

Legislative Council,*Tuesday, 16th August, 1938.*

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, re-grading	123
Public Service, assessment of pensions paid	123
Education, shorthand and typing	123
Address-in-reply, fourth day	123

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

Eastern Goldfields Technical School, Harvey, Narrogin, Northam High School. 3, Typewriting machines are not supplied by the Government except at the Eastern Goldfields Technical School, where thirty such machines are in use.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Fourth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 10th August.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, REGRADING.

Hon. G. B. WOOD asked the Chief Secretary: What amounts, approximately, have been spent on the regrading of the railways between Narrogin and Fremantle, Narrogin and Bunbury, Narrogin and Albany?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The approximate expenditure by the Railway Department during the five years 1933-34 to 1937-38 inclusive on regrading (including deviations) was:—Narrogin-Fremantle, nil; Narrogin-Bunbury, £73,173; Narrogin-Albany, nil.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE.*Assessment of pensions paid.*

Hon. W. J. MANN asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What amount of pension was drawn from the State by—(a) Mr. C. A. Munt, and (b) Mr. A. Berkeley from the 1st January, 1938, to the 30th June, 1938, inclusive? 2, Upon what rate of retiring salary was each amount assessed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, (a) £327 12s.; (b) £215 5s. 4d. 2, In each case on the average annual salary over the three years preceding the date of retirement—(a) £982 16s.; (b) £1,122 13s. 5d.

QUESTION—EDUCATION.*Shorthand and Typing.*

Hon. E. H. H. HALL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is shorthand or typewriting taught at Government schools outside the metropolitan-suburban area? 2, If so, at which schools? 3, If typewriting is taught, are typewriting machines supplied; and, if so, how many at the various schools?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, Bunbury High School. Collicie,

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [4.40]: I am one of those members who formerly thought that the Address-in-reply debate represented so much waste of time, but I have now altered my opinion because I realise it serves a very good purpose. It allows members to advance views that they would not otherwise have an opportunity of expressing. It permits them to let off steam, as it were, and so save considerable time later on when the business of the House is more congested. At the outset I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon once again being appointed to the high office you now hold. It must be gratifying to have been chosen for that post and to know you enjoy the confidence of a majority of the members of this Chamber. It would not be altogether satisfactory for anyone to hold such a high office unopposed for term after term merely because of sentimental reasons or because no one else was game enough to nominate. As you have been chosen for the position by a majority of the members, I sincerely congratulate you. I also offer my congratulations to the two new members who have entered the Chamber. Although we regret having lost two who formerly sat in this House—one through death and one through the will of the electors—it makes no difference to the warmth of our welcome to the newcomers. We heard Mr. Hall in a very able address when he moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. I was glad to hear him express his sympathy with the farmers and extend his sympathies to the butter producers and others engaged in forms of production apart from that with which he is more intimately associated, namely, mining. No doubt he will be able to disclose his sympathy in a practical way when we have presented to us measures for the benefit of those sections of the community to which I specially refer.

I was glad to note during my journey to the Eastern States via Kalgoorlie, the wonderful improvement the Commissioner of Railways has effected on the section between Perth and Kalgoorlie. I had not previously travelled over that line for nine years, and I assure members that instead of experiencing a dreary journey, I enjoyed it both to and from Kalgoorlie. After having travelled 11,000 miles over railways throughout the Commonwealth, I was really proud to find that our section of the railways compared very favourably with those in other parts with the exception of two services, those supplied by the "Spirit of Progress" train and the Trans. train. In view of our narrow gauge, I consider the Commissioner of Railways has carried out a very fine job. Having congratulated him on that achievement, I suggest that he extends that quality of service to other lines. I cannot see why we should not have parlour coaches, somewhat smaller than that engaged on the run to Kalgoorlie, on the Albany line and on the Northern line. There is also room for improvement in the speeding up of some of our train services. The Kalgoorlie train from Perth to Northam takes two hours 33 minutes to cover a distance of 66 miles. With an extra 12 miles to York from Perth the train takes four hours. I fail to see why some improvement in the speeding up of the service over that section cannot be effected. The train to Northam runs as an express to Spencer's Brook and I hope that system will be extended by running the Albany train express to the same point. The Commissioner could put on a parlour coach and take it off at Beverley, picking it up again there the next morning for the return journey, and thus only one coach would be necessary to meet requirements. I have before me details regarding the financial returns from the railways to the end of June of this year and I notice that the railways lost £25,000 in respect of passenger traffic. The railways cannot hope to hold that form of traffic if something is not done to make them more attractive. I do not think people desire to travel by motor car if they are able to avail themselves of a comfortable and quick journey by train.

A pleasing feature of the returns is the acknowledgment of the important part played by the wheat industry in railway receipts. In the "West Australian" there ap-

peared some comments on the railway statistics, including the following:—

The improvement last year on the results for 1936-37 amounted to £146,659—earnings having increased by £216,000, less increased working expenses, £90,000, while interest, owing to conversions, decreased by £21,000. The bigger wheat harvest and increased wheat haulage had, as was inevitable, an important effect upon railway finance. While gross earnings increased by £216,000, wheat alone was responsible for £180,000. Wheat last year contributed 107,008,000 ton miles to the total of 391,000,000 worked by the railways, an increase for wheat of about 33,000,000 ton miles over the previous year. Wheat constituted 25 per cent. of the tonnage handled by the railways, and nearly 27½ per cent. of the ton-mileage, but returned less than 18 per cent. of the gross earnings of the department. Notwithstanding the low freight rate at which it is hauled, an additional 10,000,000 bushels of wheat last year almost set the railways on their financial feet.

