of Bills that were passed, all designed to help primary industries. It will be very hard for members of the Country Party, in the face of what the Government have done, to go before their electors with anything tangible. I need only mention the Agricultural Bank Act, the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, the Land Act, and the Dairy Products Act. There is very little left for them to say, unless they refer to the growing of crops with which to feed the people of the metropolitan area. Reference was made to education. It is pleasing to see that money is being spent in that direction. Last year I referred to the University and to the need for a medical school. I could not make out why so many young men left the State for the Eastern States, and on their return here went to hospitals as students. In the "West Australian" recently I found the following:—

The need for the establishment of a medical school in Perth was emphasised yesterday by Professor W. Burridge, Professor of Physiology in the University of Lucknow, who is visiting Australia during vacation.

Professor Burridge said that there were about 330 doctors in Western Australia, and a doctor's professional life was estimated on an average to be about 25 years. These figures indicated the need of the State for from 15 to 16 doctors each year. As a fact, he understood that 16 doctors came to Western Australia every year. In England it used to cost about £1,000 to train a doctor before the war, and he expected that in Australia it would now

cost about £1,500 to take a doctor through the course of training. This represented an expenditure of about £250 a year. At present medical students could do their first year's work at the University of Western Australia, but then they went to the medical schools in Adelaide, Melbourne or Sydney. About 18 students took first-year medicine each year at the University of Western Australia; therefore the loss to the State resulting from the fact that students had to continue their medical studies in other States was about £4,500 a year.

This estimate of cost, Professor Burridge continued, included provision for University fees. The University of Western Australia, he understood, did not charge fees in the accepted sense of the word. It was presumed that if 18 students began a medical course at the University of Western Australia, knowing that they would have to continue their training elsewhere after the first year, their parents were prepared to pay for that training. In England a medical student had to pay between £50 and £80 a year.

A medical school would have to be established ultimately in the University of Western Australia, said the Professor. All the requirements for clinical training of medical students existed in Perth. The hospitals were satisfactory, and there were medical men in the city fitted to take charge of a medical school and to conduct the various departments. The Perth Hospital took a number of doctors each year, and now all the appointments had to be filled by students trained in other States. If a school were established some at least of the graduates would serve at the Perth Hospital. A medical school should consist of Professors of Anatomy, Pathology and Physiology and part-time lectures in surgery, medicine and public health. It would be necessary to provide training in all these branches of medical science, for it would be better to have no medical school at all than to establish one which was not efficient. Regard must always be paid to the fact that a medical school trained men to care for the health of the people in a community, and therefore no training could be too good.

"A medical school which takes 18 new students each year is a small institution compared with the majority of medical schools," added Professor Burridge. "It would not, however, be the smallest medical school. I know of a medical school which takes ten students every three years. That medical school is in Malta, which has a population of 250,000. The school is subsidised by the Government, and all the professors are government servants. There is certainly a need for a medical school in Perth. Buildings and equipment are the first necessity, but having got those things you have everything else in this community with which to establish a good medical school."

I do hope that what is suggested in that statement will materialise. It does not seem right that all our young men should go to the Eastern States to complete their education, and then return to obtain practical experience here. There has been a good deal of controversy with reference to sus-

tenance workers. I think there will be sustenance work for all time, unless an alteration is made in the working hours. I am a great believer in a 40-hour week with no reduction in pay. It is no use reducing wages because so soon as we do that we take away a good deal of purchasing power from the individual. The time is coming when we shall have to introduce a shorter working week. At present all our workers are not engaged on full time; I should like to see them working full time but unfortunately our finances will not permit of that. The number of factories in Western Australia increased in two years by 197, and the number of employees by 3,671. That in itself goes to show that there is an improvement in that direction, and I hope the Deputy Leader of the Country Party will bear those figures in mind. If the men engaged in the factories worked 40 hours, it would be possible for an additional number to secure employment. The question of preference to unionists is rather a sore point with everybody, though not with me. We are doing our utmost to induce people to buy locally-made goods, and yet a lot of the producers of local goods are employing non-union labour. If it is good enough to boost the purchase of local products, it should be good enough for the producers to employ union labour. The employment of youth is another matter than has engaged public attention for a considerable time. We learn that in the building trade there is no chance for the employment of lads. Unfortunately, the Bill introduced by the member for Subiaco last year did not pass another place. It is to be hoped that with its restoration to the Notice Paper in the Legislative Council this session it will soon afterwards become law. The condition of the building trade is anything but satisfactory. A contractor will secure a job to build a house and he sublets the foundations to foreigners and perhaps the erection of the walls is also sublet. Consequently, there is no chance for apprentices. None of these so-called contractors can find any room for apprentices because there is no work for them to do. Another matter to which I wish to draw attention relates to the tramway system of Perth. The steps of most of the tramcars are unnecessarily high and it is a difficult matter for many people, particularly elderly women, to board those trams. The Minister for Railways should see to it that entrance and exit to the cars are made

easier. This could be done by increasing the number of steps to two.

Mr. Patrick: The steps are too high for elderly people.

The Premier: Even too high for some young people.

Mr. CLOTHIER: Another matter to which the Minister for Railways might give his attention is the distinction that is made between first and second class passengers on the Trans. train. We read only a few days ago that the Railway Department intend to supply hot water bags for first-class passengers. Nothing, however, is proposed for the second class passengers who, in many instances, have to sit up all night. It is not right that the comfort of first-class passengers should be studied in this way, while the second-class passengers should be allowed to shiver in the cold weather. In the Melbourne to Adelaide express I noticed as many as eight or nine people seated in a second-class compartment. Thank goodness our railways are an improvement on that. All the same, there should not be so much distinction between first and second-class passengers.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The only difference is that the second-class passenger does not pay as much as the first-class passenger.