I quote those figures to indicate to the House how very important the wheat industry is to Western Australia. Many other activities depend upon its success and that brings me to the question of a home consumption price for wheat in support of an industry that is staggering under great disabilities. Owing to the collapse in prices, the industry is in a parlous condition, or at any rate will be in that condition in the near future. It is labouring under the effects of the national policy of protection; it has to bear the burden of home prices for labour, the financial obligations imposed by the Arbitration Court awards, the effects of workers' compensation costs, and now the burden of the new National Insurance scheme has been thrust upon the industry. It is merely logical and just to claim that the industry should have the benefit of a home price for wheat used for home consumption. I found in the Eastern States that much interest was being taken in this question because it was realised on all sides as being absolutely necessary if the industry was to be maintained. In the past the industry has been kept going by sops such as acreage bounties, and so on, but it has been recognised that these are merely sops that have been used on the battle-ground by political parties at election time. A scheme has been formulated—and it is a very good one—that will provide for a home consumption price of 4s. 8d. a bushel for all wheat used in the consumption of flour. That price will give to the farmer a return of 3s. 5d. a

bushel at his siding, which will balance up in respect of the wheat that has to be exported overseas. One quarter of the wheat produced is used within Australia and the effect of putting up the price 2s. per bushel for home consumption would be to provide the farmer with 6d. for every bushel of wheat he produced. It has been computed that the added costs under the national policy of protection, to which I referred earlier, represent a burden of 6d. per bushel that has to be carried by the wheat growers. In those circumstances, it is only just that some relief should be extended to them. Not only do the farmers and those who represent them think that they are entitled to it, but Mr. Fethers, President of the Chamber of Commerce, speaking at a meeting of that body last night, made references to the matter, and I hope that members of the National Party in this Chamber will listen to a passage I propose to read.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: We are all ears.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: What I shall read furnishes a view of the question quite apart from that of those directly interested in the wheat industry. It shows that other people recognise the necessity for some action to maintain the stability of the industry. After dealing with the future of the industry and other phases, Mr. Fethers proceeded to say—

If this prediction is right, then we may expect demands from the wheat industry for assistance, in view of the fact that on the general average of yield per acre, anything under 3s. per bushel at sidings is looked upon as unprofitable to growers. As only approximately 25 to 30 per cent. of our yield in Australia is consumed internally, it follows that the other 70 to 75 per cent. of our wheat yield is solely dependent on overseas parity, over which we have no control whatever. Therefore, any scheme to bolster up the price for the whole of the wheat yield must concentrate on that 25 to 30 per cent. which the Australian public consumes locally. This would mean an excise duty on locally-consumed flour, collected from the consuming public and distributed to growers on a per bushel, or a per acre basis, or both. Any scheme suggested having for its object the influencing of overseas value must fail, as we are up against economic laws over which we can have no control. Should it be found necessary to raise funds to augment growers' returns the only legal and sound way is by the excise and bounty scheme, whereby local consumers reimburse the growers. This method of assisting growers is anathema to Governments, but it is the only means of rectifying the position of low overseas values

and therefore must be faced in a constructive manner by the Governments. The chamber must take steps to support such a scheme, if it is found necessary to increase the return to the grower, rather than allow any uneconomical but politically acceptable disturbance to natural functions of marketing, which may be advanced from time to time.

Hon. H. Seddon: Are you advocating a Federal or a State scheme?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: A Federal scheme is the only one that would be reasonably possible for this State. We should accept a Federal scheme with both hands. This State is such a large producer of wheat and has such a large quantity for export that we should be glad to accept a Federal scheme on those grounds alone. The other wheat-producing States, with their large home consumption, would not benefit to the extent that this State would.

Hon. L. Craig: We in this State would benefit more than would any other State.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, and South Australia would be the State to derive the next greatest benefit.

Hon. A. Thomson: Such a scheme would need legislative support.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, it would need the support of the Federal Government and of the State Governments with the exception of Queensland and Tasmania. I do not think it would matter whether those two States came into the scheme or not. Owing to the failure of the referendum, however, the Commonwealth is powerless to introduce such a scheme.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: It would be better to have all the States in agreement.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not think it would matter whether Queensland and Tasmania were in agreement because those States usually have no wheat at all for export. This year Queensland might have a small quantity available for export. I agree that it would be better to get them under such an agreement, but so long as the main States agreed, such a scheme would be possible. The feeling in the Eastern States is definitely in favour of some such scheme for the wheat industry. In Queensland I conversed with various heads of the sugar-cane growers. I put it to them in this way, "You fellows have received a very good deal from the rest of Australia, what about giving the wheatgrowers a chance?" The reply I received was, "Yes, it is time the wheatgrowers were put on a decent basis. We are

satisfied with the deal we have received, and it is up to us to agree to something being done for them." Therefore I conclude that such a scheme would be accepted. It is of no use paying a bounty from one year to another. What we want is a definite scheme covering a period of 10 years, so that we shall know where we stand.

I propose to anticipate an objection that may be raised on the ground that the fixing of a home price for wheat would necessitate a rise in the price of bread. The actual cost of the wheat used to make a 2-lb. loaf of bread is very small indeed. With wheat at 3s. a bushel, the value of the wheat in a 2-lb. loaf is about $1\frac{1}{4}$ d., and to grant a home-consumption price to the wheatgrowers would increase the price of the wheat in the loaf by only three farthings. The price of a loaf of bread depends more upon the cost of production and distribution under arbitration awards, and bakers' profits. Therefore I trust that argument will not be advanced against granting wheatgrowers the desirable and just relief I have indicated.

Let me now touch on the wool industry and the need for a stabilised price for that industry. I am not blaming any Government for the position that exists to-day. The woolgrowers are hopelessly divided amongst themselves, and so long as that division continues, we cannot reasonably expect any Government to put up a scheme to help them. In the Eastern States in particular, the feeling is now definitely tending in favour of some stabilisation scheme that will ensure a minimum price for wool. A lot of conservatives say that to interfere with the wool industry would be unwise, and that we must take what is given us for our wool. We have not received a very good deal from overseas buyers, particularly those of Bradford. They are glad enough to get our wool at bargain prices, but it is time that steps were taken to protect our growers. I do not advocate that we should ask 1s. 6d. or 2s. per lb. for our wool, or anything like it, but growers are entitled to say that they will not accept less than a certain price. The State Government has not been of much assistance to the woolgrowers. The Primary Producers' Association on one occasion asked the Minister for Agriculture to take a plebiscite of woolgrowers to ascertain their feelings in the matter, but the request was turned down. Something along those lines should be done in the near future. Aus-

tralia cannot afford to throw its wool away at bargain prices. We cannot control the overseas price of wheat, but with wool it is a different matter. There we have the thick end of the stick. If we insisted upon receiving a minimum price of 1s. or 1s. 3d. a lb., I am sure we could obtain it. The position of the growers is such that some action must be taken, and the sooner it is taken the better.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have you studied the influence of synthetic material?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. That is a bogey that buyers have been putting up for a long time.