Mr. CLOTHIER: I am glad to see that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill to deal with third party insurance. I shall have a good deal to say about that when the Bill comes forward, especially as I am anxious to see that it is brought about by reason of my being interested in an accident that occurred in Melbourne a little time back. With reference to the electorate I represent, I am grateful to the Government for what they have done there. We have heard a lot about the drainage of Maylands. Part of that work goes through the Middle Swan electorate, but it automatically goes back into Maylands.

Mr. Hegney: I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CLOTHIER: The work is a credit to the Government. I suppose it is the biggest drain of its kind in the Commonwealth, except perhaps one in Queensland. There have been employed on this work no fewer than 85 men during the last two years. The man in charge of the job deserves every credit; not only has he been a capable overseer, but he has invented labour-saving appliances which have not affected the number of men engaged on the work. As a

matter of fact, the result has been the speeding up of the work, and has made the labour lighter for the men. One of these labour-saving appliances is a small pile driver, which has meant a lot to the workmen there, seeing that they are not the type who are accustomed to swinging picks and shovels.

Mr. Hegney: A lot of them are ex-farmers.

Mr. CLOTHIER: The men there have not been accustomed to that class of work. A sum of £58,000 has been spent to date and a further £28,000 has been allotted to complete the work.

Mr. Hegney: And it will not be long before it will require to be duplicated.

Mr. CLOTHIER: It is a fine job and represents the expenditure of a good deal of money in the district I represent. Reverting back to trams, I should like to draw attention to the manner in which the Walcott-street line is operated. I suggest that if anyone were in a hurry to get into town, he should walk rather than proceed by a Walcott-street tram, because so much time is wasted on the loops. Other sections of lines have been duplicated and it is due to the Government to lose no time in duplicating the Walcott-street line. The line itself could even be carried out further, because many homes have been built beyond the present terminus. I should like the Government to take that matter into consideration. If they undertake to provide transport for the public, they should endeavour to provide a reasonable service.

The Minister for Railways: You should not use extravagant statements if you wish to get extensions or anything else.

Mr. Sampson: Would trolley buses be better?

Mr. CLOTHIER: Some better provision will have to be made, because many houses are being built in that part and the people will need transport facilities. All of them do not own motor cars. In conclusion I express the hope that the Government will continue the good work they are doing, and that the measures passed by this House will receive favourable consideration in another place.

MR. WARNER (Mt. Marshall) [6.1]: I should like to endorse the remarks of other speakers by way of congratulating the Minister for Agriculture on his elevation to Ministerial rank. From what I have seen of him at deputations, I consider that he has a real grip of affairs and I confidently ex-

pect him to make a mark in the political life of the State.

The Premier: He has no agricultural conscience, you know!

Mr. WARNER: I regret the illness of the Minister for Employment. I trust that he will soon be restored to health and able to resume his duties in the House. I also congratulate the members for Avon and South Fremantle on their election. I have no wish to traverse the whole of the ground covered by previous speakers. Opportunities will be available later to speak on many of the subjects that have been dealt with. There are some matters concerning the department of the Minister for Lands, however, that I should like to mention. I believe the time has come when the Government should insist that, wherever any large area of land is leased or otherwise disposed of by the department, a one-chain or half-chain strip of natural scrub or forest should be left along the boundary lines. In those parts of the country where large areas have been cleared, areas with farms of over 1,000 acres, one might travel for miles without seeing a bit of the natural bush.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Would not such strips make additional harbours for vermin?

Mr. WARNER: I do not think so. I believe a similar proposal was made by the Surveyor General many years ago but was not adopted. Had it been adopted there would have been strips of virgin country bounding most of the farms, which would have formed a break against that soil erosion which is occurring in the United States and in some of the Eastern States, as well as in parts of this State. The Minister should make it incumbent upon any person taking up large tracts of country to leave such a strip of bush along two sides of the holding. If a width of one chain were left, it would not represent an appreciable acreage in comparison with the area of the farm. Such a strip would afford little or no harbour for vermin, but it would constitute an asset in the shape of firewood or timber for farm use and would prevent the surface soil from being blown away. In the northern parts of my electorate one can see soil piled up to a depth of a foot against the fences. I also suggest to the Minister that the Act be amended so that a farmer holding 1,000 acres or more of land should be able to take up, under improvement conditions, an adjoining area of third-class

land at a cheap rate. Much third-class land adjoins existing holdings and constitutes a breeding ground for vermin. This vacant land represents a hardship to the road board, and the Government will not take any responsibility for clearing it of vermin. If it were made available to adjoining holders at a cost of a little more than the survey fees, such land could be utilised for grazing purposes and for growing oats. The land will not be taken up unless the price is reduced, and I would not advocate its being handed over to settlers unless they had arable land on which they were growing other crops. I wish to give credit to the Agricultural Bank commissioners for their prompt action in relieving want in the northern part of my district. When the drought became pronounced and we were fearing a repetition of the experiences of 1914, and when storekeepers refused further credit, the commissioners entered the field and issued rations to enable farmers to carry on until they could submit their applications for assistance and for fodder for their stock. So far I have been unable to ascertain what policy the commissioners intend to adopt. We do know that they will not permit members of Parliament to go to the bank on clients' affairs, and we also understand that they intend to enforce the provisions of the Act. In many parts of the State the morale of settlers is being weakened because they are fearful of the attitude that the commissioners might adopt under Sections 51 and 52 of the Act. I believe that the action of the commissioners in having a full inventory taken of all that is on a client's holding is merely being done with the object of ascertaining the actual value in the event of a writing down. I believe it is essential that this be done, but it is equally important that the commissioners should let the farmers know that the object is not, as they fear, to enforce Sections 51 and 52 of the Act. I cannot believe that any harm would have arisen from members of Parliament interviewing the commissioners on behalf of settlers in their district. I believe that nothing but good could have come of it. I am quite satisfied that the commissioners could not have been influenced by any attempt to exercise political pull. Previously I was able to save many of my constituents a trip to Perth, whereas now they have to make the journey, and then they are told that their business must go

through the district office. We have been told that all the work must be done through the district office, but I am not sure whether it is so done. I know of instances where the settler has been informed by the district office, "We will send the matter on to head office." The commissioners would be well advised to explain their attitude regarding Sections 51 and 52 of the Act and thus remove the fear entertained by farmers. Many settlers in the northern part of my district, who have been forced during the present season to accept assistance from the Agricultural Bank, have suggested at gatherings I have attended that the commissioners should make available a small grant for clearing, fencing, dam sinking, etc., so that they might earn the money they are receiving and add to the assets of the farm. The men concerned are mainly ex-miners, and they consider that the sustenance being granted to them savours too much of a dole. They would prefer to receive a small grant with which they could create an asset on the property. I do not believe that much hay will be cut this season in the northern part of my constituency. There are other places where, if we get late rains, I believe there will be hay crops. The Minister might give attention to this point, seeing that hay will be required next year by many of the Bank clients.

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

Mr. WARNER: Before the tea adjournment I suggested that it was likely there would be no substantial hay crops in the eastern portion of my district this year, and that the Agricultural Bank, where the authorities knew there was a fair-sized paddock with a good hay crop, might arrange to have an average taken, with the farmer, of the estimated yield of that crop. If the two parties come to an agreement on that point, the farmer should be offered the price of the probable yield of wheat at the siding, at his delivery time, which might be December or January. The Bank would then see that he cut the crop as hay and stacked it, instead of leaving it to be stripped. That course might prove of advantage as saving a great deal of carting over considerable distances in case of a shortage of feed. In addition, it would obviate the introduction of foreign weeds into the district. It is extremely unlikely that the Bank Commissioners would run any

risk of making a loss, because the value of a hay crop next year should be as large as that of any crop stripped for wheat. I do believe there will be a shortage of hay in the northern areas next year. The farmer who did cut a crop for hay would find it advantageous to do summer fallowing and to cultivate the land immediately the hay had been carted off it. The effect would be to remove all weeds and rubbish, and ensure a good clean paddock, available for cultivation after the first rains. Another matter I wish to touch on as regards the Agricultural Bank is insurance of farm labourers, employees of the farmers. Last year there was a case in which an ex-naval man, who had served during the Great War, while working for a farmer had his arm torn off by the harvester. That man found himself in the unfortunate position of having no compensation whatever coming to him. Eventually he was assisted only by a benefit organised for him, and by contributions from the Returned Soldiers' League. We know that every farmer is under a legal obligation to take out insurance for his employees, but in many cases of the kind which I have queried, the excuse has been that money was not available for the payment of premiums. In consequence I wrote to the Agricultural Bank on the 12th April last—

There has been a number of cases recently where farmers' employees have not been covered by insurance under the Act (although according to the Act it is necessary for this to be done), and have met with accidents, learning to their sorrow after the accident that the insurance policy has not been taken out by the employer.

The farmer is not in a position to pay anything—hence the employee is thrown on his own resources, and has been obliged to enter hospital as a necessitous case, where, had the Act been complied with, the treatment would be different, and compensation forthcoming. I learn that the neglect to insure employees is often covered by the excuse that the farmer has not the money to pay the premium: that the amount is not made available by the trustees, etc.

It is my great wish to be able to have the Act enforced for the protection not only of the farmers, but more particularly the farm employees. Recently, a man in my electorate had his arm torn off by a harvester. The farmer was not insured, and his position is such that he can pay no compensation. The injured man will receive nothing beyond the result of a benefit that has been raised for him. This case is not an isolated one.

Could the Commissioners arrange some method whereby every farmer who is being carried on (and will employ labour) must have arrangements made to take out a policy and the employees protected?

I should be grateful for your view on this subject, and of the method that can be adopted.

The following reply reached me from the Acting General Manager of the Agricultural Bank, dated the 26th April:—

I desire to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 12th inst., and agree as to the desirability of all farm workers being insured under the Act, both in the interests of themselves and the farmer-employer. The Act, as you are aware, makes it compulsory for the employer to insure.

There is, however, no provision in the Agricultural Bank Act for advances to pay insurance premiums, even if the Commissioners were aware of what labour the farmer intended to employ and the period involved.

I plead with the Government to amend the Agricultural Bank Act so as to compel clients of the bank to insure their employees. Then the excuse will not be there that money is not available for the necessary premiums. I regard myself as representing all the electors in my constituency, irrespective of whether they be sustenance workers or farmers. At the present time many farmers are only managers of their properties for trustees, and the present Government should promptly introduce legislation bringing such farmers within the scope of the obligation to insure employees. I am greatly concerned about the matter, because the case I have quoted is not an isolated one. I fear that the excuse as to no money being available for payment of premiums may be advanced in future cases. I am glad that the Minister for Agriculture has given serious consideration to the destruction of emus, which pest has been most severe. The move is highly desirable. The only fault I find with the Minister's decision is that the bonus is not quite large enough, though possibly it would be difficult to finance a higher amount. When the emus in a starved condition came into the wheat areas they were easily slain: but now that they have had a few weeks or months on the crops, they are getting fat and good goers. It will be hard to secure enough emus now to make hunting them profitable. Perhaps the Minister might arrange for ex-service men who cannot go on general sustenance work by reason of their physical condition, but who are still able to use firearms, to be supplied with rifles and ammunition from Commonwealth stores, so that in exterminating the pest