Hon. W. J. Mann interjected.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I think it would be unreasonable to ask for 2s. a lb. We are not asking for that price. If we did ask an unreasonable price synthetic wool would be a greater menace.

Hon. V. Hamersley: But we would be only too glad to get it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Very glad, but we should not ask for anything like that figure. Let me explain the position of the wool industry. Last August wool was bringing 1s. 6d. a lb. If a grower did not sell his wool in August, but held it until February, he was lucky if he received 1s. a lb. Yet, during that period, there was no more synthetic wool in the world than there was previously, and production had not increased in that time. If any member can argue that the market was not rigged against us, I shall be glad to hear his argument. I am sure that the buyers of Bradford thought they had us in the bag and took advantage of the position.

Hon. L. Craig: Wheatgrowers were also in the bag during the same period.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: But there was a greater production of wheat, and that cannot be said of wool. As woolgrowers, we are hopelessly divided, and I admit this is a matter that must be fought out by the growers. I hope the Government will afford an opportunity to ascertain the opinion of the woolgrowers by means of a plebiscite.

I wish to pay a tribute to the Government and to the Chief Entomologist for the excellent work performed to combat the grasshopper menace in the north-eastern wheat belt. I hope there will be no "let-up" on it. The position today is serious, more so than it was last year. Owing to the dry season, the grasshoppers are gradually mak-

ing their way into other areas. The Government Entomologist told me that last year he was perturbed to find the pest at Kellerberrin, and he said there was no reason why this year it should not come down to the Avon Valley if the season continued dry. We hope there will not be a continuance of dry seasons. The Government should spare no effort and no expense in the matter of eradication; an expenditure of £10,000 or £20,000 would be nothing in comparison with the savings possible.

I am indeed disappointed that the Government maintains silence as to its intentions for relief to the egg industry. The Minister for Agriculture, in spite of various deputations, has not disclosed his hand at all. An egg board is nothing new. Such boards exist in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria under the general marketing scheme. For the last 12 months our poultry farmers have done well in spite of throwing their produce on the market in a haphazard manner. The local millers, I consider, are putting it over the people who use bran and pollard. Let me quote a few figures to show the disabilities under which our poultry farmers labour. In Western Australia the price of flour is £10 10s. per ton, less 5s. for cash; in South Australia it is £8 2s. In Western Australia bran costs £7 per ton, as compared with £5 17s. 6d. in South Australia—a difference of 22s. 6d. per ton. Pollard in Western Australia costs £7 5s. per ton, and in South Australia £6 5s.—a difference of £1 per ton. I do not know why that should be so. I am told the object is to make up the loss on flour exported. On the figures I have quoted, however, it does seem that flour is making up some of the loss, seeing that in Western Australia we pay £1 18s. per ton more than the South Australian price. The Government might look into the matter with a view to affording relief that is much needed in various quarters.

Hon. J. Craig: I think it is the bakers and the millers together.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I fail to see that the poultry farmer should carry the loss, if any, on flour exported. Now I come to the old trouble of education in the country. I am afraid that trouble will persist while the present Government remains in power. In the country we cannot obtain any relief at all. The most modest request

is turned down on the plea of "no funds." I proceed to quote a few figures disclosing great disparities between education in the city and education in the country. The East Perth Girls' School has cost £78,500.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Money well spent.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Nobody complains of that expenditure; it is money well spent. I was about to touch on that aspect. The expenditure of £78,500 at East Perth provides for 669 children at an average capital cost of £117 per child. At Merredin there is a school which cost £4,119, with an average attendance of 252 children, representing a capital cost of £16 10s. 6d. per child, as against £117 at East Perth. The Merredin people want a few modest improvements, but cannot get them because they are told, there is no money available.

Hon. A. Thomson: That has gone on for years.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The school ground is a disgrace, and has been condemned by the Health Department. The place is full of water whenever it rains. The headmaster has not even an office in which to interview parents, or in which to cane boys—these have to be taken out on the verandah for that purpose. Such conditions do not seem right in an important place like Merredin. I have been on three deputations, all of which were told that there was no money. They were side-stepped for a couple of months, and then given that reply. At Corrigin—and this is worse—the capital cost of the school is roughly £4 per child. Yet the Government do not hesitate to spend all that money in East Perth. Again, Merredin is badly in need of domestic science tuition. In Saturday's "West Australian" there was a picture of girls at East Perth learning all sorts of things connected with domestic science. It is hard that country children cannot enjoy similar facilities. I do not suggest that such facilities should be made available in every little school, but they should be provided where there is an average attendance of 252 children, and I hope something will be done. Again, assistance might be given to the small country schools towards provision of wireless sets, merely sets to pick up the National Station. I understand that such sets can be bought cheaply in large numbers.

Hon. L. Craig: Parents and citizens' associations usually provide them.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Do those associations provide them in East Perth? The associations, it would seem, are merely supposed to do those things in the country. I say nothing against parents and citizens' associations in the city, but unfortunate farmers who have suffered from droughts and pests cannot afford to supply wireless sets and so forth. Why has the Government not formulated a scheme for supplying cheap sets, for which parents could afford to pay? The present price of £30 is impossible to pay in most cases. However, no effort has yet been made by the Government.

Now I turn to the highly contentious subject of starting-price betting. I investigated it in various Eastern States recently, and was greatly impressed with what has been done in Queensland. Even political opponents of Mr. Forgan Smith praise him highly from that aspect. We know what goes on in Western Australia. I do not wish to speak too drastically, but the way starting-price betting is now conducted here amounts to a positive disgrace. In any country town from one to three or four shops are devoted to starting-price betting. I make no reference to the city; I leave that to my city friends. All sorts of people are to be seen around betting shops in the country—young fellows, adults, and even policemen. It would be a disgrace even if betting were legal. I had working for me a boy who was trying to buy a bicycle on time payment, and I told him it would be best if he spent nearly all his wages in that direction. He replied, "No; I must do some betting." Every Saturday afternoon while he was with me, he spent at the betting shops. Eventually he lost his bicycle, and when he left me he had not a single penny to his name. If the betting shops were not there, boys and men would not be betting. I have no objection to mild gambling by those who can afford it. For instance, I do not see why a man should not buy a lottery ticket and then go to a cricket or football match. But the young fellows I have in mind do not even look at cricket and football matches, let alone play those games; they spend their spare time around the betting shops. The Government would lose no prestige if they tried to remedy the evil; indeed, they would gain more votes than they would lose. Some New South Wales Parliamentarians went to

Queensland to see what was being done there as regards betting, and were so impressed that they introduced into the New South Wales Parliament a Bill on similar lines. To put down betting will be extremely difficult; I do not suppose it will ever be done as long as the Commonwealth Government allows races to be broadcast every Saturday afternoon. Still, some attempt should be made. I regret the optimistic note in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech concerning a wonderful season. I assure the House that the season is most unfavourable. In fact, things are very bad in Western Australia to-day, and it is time people knew it.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: There is absolutely no feed at all.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: No. Even in the York district there is very little. Outback in the wheat belt, although the crops look well to-day, there is no reserve moisture. If there are not heavy rains shortly, Western Australia will be in for a bad time. Rain even now would not save many of the pastures.

Hon. L. Craig: The South-West has never been so dry.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am indeed sorry to hear it. While on the subject of seasons, let me touch on some of the marginal farms in the north-eastern wheat belt. The time is ripe for making a definite effort to bring some of the farmers in from that area. In the Yilgarn district the averages for the last five years have been 8.5, 5.7, 4.2, 2.5, and 4.8 bushels per acre. For the Mukinbudin district the averages for the four years 1933-34 to 1936-37 have been 8.5, 2.6, 3.0, and 3.9 bushels to the acre. The figures for Westonia and Mt. Marshall are practically the same. Last year Westonia averaged 4.3 bushels and Mukinbudin 3.9. Some of the farmers must be moved from those districts, and the sooner we face that fact the better.

I do not know what was in the Government's mind when appointing the Light Lands Royal Commission. The Commission gathered no information that the Government could not have obtained from its field officers. In the Great Southern and South-Western districts it has been found that light lands can be brought into productivity with subterranean clover. The point is this: what moved the Government to set up the Light Lands Royal Commission? Was the idea to bring in farmers from the back areas?

I sincerely hope so. The figures are alarming to anyone who studies them. There is no need for experimenting with some of our light lands so long as the rainfall is adequate. We know what the country can carry if developed. If the Government moved some of those outback people into the better rainfall areas, it would be doing a wonderful job.

A great deal has been said lately about aborigines. People are highly dissatisfied with what is going on in the Native Administration Department. I have been fired at from all directions by people who are dissatisfied with the treatment and conditions prescribed under the Act. A Bill dealing with aborigines was before Parliament two years ago, and we thought conditions would be much improved when that measure was passed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The regulations are the trouble.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Conditions are much worse to-day. While returning over the Trans. line, I wondered what visitors to Western Australia would think when they saw those decrepit, half-starved, dirty, smelly aborigines cadging their way through life from passengers on the train. Visitors to the State do not know that the aborigines are being helped by the Government. One aboriginal said to me, "Give me a penny." I said, "I have not got one; what do you want it for?" He replied, "To buy bread." I knew that was not true, but many people coming from the Eastern States would not know it was untrue. It is a terrible disgrace. People coming from overseas and proceeding to the Eastern States also see those aborigines and naturally form the opinion that they are typical of the aborigines of the State. The half-caste problem is also serious. If the half-castes could be put to work, they would not be increasing as they are. At present, they are given rations and naturally think that they need not work. If these matters were rectified, we would be much better off. The future of the half-castes of this State is very serious indeed. As far as I can see, the Department of Native Affairs has done absolutely nothing to rectify the matter.

I was interested the other night to hear Mr. Craig read the report of Dr. Bull on the rabbit virus. We must accept that report as authentic. I hope the Government will do everything possible to urge the Com-

monwealth Government to release some of the virus for use in this State. I know there will be much opposition to its distribution. A few weeks ago, when in New South Wales, I was listening to a debate in the Parliament and heard a member of the Country Party say that much of the soil erosion in New South Wales was attributable to the rabbit. He said that once the rabbit was disposed of, there would be an end to soil erosion. I then heard a howl from Opposition members about what a great friend the rabbit is to the poor man; this cry came from members for Newcastle, and it made me think what a great deal of opposition would be offered to the release of the rabbit virus. While I was in Victoria, I heard that the rabbit was a great friend of the fur industry, and that there was a good export trade in rabbit skins. I am afraid, therefore, that strenuous opposition will be offered by the Eastern States to the distribution of the virus. Perhaps I should not repeat this, but at the Road Boards Conference held recently, our chief stock inspector said the rabbit virus should not be distributed because the farmers would not employ other than the present methods to destroy rabbits.

Hon. L. Craig: That is a lame excuse.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. I was sorry our inspector said that. Nobody expects that the rabbit virus will be 100 per cent. successful, but if it is only 25 per cent. successful, we shall have another method of destroying the rabbit.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You would not suggest that the Federal Government ought to override the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member heard Dr. Bull's report read by Mr. Craig. It appears to me that there is absolutely no reason why the virus should not be released.

Hon. L. Craig: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research has not recommended its distribution.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It never will.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I can prove that the virus will do harm to no animal but the rabbit.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research must accept responsibility for its action.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I fail to see, if the virus is harmless to all animals but the rabbit, why the Federal Government cannot assume a little responsibility.