these men may secure a living in a better way than by reliance on sustenance or the dole. I am convinced wheat alone is not going to pay the farmer in the future. I believe it will be essential to go in for mixed farming, which at present is a costly process. The only way of attaining the end is by way of further advances, of either Commonwealth or State money, through the Agricultural Bank, which has already been heavily slugged in some cases. Mixed farming, I repeat, is essential. One of the greatest helps toward the development of mixed farming in the northern wheat belt is an adequate water supply. I have been successful in obtaining some supplies in that country, the result being largely to save the situation during the past year or two. Further water catchments should, however, be put down so as to enable the settlers not only to change over to mixed farming but also to take them off their present system of power farming, the expenditure for which goes largely to a foreign country. Horse farming should be substituted for power farming. Shortage of water on farms means that many a settler who possibly could have carried through and shown a profit with a few sheep, has been obliged, owing to the shortage of water, to dispose of his sheep before being able to get a profitable wool clip, and to get rid of the lambs before they had grown to a size which would ensure anything like an adequate return. The farmer has been robbed of all chance of making a profit owing to shortage of water. Had water supplies been available, probably many farmers who have applied for help would have been relieved of the need for applying, at all events so early in the season. In my opinion the expenditure of a large amount of money on water supplies in that district would be profitable. There might not be immediate returns as from reproductive works, but things would get better as more and more farmers adopted mixed farming. Then rates and so forth would be paid. At present the State has to borrow money to put our unemployed on work such as will enable them to earn a living. They might as well be employed in the North creating an asset which will remain as long as any asset that can be created by work here in the South. Even if a large scheme of water supply were undertaken, the only other expenditure besides labour would be the cost of the pipes. If locally manufactured cement pipes could be used—as I believe they can—

the whole of the money expended would be spent on labour and on local products. Unemployment has, I think, been mentioned by every speaker so far during this debate. After all our study of the subject, and in spite of having viewed it from so many angles, we must admit that nothing has been put forward that will help the Government to solve the problem. We know it is a highly difficult problem. We know that for the time being money must be borrowed, but when that money is spent on works we desire to be assured that they will be reproductive. There is little else I desire to deal with, apart from bulk handling. I have been a firm believer in that system ever since it first came under notice. I am gratified that at last the Royal Commission have reported favourably. I trust that their recommendations will be adopted, and that before long bulk handling will be in operation throughout the State. I have heard that a number of men will be thrown out of work as the result of the introduction of bulk handling, particularly at Fremantle. I do not know that the extent of the prospective unemployment will be as great as figures I have been shown would suggest. At any rate, the main squeal seems to come from the Fremantle lumpers. For many years, we have been told from that end of the State that the farmers have been spoon-fed and, in fact, fed with a scoop. There are many abandoned farms on the hands of the Agricultural Bank, and the lumpers need not be thrown out of work: they can take over those abandoned farms.

Mr. Sleeman: What would they grow if they went there?

Mr. WARNER: Let the lumpers join the spoon-fed farmer gang, and they will very soon learn that the farmer's life is not such a rosy one! I am grateful for many things the Government have been able to do to assist farmers, but I still hope that they will provide water supplies in some parts of my electorate, so that the farmers may be able to continue their operations. We cannot afford to have any more abandoned farms there.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [7.47]: Some time ago a serious storm swept through the Bickley Valley, with the result that to-day the settlers there are suffering grave disabilities. A position already hard was made much worse because of the storm, and many of the settlers have been reduced to a con-

dition bordering upon destitution. As a result, it is understood that the position of each of the settlers will be dealt with on its merits, and that sustenance will be provided in certain cases. I am strongly of opinion that their position should be generously dealt with, because the men have endeavoured to earn a living in the district, and have faced exceedingly grave difficulties. Their position to-day, because of erosion of soil and destruction of crops, makes their future black indeed. The advisability of waiting upon the Premier to discuss matters with him was considered for some time, but the suggestion came from the Premier himself that it would be advisable if statements were submitted regarding the position of each individual sufferer. There is a good deal to be said for that, and within a few days now the statements requested will be forwarded to the Premier. I hope he will give this matter the practical and sympathetic consideration that the needs of these people call for. I venture also to refer to another somewhat similar occurrence, the disaster at Broome. As a result of that tragedy, practical assistance has been rendered by the Government, and we claim that the growers of Bickley Valley are equally deserving of that helpful consideration. There is no objection whatever to the Broome pearlers having received that assistance, although it must be recognised that the pearlers, although they have been confronted with difficulties for a long time, have an advantage over the fruit-growers in that, if the necessary money be available, they can forthwith, apart from the restoration of human life, provide the equipment necessary for pearling. On the other hand, the growers of Bickley Valley are not in that position. The fruit trees, particularly the citrus, were seriously damaged, and vegetables were swept away entirely. I realise that the renewal of the vegetable crops can be rectified next season, but there are many of the growers who depend for their living upon the fruit crops, and they find the future holds very little for them. One of the orchardists is at present engaged in grubbing up many citrus trees. I cannot say whether that is because the trees were so injured, but the fact remains that some very fine trees are now being taken out of a holding of about four acres. When the Premier receives the communications to which I have referred, I hope he will not fail to give sympathetic

consideration to them. Then again, the pearlers have an advantage over the fruit-growers from the standpoint of marketing. There is an organisation dealing with the marketing of pearshell, which is an important and valuable part of the industry. The needs of the Bickley growers are so great that some have already had sustenance made available to them, and I have to thank the chairman and members of the Lotteries Commission for help that was rendered when it was greatly needed. Further help is being requested. I also express my appreciation of the very generous assistance afforded by the public in meeting the immediate requirements of the sufferers from the cyclone. In addition to sustenance for man, woman and child, there is necessity, of course, for sustenance for orchard requirements. You, Mr. Speaker, as a horticulturist, know that you can make but little progress unless the soil is fed with the elements necessary to promote growth. During the course of the debate, references have been made to the necessity for marketing organisation. I am pleased that the Minister for Lands is present because his Bill, which sought to provide for the pooling of all fruit, was before Parliament in 1924. It was an excellent measure, and my one regret is that, in the ensuing years, the Minister's enthusiasm seems to have waned, or perhaps he now prefers to leave the work to the Minister who is now in charge of the department concerned. If that is so, his attitude is quite reasonable, and I feel sure that both he and the Minister who succeeded him will give the latest Minister for Agriculture all the help that experience and a realisation of the needs of the producers will prompt them to furnish. "Orderly marketing" is a hackneyed phrase, but organisation in marketing is what is being striven for in most countries throughout the world. Unfortunately, Western Australia has adopted an attitude—if standing still and doing nothing can be described as adopting an attitude, as a result of which very little progress has been made along those lines. I cannot understand why that should be so, particularly in a State that is controlled mostly by young men who should bring to bear new thoughts and fresh ideas in their desire to help those who, because of world conditions, cannot help themselves. To-day it is impossible for the growers to secure a fair return for their products. I shall give the House some