Hon. L. Craig: The State can apply for it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: There is no reason why the State should not. Personally, as a farmer and a member of a road board, I would be prepared to experiment with the virus on my farm, and so would many other farmers. The experimental stage is past. The only point upon which the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research is not certain is whether the virus will be 100 per cent. successful, but nobody expects that. The council has carried out its experiments on an island, and our conditions are quite different. I have heard that there is a lot of grass on the island, which would discourage the rabbit moving about from place to place. But here, where waters are far apart, I think the rabbit would travel from one place to another. In spite of what the stock inspector said, I hope the Government will make representations to the Commonwealth Government for a supply of the virus for use in this State. If it is not desired to supply the virus to a private individual or to a road board, then let the Government experiment with it on the Meckering farm, where so many experiments have been carried out.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Why take it to my district and not to your own?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I will have it at York with pleasure. I am surprised at Mr. Baxter's remarks; anyone would think he owned shares in a wire-netting factory.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: To use the virus successfully, a netted enclosure would be required.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not contend that we can do without wire-netting. We cannot do without trapping, but if there is another method of getting rid of the rabbit, for goodness sake let us be game enough to try it. I hope the health regulations, about which we have heard a great deal lately, will in due course be disallowed.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hardships that some of the people in my district have to endure to-day have been brought forcibly home to me. A farmer told me that he had two pigs for which he assured me

he could get £5 at Nelson's if he were allowed to kill them on his farm. He is not allowed to do so. The butcher came along and offered him £4, which he accepted, and so lost £1 on his pigs. That is imposing a very definite hardship on the farmer. Another farmer told me he had a cow which he valued at £6 10s., but he had to accept £5 for it from the butcher.

Member: What did the butcher have to say about it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I interviewed the butcher to check up the statements made to me, and he said they were true. The butcher explained that he had to send the beasts to Midland Junction to be killed; the carcasses were then returned to him and were subsequently sent to the hills district for sale.

Member: The farmer has to send the beasts to Midland Junction.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I must remind members that this is a debate, not a dialogue.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am not advocating that farmers should be allowed to kill beasts on the farm, or here, there and everywhere. I am not advocating that meat should not be inspected. I do, however, advocate that certain centres in outer suburban areas, such as Armadale, Sawyer's Valley, Mt. Helena, Bullsbrook and Rockingham, should be set apart as places where beasts may be slaughtered. At present, beasts at Armadale must be sent to Midland Junction to be slaughtered and the carcasses are then sent back to Armadale for sale. That is not fair. I hope an end will be put to that sort of thing. I desire to make it abundantly clear that I do not oppose meat inspection, which is very necessary.

In conclusion, I desire to touch upon a matter that may be considered parochial, the Wongan Hills Hotel. That is a State hotel, and it is a disgrace. If it were privately owned, it would not be tolerated for six months. Recently, when I was at Wongan Hills, it was desired to hold a big function at the hotel. A Minister of the Crown was present, but the hotel could cater for only 20 guests. I understand that quite 100 people wished to participate in the dinner given to celebrate the opening of the local hospital. It was explained to Mr. Panton what a disgraceful state of affairs existed so far as the hotel was concerned. I hope something will be done in the matter. I do

not advocate extensions or additions to the hotel; I think it should be pulled down and a suitable hotel, worthy of the district, erected in its place. I support the motion.

HON. E. H. ANGELO (North) [5.25]: May I preface my remarks by complimenting you, Sir, on your re-election to this House and particularly on your re-election as its President? I trust you may enjoy your term of office and that its end will see you enjoying as good health as you are to-day. I desire to welcome the two new members to this Chamber. We have had the privilege of hearing Mr. Hall, and I think we all agree he will be a great help to that portion of the State which he has the honour of representing. We have yet to enjoy the pleasure of hearing our other new member. We know, however, that he is an able business man, and I am sure he will do wonderfully good work in this Chamber. I am also pleased that the other seven members who had to submit themselves for re-election are back with us once more, back amongst their old friends. I must express particular pleasure at the return of my colleague for the North (Hon. J. J. Holmes). He has received a great compliment at the hands of those whom he represents, having been returned unopposed. He has worthily represented his province in this Chamber for many years. When speaking the other night, Mr. Baxter referred to the length of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. It certainly took some time to deliver, but it was given under the most pleasing of circumstances. We were surrounded by the youth and beauty of Perth. The Speech certainly did not seem too long to me.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It has age and wisdom, too.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am obliged to my hon. friend for that addition. About the length of one portion of the Speech, however, I can make no complaint, and that is the paragraph referring to the North-West. I have heard 21 or 22 opening Speeches read in Parliament; and usually the people interested in the North have had to be satisfied with a few lines somewhere in the middle of the Speech. On this occasion we have a half page.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: There must be an election coming on.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes. Some very useful information was contained in that

half page. I thank the Government—and I am sure I am also voicing the thanks of my two colleagues—for having rebuilt the jetty at Point Samson. The previous Government failed to carry out the work, but that was because of lack of finance. As happens very often, the National Party seems to be in power while a depression is affecting the finances of the State. We are not only grateful to the Government for rebuilding the jetty at Point Samson, but also for rebuilding the Onslow jetty during the previous year. The re-erection of that jetty has given the people in that district more heart to carry on their work. Before the jetty was re-built they had not adequate facilities for the shipment of their stock. The expense of shipping their wool was considerable and the getting of passengers to the shore was anything but a pleasant experience, especially for the women residing at Onslow and in the back country. However, I am grateful for what has been done and in that regard I know I am voicing the opinion of my colleagues. I am in a rather embarrassing position to-night, as both my colleagues of the North are absent. Mr. Holmes has had to go to the North, but I hope that he will be back in time to take part in this debate because—as I think all members realise—his contributions to the Address-in-reply debate are always interesting and informative. Mr. Miles is at present testing the climate of the Old Country. I am perfectly sure of one thing, and that is that the people of Great Britain will know more about Western Australia—its potentialities, and the opportunities that exist for the investment of money in this State—after Mr. Miles has left England than before he arrived; for if there is a good advertiser of Western Australia wherever he goes, it is my colleague, Mr. Miles. I hope that he also will be back in time to take part in the debates we are bound to have on some of the measures forecast in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech.