figures relating to the prices secured for oranges, at a later stage. A few days ago, in company with others who were interested in securing the establishment of an egg marketing board, I waited upon the Minister for Agriculture. The deputation was introduced by the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox), and the Minister showed himself not only conversant with the subject, but sympathetic as well. If we may judge from what he said during the discussion, the Minister will probably introduce legislation to provide for the necessary board of control during the present session. I regard that work as essential. New South Wales and Queensland have already established boards, and other States are considering the matter. The importance of control cannot be exaggerated. The position with regard to fruit, eggs and various other primary products is that, under the present marketing laws, it is impossible for those engaged in production to earn a living. It is clear that the Minister for Agriculture and his two predecessors in office who are with him this evening have, by their silence, suggested their assent to what I have been saying. I am glad of that; they have had sufficient time within which to think it over. We have been discussing it ever since I returned from Queensland in 1924 with information of the success of what was known as the "committee-of-direction method" of marketing. I am a regular reader of the "Queensland Producer" and it presents striking examples of how best to market products. In Queensland not only Labour Ministers but Ministers of other political views have continued the work, walking, step by step, with the originators of the scheme. I wish to suggest a little job for our new Minister for Agriculture. It is remarkable that our primary producers have to pay more for wheat offal than is paid by the primary producers in Adelaide. We have to face the same market when we export our goods, and we feel it is time that consideration by someone in authority should be given to this subject. We know the Government are not carrying on a State mill and do not fix the prices for the offal of wheat, but the fact that the prices here are greater than those in Adelaide can properly be considered at this time.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Do you agree with the setting up of a State mill?

Mr. SAMPSON: Not at all. I hope we never have it. We are already paying in excess of what is paid in Adelaide, and for

the industry to carry a greater burden is distinctly unfair. I have turned up the "Adelaide Chronicle" of 18th July and the "Western Mail" of the same date, and I learn that in Adelaide the price of bran on that day was £5 per ton on trucks in the metropolitan area, the price of pollard £5 2s. 6d., and on both lines there was a reduction of 5s. per ton for cash with order for not less than 11¼ tons. In Western Australia on the same day—according to the "Western Mail"—the metropolitan price of bran and of pollard was £6 5s. less 5s. per ton for truck lots. That shows a considerable difference, nearly 20 per cent. Thinking that might have been just one particular week when for some unknown reasons the prices had varied, I turned up the same two newspapers of the 1st August. I there found that in Adelaide the metropolitan price of bran was £5 per ton on trucks and of pollard £5 2s. 6d., both less 5s. per ton for cash with order for not less than 11¼ tons. In Western Australia on the same date the metropolitan price of bran and pollard was £6 5s. per ton each, less 5s. per ton for truck lots. The difference is considerable, and I suggest the Minister might call a meeting of millers to discuss this matter, the object being to give to our poultry men and dairy men and others the same prices as are enjoyed in Adelaide. I have to thank the newly appointed Minister for Agriculture for information in regard to a question relating to the fruitfly. We had before us last year a Bill for which we should thank the then Minister for Agriculture, notwithstanding that the Bill reached us rather late and, another place being surfeited with work, that Bill suffered an untimely fate. However, I desire to thank the present Minister for Agriculture for an implied promise; at all events he said the re-introduction of the Bill is being considered. I hope the Premier and his colleagues will make this possible. The position to-day in regard to fruitfly in this State is an absolute scandal. We have gone on year after year, right from the time when the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson), almost in his boyhood, took up the claim that something should be done to control the fruitfly; yet to-day we are practically where we started. There is no control. There is some legislation, but for a long time it was not administered, it remained a dead letter

on the statute-book, and consequently our growers have suffered very severely indeed. I hope and believe the Minister for Agriculture is going to set his hand to this and to mark an important point in his life by bringing about the extermination or at least the control, of the fruitfly in this State. I believe the Minister can do that and I sincerely hope he will. I am almost sick of hearing my own voice on this question of the fruitfly. It has been spoken of so often and so many efforts have been made to secure effective action that one grows discouraged at the inaction of those who have it in their power to do something. We have some honorary inspectors, it is true, and the Fruitfly Advisory Board is functioning, but we want the department to function. When it does that, and carries into effect the legislation on our statute-book, the fruitfly will be wiped out. One of the great difficulties of fruit production in Western Australia is in regard to citrus. This country is particularly suited to the production of citrus, and if we had a wider knowledge of exporting citrus and better laws in regard to marketing, maybe we would make some progress there. But the position is exceedingly difficult. Let me give the House the returns of two growers who sent to market some navel oranges. One sent nine cases and his gross return, less marketing charges, was 12s. 3d.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It is worse than growing wheat.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, I think it is. The cases cost this grower 5s. 5d. and the transport 3s., or a total of 8s. 5d., and his net aggregate return for the nine cases was 3s. 8d. The other grower sent four cases and, less sales charges, he received 6s. 6d. The cases cost him 1s. 8d., the transport 1s. 4d., thus leaving him a net return of 3s. 6d. for the four cases. The growers are facing an unusually difficult time, not only for this season but for every season. You will know that within the last few years there has been a Back-to-Palestine movement, and Jews from all over the world have been returning to that country.

Mr. Sleeman: Would not you like to return?

Mr. SAMPSON: I should like to visit the country.

Mr. Sleeman: You did enough damage when you visited Malta.

Mr. SAMPSON: I have been very close to Palestine, and I can tell members something of the marketing of oranges at Port Said. Last year the export of oranges from Palestine was approximately 7,000,000 cases. South Africa also is advancing, and in view of this increasingly large production of oranges in Palestine, we can quite understand the handicaps of our growers who depend on export for their returns. There are pathological difficulties in the way of exporting oranges. In December last the Minister for Commerce, Dr. Page, formed an Australian Agricultural Council. The work proposed to be done by that council includes export control and certain advisory functions, and a planting policy is suggested. That is an excellent thing with which the Minister for Agriculture is conversant and I am sure he agrees that there should be a planting policy, that there should be advice as to the varieties to be grown, and more than all, there should be study of the packing and forwarding of oranges. It is an exceedingly difficult fruit to maintain in good order for any length of time. There is the blue mould, for which some growers in the United States recommend the Brogdex method as a remedy. Far more oranges and citrus of every description are grown in this State than this State can absorb. With the absence of any organisation in marketing, it means that some fruit is sent away from the metropolitan area to various centres but it is usually either a glut or a famine, and from time to time certain towns have been without any fruit whatever. All who have given consideration to this matter believe that if there were organisation, if there were consideration of the releasing of fruit in accordance with the demand of the market and the utilisation of all those centres which could be expected to take fruit, it would mean that much fruit which at present cannot be sent to market would be sent away. Whatever is done, however, the time is close when there will be a surplus in production. We must note that throughout the citrus-growing districts tree planting is going on all the while. Every year more and more trees come into bearing. This makes the position more difficult, and prompts the hope that the proposition as put up by the Commonwealth Government for an Australian agricultural council may prove success-

ful. The Commonwealth Government have provided £2,000 per annum for five years to enable the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research to undertake investigations into the factors affecting the keeping quality of oranges during storage. That is a matter of first importance to citrus growers. I hope some of this money will be spent locally, and that an investigation will be made in respect to Western Australian fruit. Fruit produced in one district varies in texture and requires different treatment from fruit grown in other districts. Another work it is hoped to give effect to is that of improving existing export standards. It is not my intention to criticise the Agricultural Bank. I appreciate the very grave difficulties confronting that institution. I know that on the success or failure of these efforts a great deal depends. Road boards are performing a service without which Governments would find themselves in a very parlous position. They carry out an enormous amount of honorary work. They are more than road boards, for, as the ex Deputy Premier desired once to say in a Bill, they are district councils for all the outer areas of the State. Realising what these boards do, we asked—I speak as chairman of the Road Boards Association—that the Agricultural Bank should give consideration to the payment of at least a proportion of the rates due by Agricultural Bank properties to road boards. That is not an unreasonable request. Road boards are very anxious to assist the bank in every way within their power. It is their duty to maintain their roads in good order for traffic, thereby allowing growers to send their produce to the railways. The bank would be acting not only in the interests of road boards, but in the interests of the State if instead of refraining from paying the local authorities any portion of the rates due on its properties, it paid at least a proportion and enabled the road boards to continue to maintain the roads. During the past few weeks a deputation waited upon the office of the Minister for Lands, the Minister himself unfortunately being out of town. We were gratified to learn that the subject which the deputation desired to discuss with the Minister is already favourably regarded by him. I refer to the need for rural fire brigades. Those concerned in the bringing down of

a measure to be termed a rural fire brigades Bill, or something of the kind, are anxious that power should be given to enable certain approved people to go upon properties where a fire is in progress, to take water, to burn or plough fire breaks, and to do such things as may seem desirable for the control and extinction of the fire. That principle is in existence in other States of the Commonwealth. An Act giving statutory power to go upon land to do these things is in existence in South Australia and Victoria, and I believe in New South Wales and Queensland. True to form Western Australia lags behind. Why we are so slow in doing those things which are essential I cannot understand. I hope this session the Minister for Lands will bring down legislation to carry this suggestion into effect. If rates due on Agricultural Bank properties are paid to road boards and fire brigade legislation is brought down, some of the needs of the country will be satisfied. The trend at present is for people to come within the city areas. That is bad. If we look after the country, the towns will look after themselves. Perhaps we are looking after the city overmuch. The figures show that people are leaving the country and coming to the towns. I hope during this session some consideration will be given to this subject. I could wish this House had some power with respect to tariffs, but unfortunately it has none. Surely we can do something to influence the Commonwealth Government with respect to these burdens. The prosperity of this State is heavily prejudiced owing to the incidence of the tariff. Clients overseas are being lost to us through the imposition of duties on those goods which previously were imported in greater quantities by us. In the final analysis we will suffer considerably because of this policy of economic nationalisation. A policy which says that any country can live without dependence on another is futile. Experience shows that we would live better and get further if we gave consideration to the production of those things which we could best produce, and left to other countries the production of those things which we can secure better by purchasing from them. If there is an interchange of goods there will not be the same cry for a change in our monetary system, or for changes in other respects. Ministers may give all possible thought to wiping out unemployment, but unemployment will

never disappear while present conditions exist. We have to look at the matter from the standpoint of the world. Australia is not able to live unto itself, any more than this State is able. We can produce commodities as well as any other part of the world can produce them. I understand that in wool we hold pride of place.

Mr. North: Do you support the local products campaign?

Mr. SAMPSON: We must support local products within limits. It is a mistaken idea to think that we can live by taking in each other's washing. That policy has already led Australia into a morass of difficulties. We are losing clients. We are closing the door in their faces, and we cannot expect to maintain a one-way trade.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Of course we should have all our printing done in this State.

Mr. SAMPSON: I was not dealing with printing, although it is a subject of paramount interest. We can produce lemons equal to the best that are grown in Italy and Sicily.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: They are rotting on the trees to-day.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Premier proposes to discuss with Premiers of some of the smaller States certain disabilities under which this State suffers. Only good can be the outcome of such a meeting. I was much impressed by the statement of the Premier when he heard of the non-success which befell our secession delegation. I feel as many thousands of others in this State feel, that it was a great pity the Case was not permitted to be discussed. That was a tactical error. It means that the Secession League must continue to fight for our rights. If Western Australia is to retain a semblance of solvency we must proceed along lines different from those we are following to-day. We are antagonising those who once were our friends and who once purchased our products. We are behaving in a very shortsighted manner. I hope that wisdom will come to the Federal Ministers, and that they will see the foolishness of continuing in the way they are going.