In the Speech mention is made of whaling activities. I regret that whaling is not playing as prominent a part in the North this year as it did last year. Two big fleets operated outside of Carnarvon last year; this year there is only one. Unfortunately the fleet that meant the most to Western Australia is not operating this year. I refer to the Norwegian fleet that spent quite a lot of money in Western Australia. Its activities

helped us considerably in Carnarvon and it was also of some value in this part of the State where supplies for the fleet were obtained. In addition, the presence of the fleet in Western Australian waters had the advantage that it brought to the State a fine class of men. The officers and men of that fleet were people I was glad to see coming here and learning a little about the possibilities that exist from the development of the marine wealth in the North. It is unfortunate that they are not here this year. Whether it is because they could not get the same facilities from the Government in the way of concessions as were offered last year I do not know. I cannot see why we in Australia could not have exploited that wonderful industry ourselves. However, there does not seem to be any money for that sort of enterprise in the North and, consequently, sooner than not have that wealth exploited at all, I was glad to see men of the character and the stamina of the Norwegians coming to our coast.

Reference is made in the Speech to the new State boat "Koolama." I had an opportunity of travelling in June as far as the North-West in that very beautiful ship. In a few minor directions an improvement is required in the vessel, but every new ship has these little disadvantages at first, especially when it is built for such an exacting coast as that of our North-west. That it is going to be a most useful vessel in assisting the development of the North-West, I am positive. It is a splendid boat for tourists. The accommodation is very comfortable indeed. I hope, however, that an attempt will not be made to fill the vessel with tourists in the summer months when North-West residents are desirous of coming south for a holiday or desire to return from holidays. For many years tourists have been monopolising most of the accommodation that should have been made available for North-West residents.

Hon. J. Nicholson: To overcome that difficulty would it not be possible to charter a vessel especially for tourists?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I do not know. The tourist traffic is useful for eight months of the year. That is the only time that I would like to go up there for pleasure. I hope that during the hot months, when our residents want to travel up and down the coast, the management will realise that those people should have

the first call on the accommodation of the ship. Reverting to the tourist aspect, I would like to say what a wonderfully cheap trip can be made on the vessel. The return fare to Darwin, covering a period of 25 days, is £21 15s. I do not think that could be beaten anywhere in the world.

Hon. A. Thomson: It is equal to the cost of ordinary hotel accommodation for that period.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Really, it is less than that. The table is excellent. People desiring a sea trip would do well to make the journey.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is a sample of Government enterprise.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: It is a sound Government developmental utility used to a certain extent to give the people of the south a little knowledge of the North that they very sadly need. Regarding the sale of the "Kangaroo," I was sorry to hear the comments of Mr. Baxter and was rather surprised to learn that there was a chance of selling the vessel for £40,000 after it had been sold for £25,000. But I find that is often the case. I have known many stations to be sold, stations that have been advertised for years, and after they have been sold, an extra £5,000 has been offered for them. This I do know, being well acquainted with some of the officers of the State Shipping Service, that we were very fortunate to obtain £25,000.

Hon. A. Thomson: The sum of £40,000 would have been better.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: If we could have got it. When the late Mr. Scaddan was in power, we were offered £70,000, and that was turned down. The vessel is altogether too slow.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It should never have been purchased.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: As it happened, it was a good thing for Western Australia that the vessel was purchased, because within a few years a profit of over £200,000 was made. I think the figure was £270,000. But what happened? The profit was paid into Consolidated Revenue. It would have been better if the money had been credited to the State Shipping Service and used to meet the cost of re-conditioning the vessel, instead of that cost having to be paid out of revenue.

In the Speech, Yampi Sound is mentioned. I am one of those that sincerely regret the

loss of that industry. I am sorry that Western Australia has been deprived of all that the agreement with Japan regarding Yampi Sound would have meant to the State. Not only was Japan going to take our iron ore, but there was a possibility of that country opening up a cattle trade with the West Kimberley district. Had that eventuated, the great problem of what is to become of the cattle from the West Kimberley district would have been solved. In recent years, producers in the south have been engaged in raising cattle on a much larger scale than formerly, which has brought down the price of the Kimberley cattle. The opening of a trade with Japan would have proved very beneficial. I regret the action of the Federal Government for that reason and because it will not now be possible to employ the hundreds of Australian men that it was proposed to employ in the North where the need for population is so great. I am not, however, going to take it on myself to say that the Federal Government was not right in the action it took. There is always something more behind such actions than is perceptible on the surface. Why was that course taken? I will not believe that it was done to deprive Western Australia of some advantage. There is more in it than that. The statement was made that the British Government requested the Federal Government to do what was done. That has been denied by the Federal Government and by the Press. But have not similar denials been made when international relationships have been involved? The only reason I can find for the imposition of this extraordinary embargo by the Federal Government is that it was due to a request from Britain.

Hon. G. Fraser: The Broken Hill combine would have had some say.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I do not believe that the members of the Federal Government are dishonourable men capable of imposing such an embargo for the purpose of boosting Broken Hill. I firmly believe that the British Government asked that this should be done. The British Government knows what is happening in the world and what foreign countries are doing. It knows perhaps that those countries are desirous of building up huge navies and of piling up munitions of war and that they are experiencing a shortage of iron. Knowing all this, would

it not be the duty of the British Government to prevent such developments to the best of its ability? I was speaking in Darwin the other day to a man who is in a better position than most of us to know what is taking place and he told me that the British Government had made that request to the Federal Government at the suggestion of another Government not altogether too friendly to Japan. I only hope there is some truth in it, although I am not in a position to say definitely that there is, because if we have done something of that nature at the request of a very friendly nation—a nation with which we want to be even more friendly—we can expect some quid pro quo in the near future.

Hon. G. Fraser: Friends to-day, enemies to-morrow, you know!

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would it not be better to ascertain facts rather than to quote hearsay in a matter so grave as this?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I agree with the hon. member but, lacking some explanation, the action of the Federal Government is so extraordinary that we must seek the reason. I am charitable enough to think there is some good reason for what was done. If not, if it was just a method of boosting the Eastern States to our disadvantage, there was no excuse for the action taken. However, I am charitable enough to hope that some important reason warranted such drastic action.

Hon. H. Seddon: You are not so charitable to the British Government, seeing that the British Government denied having anything to do with the matter.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The British Government did not deny it; the Federal Government did.

Hon. H. Seddon: And the British Government, too.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Did the British Government deny it? I did not see that.