The Minister for Agriculture: That will be a great disadvantage to the Country Party.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is a disadvantage to any party that is associated with any Government that cannot see beyond their own

doors. Our population and the growth of the State depend on trade outside our borders. Without population our outlook is impossible. The Minister for Agriculture may not see out his first term before we reach greater financial difficulties than we are now in. We cannot continue as we are going unless we are able to sell our products overseas. Our Federal masters must review the embargoes they have imposed and all those factors which in their opinion were going to bring prosperity to Australia. Prosperity can come only by the production of that which we can best produce and their exchange for the products of other countries. I wish to say a few words to the Minister for Railways. I have always been treated with the utmost courtesy by him, particularly when introducing deputations, but I must confess to disappointment in respect of two matters. One is the dangerous railway crossings. Time after time I have written about these, and I have referred to the subject in the House. I have occasion to remember one dangerous crossing, and an experience I had there in the company of the Minister for Lands. Some years ago we were returning from a smoke social at Armadale. The conditions were quite normal, and we were able to look after ourselves. The Minister was in a most precarious position that night in that he faced great danger. The train at the crossing only narrowly escaped overtaking us, which was very fortunate. I was seated next to the Minister, and the last thing I expected was to find the train at such close quarters. The Minister might not have realised how close he was to a time when the worries of Ministerial work and other duties might have ended. I can tell the House of another experience I had at a dangerous railway crossing. On last Labour Day with four friends I was driving from Kalamunda, and passing the abattoirs, the road turned towards Midland Junction. When we reached the crossing, I remarked "Look out for the train." All looked out and everything appeared all right. I crossed and turned to the left towards Midland Junction, but before I had travelled the distance of a chain a train rattled past. Not one of us in the car had seen that train approach. The headlamps of many of the trains are of kerosene, and very difficult to see unless at close range. I am not blaming the Minister, but I do want

him to see that all trains carry electric head-lamps.

The Minister for Railways: More than half have electric head lights.

Mr. SAMPSON: But those trains that have not electric headlights are really a menace. One requires to be hit once by such a train and all is over. In reply to a question I asked to-day regarding an accident at the Maddington crossing, the Minister said that the accident occurred at Gosnells on the date named. It seems therefore that there were two accidents on that day, because I have a clipping from the "Swan Leader," which shows that the accident actually happened at the Maddington crossing. I am very much concerned about all the accidents that have happened at railway crossings. It is really scandalous that trains should be permitted to run without proper lights. In so many cases it is impossible to see the headlight unless one has powerful eyes. Is it such a costly matter to instal proper headlights that this danger must continue? The provision of reasonable protection for the public in this respect is long overdue. I ask the Minister to take a definite stand, otherwise he will be classed as a murderer.

Mr. Sleeman: What would you do in the daytime? Would you have a man before the train with a red flag?

Mr. SAMPSON: This is not a matter to be treated flippantly. One can see a train approaching in the daytime, but not so at night.

The Minister for Railways: It is difficult at some times to see an approaching train even in the daytime.

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes, but the majority of the accidents have happened at night. According to the Minister the departmental report set out that the accident on the date mentioned in my question, occurred at Gosnells. Maddington, however, is a particularly dangerous crossing. Reverting to the narrow escape I had with my friends at Midland, we drove along the York road, and when we reached the railway crossing on that road we found that a train had actually hit a motor car and pushed it against the barrier at the cattlepit. I sympathised with the driver of that car; it was a dark night and I daresay he exercised as much care as I did a little while before at the other crossing. But he was caught and it was only by chance that we were missed. There are other crossings which are dangerous, for instance, at Rivervale and at

Jewell-street. The York-road crossing has a long record of accidents against it, and some of them have proved fatal. Again, it is not so very long since two men were killed at the Jewell-street crossing. The other matter concerning which I wish to speak to the Minister is in respect to the extension of electric current. I have spoken on this subject on many occasions, and I know that certain machinery is to be installed at the East Perth Power House. We have had that promise held out to us for many years. I can remember when Mr. Scaddan was Minister figures being taken out to show the cost of the change-over from steam to electric drive for the main pumping station at Mundaring Weir and it was shown that electric power would be the cheaper. Then there was a question of the expenditure of £14,000 to supply certain towns, including Mundaring. Again something intervened, although the Minister was sympathetic at the time. So long as the Government have charge of works such as these, there will always be delays. Some years ago a friend of mine at Mundaring proposed to instal an electric motor. I told him not to hurry and held him up for three years. Finally he said, "I am getting fairly old and I want to see this work done in my lifetime." About five years ago he put in an engine. So long as any Government controls the Electricity Department, so long will the people be deprived of the power they need, the provision of which would make market gardening and orchard work in certain centres possible and provide the necessary flow of water at a critical time. I do not blame the Minister. He is connected with a wretched system that binds a man hand and foot. He is shackled. If he were the managing director of an electric supply company, he would either get what he wanted or the business would go into bankruptcy. As it is, we go on year after year pleading for this service. The member for Toodyay and other members have spoken on the subject, but their voices have been wasted on the desert air.

Mr. Needham: Did you act as managing director when you were Chief Secretary?

Mr. SAMPSON: I have never supported State trading concerns or certain utilities. I venture the opinion that the Minister would be glad if the Government got rid of the Electricity Department so that the people in the outer suburban districts could get

the electric current they so greatly need. It was stated last night that the Perth City Council were partly to blame for the delay because they got current from the Government at less than cost price. I very much doubt that.

The Minister for Water Supplies: You remember what the position was before the Government took over?