Members: Yes.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: If that is the position, all I can say is that I do not understand the reason for the embargo. But I feel perfectly certain the Federal Government did not want a foreign nation, which I think has not very much love for us and even has envious aspirations concerning our country, to acquire that iron. Whatever the reason, the Federal Government has imposed that embargo, and it is

up to this Government to insist that the amount expended by the Japanese and our own people should be refunded and to endeavour to have Yampi iron utilised in Australia. If the Government takes somebody's land for public purposes, the owner of the land is compensated. Consequently, the Federal Government should make it up to Western Australia by assisting us to establish an industry there. I trust that will be done. I am convinced that the House would back up any action that our own Government took in that direction.

With regard to the northern pastoral areas, I am sorry to say that whilst one or two districts have had some relief by way of rain, there are still others that are very badly off. The Gascoyne district, particularly, is in a deplorable condition. There has been only a little over an inch of rain this year, and that, too, following three years of drought. I am afraid that the Government will be asked to give sympathetic help to the people there in the future. As a number of the stations will require fodder to keep the rams and ewes alive, I feel certain that the Government will assist by carrying it to those parts at the cheapest possible rate. This brings me to another matter on which I spoke last year and the year before, namely, the desirability of the Government and the people of Western Australia seriously considering the advisableness of handing over the Kimberleys to the Federal Government. I was in Darwin last month and I was astounded to notice the progress that had been made in a comparatively short space of time. I had visited Darwin a year before, and I assure members that in the period fully 200 new houses must have been built there. I should say that Darwin is one of the most active places in Australia for its size. It is all Federal money that is being spent there. Why should we not have our North developed in a similar way? It should certainly be developed if only for defence purposes. The whole of our 2,000 miles of coast line remains completely undefended, and from that point alone we should hand over the Kimberleys to the Federal Government. Of course, conditions should be imposed, one of which could well be the development of that part of Western Australia, with the ultimate object of forming a new State there. What are we going to lose if we agree to part with the North? Probably the Wyndham Meat

Works. We would be losing an industry costing us perhaps £70,000 or £80,000 a year for capital invested.

Hon. G. Fraser: If you closed the Wyndham Meat Works, you could take over those at Carnarvon.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: We could impose the condition that the Federal Government carried on the meat works. We should lose the pearling industry, and in that industry I am afraid we are in for serious trouble.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: I am afraid you are right.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: To retain that industry will cost us a considerable sum of money. But reverting to the meat works, I suppose that nearly 50 per cent of the cattle being treated come from the Northern Territory. Suppose the Federal Government did take over the Kimberleys, the area could not possibly be removed to Canberra; it would still be there, and any trade that developed as a consequence of the transfer would generally benefit the remainder of the State. At present there are only 4,000 or 5,000 people in the whole of the North-West—just about the number to be found in Darwin today. Suppose the North were developed by the Federal Government, that development would add considerably to our benefit, and we should soon have between 20,000 and 30,000 people there.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What would those people do?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: They could be employed in many industries. For instance, the marine wealth would employ a considerable number. All that is required is that the North should be given an impetus by someone or some authority with capital. The cattle industry would be the greatest in the North. Not many years hence Great Britain will require cattle from its own Dominions, and in the Kimberleys we have a wonderful opportunity to develop the industry. A considerable amount of money, however, will first have to be spent in that development; it will be needed for the provision of holding and fattening paddocks for the young stock over the dry seasons.

Some years ago Mr. J. D. Cramsie, a well known authority on cattle export and formerly chairman of the Homebush Meat Works, got into touch with people in England and a syndicate there was prepared to spend seven millions of money in the development of our cattle industry in

the North. The carrying out of the project was almost assured. Acting on Mr. Cramsie's behalf, I communicated with the Premier of the day, Mr. Collier, and later cabled to Mr. Cramsie particulars of the size of the holdings and the tenure. Suddenly, a telegram came that the legal advisers of the syndicate had discovered that there were two authorities, the Federal Government and the Western Australian Government, to deal with, and the syndicate was advised not to go on with the project until it was assured that there was only one authority with which to negotiate. I mentioned this before and one or two members said, "Surely you do not believe that that would be a bar or a disadvantage." I should now like to remind those members of what has happened at Yampi. There we have direct proof that the legal advisers to the syndicate to which I have referred were right. In regard to Yampi, Western Australia made an arrangement with a London company, and after operations were started, the Federal Government cancelled it. This all goes to prove the wisdom of the people at the other end. The principal advantage to be derived from handing over the Kimberleys to the Federal Government would be that it would satisfy people prepared to spend money there in development that they would be dealing with one authority only. Apart from all this, however, the defence aspect is the most serious of all, and if only for that reason, the Commonwealth should assume control of the northern part of this State.

Two years ago I drew attention to the deplorable loss of life that had resulted from motor accidents. The other day I got into touch with the Traffic Department and requested to be supplied with particulars of accidents that had occurred in the metropolitan area during the last ten years. This is the return I received:—

	Fatal.	Serious.	Minor.
1927-28	45	269	3,298
1928-29	54	334	4,594
1929-30	43	491	4,620
1930-31	57	635	3,493
1931-32	50	510	2,638
1932-33	53	521	2,608
1933-34	46	595	2,891
1934-35	68	762	3,123
1935-36	52	835	3,155
1936-37	60	485	3,812
1937-38	71	465	4,237

Hon. L. Craig: Were they all motor accidents?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I asked for a return of motor accidents in the metropolitan area and those were the figures that were supplied to me. In the 10 years no fewer than 599 of the accidents proved fatal. What is the good of talking about increasing the birth rate and immigration when motor vehicles can do so much damage in our community. Surely it is the duty of Parliament to devise means by which these accidents can be minimised. It is really the worst disease that we have; it kills more than any other disease.

Hon. H. Tuckey: And the figures are for the metropolitan area only.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: That is so. The effect also is to crowd our hospitals, and that is another serious aspect. I suppose 50 per cent. of the inmates in the public hospitals are there as a result of motor vehicle accidents.