Mr. SAMPSON: That is many years ago and we have moved since then. The position, however, is becoming more confused every year. From time to time new power plants have been set up. There is one at York, another at Northam and another at Toodyay. I do not know much about the technicalities of electric supplies, but I understand those plants are not uniform, and when ultimately the current is supplied from one source, extensive alterations will be necessary. The people of the outer suburban area have been depending on the Government to provide electric current, and they have waited year after year practically without getting anywhere, in spite of the fact that additional plant has been promised. I am afraid that before the new plant is installed and before the outer suburban areas are given an opportunity to connect up with it, the demands of Perth will have grown so greatly that once more the generating of power will be at its peak and it will be impossible to make the additional connections.

The Minister for Railways: We have made two or three extensions this year already.

Mr. SAMPSON: There was one at Bickley, but the Minister knows that that was a peddling little thing. The concern is not handled as it would be by a company with capital at the back of it. Every year, as the Minister knows, the Electricity Department has shown a profit. I believe it has a good manager and is well controlled, but why does not the Minister make it possible for the people to get this essential commodity? Their need is desperate.

The Minister for Railways: You think I ought to develop an electrical conscience?

Mr. SAMPSON: I believe the Minister would be only too pleased to make the extensions but that the money is not provided for the work. It would certainly be reproductive work. If the Government would withdraw from this activity and allow a company to do what is so urgently required,

I am satisfied it would be done. If the Government can show a profit on the electricity supply, I am sure that an outside company would show a better profit. In saying that, I am not reflecting on the Government. I have written hundreds of letters on the subject, but I confess to a feeling of impotence and hopelessness when it comes to discussing the question of the extension of electrical current. Always it is to be. Hope springs eternal in the human breast. Man never is but always to be blest. Some day, long after the Minister and I have departed from this sphere, I suppose the current will be made available, but in my opinion, that will not happen so long as the department continues under Government control. Regardless of what one says, we seem to be unable to get anywhere.

The Minister for Railways: Do not be pessimistic.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am pessimistic. At Mundaring, two local people established lighting plants. A lady had some money and was advised to put it into a plant. Now the plant is being used merely to light her own home. A man who put in a plant supplies current for Mundaring, but it is uneconomical and costly for a small plant to supply the needs of that district. Perth could supply the needs of every centre within a radius of 100 miles. Why it does not do so, I cannot understand. Surely we could borrow the money for what would be a reproductive work.

The Minister for Railways: There is current all over your district—at Armadale, Gosnells, Kalamunda and Bickley.

Mr. SAMPSON: But it should be extended to all parts of the district. Norway is a small country and not a very rich country. I think it has a population of 2½ millions. In 1914, Norway, in the matter of electricity supply, was far ahead of Western Australia of to-day.

The Minister for Lands: Norway is 2,000 years old.

Mr. SAMPSON: Age is often a disability. The older a person becomes, the harder it is to make an impression on him. The Norwegians, however, are progressive people, while we lag behind in that respect as well as in marketing, and in other ways.

The Minister for Lands: Norway has wonderful natural conditions.

Mr. SAMPSON: And also some disadvantages, but it is an up-to-date country

in electrical equipment. People in the outer suburbs deserve this service. Is it any wonder that the city becomes more congested? We want to see life in the outer suburban districts made more attractive, and it could be made more attractive by the provision of electric current. To extend the current to those districts would be a business proposition. If the Minister could only convince the Premier of the need for this extension, I believe he could obtain sufficient money for the purpose. By the time the new generating plant is installed, I am afraid the needs of Perth and its immediate surroundings will have so grown that there will be no current to spare for the outer suburban districts.

The Minister for Railways: There will be enough for the next seven years.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have heard that story for the last nine or ten years. I am going to hope it will be so, but my faith has been shaken so often that I have become very doubtful. A last word now in respect to orderly marketing or organisation of marketing, as it is sometimes called. In June last a big conference of fruitgrowers was held in Sydney. It consisted of members of the Fruitgrowers' Federation of New South Wales, who discussed at great length the need for organisation of marketing. They brought forward a proposed Bill, and having discussed it in committee for many hours, a vote was taken. The conference was composed of picked men of all the fruit-growing districts of New South Wales, and the vote resulted in 60 in favour and 18 against. I hope that when we discuss the matter we shall be successful in securing a majority equal to that.

On motion by Mr. Fox, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.58 p.m.*

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 13th August, 1935.*

	PAGE
Questions: State Insurance Office ... ..	149
Taxation, payment drive ... ..	149
BILLS: Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 1A. ...	150
Reduction of Rents Act Continuance, as to leave to introduce, 1A. ... ..	150
Mortgages' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, as to leave to introduce, 1A. ... ..	152
Constitution Acts Amendment Act, 1899, Amendment, 2A. ... ..	153
Bunbury Racecourse Railway Discontinuance, 2A., Com. report ... ..	155
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, as to leave to introduce, 1A. ... ..	156

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

### QUESTION—STATE INSURANCE OFFICE.

#### *Premiums and Payments.*

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What was the amount of premiums collected by the State Insurance Office for the year ended the 30th June, 1935, from the mining industry for insurance against liability to pay compensation for mining diseases under the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act? 2, What were the total payments made under the Workers' Compensation Act for the year ended the 30th June, 1935, as compensation to sufferers from mining diseases?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, £75,555 18s. 0d. 2, Actual payments, £24,622 16s. 2d. In addition there was an amount of £25,000 paid to the Treasury in respect of payments previously made under the Miners' Phthisis Act and which could have been claimed under the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. These figures do not show the amount outstanding in regard to claims which have already been admitted. This liability is estimated at about £55,000.

### QUESTION—TAXATION, PAYMENT DRIVE.

Hon. R. G. MOORE asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is it the intention of the Taxation Department to make a concentrated drive to insure the payment of income tax in all towns in Western Australia, similar to that now taking place on the Goldfields? 2, If not, why not?