Hon. H. Tuckey: Because of speeding.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I am expressing my candid opinion when I say that I consider our magistrates treat offenders too leniently. We often notice that men who are arrested for being drunk while in charge of vehicles are let off with penalties of £5 or perhaps £10, while occasionally a fine of £20 is imposed. That is not punishment and it is not a deterrent. Why not cancel the driving licenses of the offenders for a period of 12 months? Most of those who own cars and offend in this manner are well off and fines of £5, £10 or £20 mean nothing to them. Our magistrates should take a more serious view of the offence and inflict a punishment which, as I have said, would act as a deterrent. Speeding is another cause of accidents that should be drastically dealt with also. Unfortunately, we are handicapped by not having a sufficiently large police force. I cannot ask the Government to find another £20,000 or £30,000 with which to increase the police force when I know it cannot afford to do so. Again, we could not fairly ask ratepayers to find that sum of money for the purpose, when it is the motorist that is the cause of the accidents. The motorist is the man who should pay the extra cost. Why should we not say to him, "It is because of your section of the community that we are obliged to increase the police force, and we are going to increase your license fee

by 10s. per car so that the money may be forthcoming for this purpose." The understanding would have to be that the increase in the license fee would be used for this specific purpose, namely, to increase the number of traffic police.

Hon. G. Fraser: And cover also the third-party risk.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: Yes. It may be objected that this would cause a number of motorists to discontinue running their cars. That would be all to the good. A moneylender told me the other day that January and July were his best months—that numbers of motorists came to him to borrow sufficient money to enable them to pay their license fees, and that they repaid him at the rate of 5s. a month.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Have you paid your own?

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I drove a car for 17 years. I was then told I had blood pressure, so I gave up driving. I was not afraid of being killed, but I did not want to kill anyone else. I have not driven a car for the last two years, but I did do so for 17 years without touching anyone.

Hon. G. Fraser: And without getting into the hands of a moneylender.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: I would be in favour of the appointment of a select committee, comprised of members of both Houses, to obtain whatever evidence was necessary and consider what methods could be devised to minimise the awful mortality that occurs. In addition to the mortality, numbers of people have been maimed, sometimes for life, and something should be done to minimise those cases. They occur chiefly through wrongdoing on the part of motorists. I do not say that all motorists are to blame, but many are culpable. The traffic police with their very small numbers are doing wonderful work, but they cannot be expected to do everything. In the city, cross-walks now abound. Police should be stationed at those places to watch proceedings, but they are not available for the purpose. We cannot get sufficient police without further expenditure. A good deal of the money would be forthcoming if the license fees were increased by 10s. or £1, on the understanding that the money was used for purposes that would lead to a prevention of accidents. The people concerned would not miss such small amounts, seeing that they would represent only a few gallons of petrol. If this method

led to some young fellows being driven off the road, no great harm would be done.

We have recently heard something about Heathcote. I am not going to become involved in any imbroglio, but I do want to mention one aspect of the matter. I am glad the Government has decided to appoint a Royal Commission. I hope it will choose Commissioners whose reports will satisfy every section of the community. If that is done, the Commission will accomplish useful results. It is not fair that Dr. Bentley should be called upon to pay his own legal expenses. He was suspended from duty by a Government official. A servant of Parliament, in the person of the Public Service Commissioner, tried the doctor, and later on a judicial authority, also appointed by Parliament, declared him to be not guilty. Is it not fair that the Government should pay Dr. Bentley's legal expenses?

Hon. V. Hamersley: Certainly.

Hon. E. H. ANGELO: The doctor was charged with an offence of which he was found not guilty. A judicial authority, appointed by Parliament, inquired into the matter and exonerated him. Apparently the doctor has to pay his own legal expenses. I hope that is not true. I am sure the Government, on further consideration, will agree that he should be reimbursed.

Every public man should state his attitude on important matters affecting Australia. I consider it time that compulsory training was restored. When I referred to this matter two years ago, the Federal Government had a large budget surplus. I said I would be satisfied if the Government spent the whole of that money on defence, and would be quite agreeable to further sums being raised by taxation so long as that money also was spent on defence. We know that much defence work has been and is being carried out, but is there one member of this Chamber who thinks we are doing all that should be done? We learn from the Press that huge armies of a million men have been brought into existence overseas. Apparently almost every country has adopted compulsory service, while others have resorted to compulsory training. Would it be a hardship upon the people of Australia if compulsory training were introduced here? Let our lads become accustomed to the use of munitions of war. If men are wanted to leave Australia, volunteers can be called for. It is the duty of

every citizen to do what he can to familiarise himself with munitions and other things that may be necessary when war occurs. Although the Prime Minister gave a promise before the last elections that compulsory training would not be introduced, now that the world is seething with unrest and war preparations are being made by every nation, is it not time that we took steps to safeguard our land, our women and our children, and prepared to the utmost extent to resist any invasion that might occur? I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Lands, special settlements	137
Mining, Great Fingal reservation	137
Public Service Appeal Board	137
Shepherd's lucerne	137
Railways, demurrage paid to and by Midland Railway Company	138
Picture shows, sixpenny admission programmes	138
Address-in-reply, fifth day	138

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

QUESTION—LANDS.

Special Settlements.

Mr. HILL asked the Minister for Lands: What are the total amounts which have been expended up to 30th June, 1937, on the special settlements—South Busselton, Nannup, Napier, Walpole?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: South Busselton, £14,027; Nannup, £54,112; Napier, £22,696; Walpole, £114,923.

QUESTION—MINING.

Great Fingal Reservation.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Mines: What was the date of the granting of the original reserve around the Great Fingal mine at Day Dawn, of which temporary reserve 1033H now forms part?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1st June, 1934. The occupant company has now advised that it will not be applying for the extension of its occupancy of this reserve, which expires on the 31st instant.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE APPEAL BOARD.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Premier: 1, Who are the members of the Public Service Appeal Board? 2, When were they appointed? 3, What remuneration do they receive?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Chairman: Mr. Justice Wolff. Members: Government representative on appeals other than those in which Education Teaching Staff is concerned—Mr. C. A. Munt; Government representative when Education Teaching Staff is involved—Mr. R. Hope Robertson; Service representatives: Clerical Division—Mr. F. J. McAdam; Professional Division—Mr. C. L. Henderson; General Division—Mr. W. H. Read; Teachers' representative—Mr. M. Darcey. 2, Chairman and Mr. Munt, 14th July, 1938; Mr. Hope Robertson, 1921; Messrs. McAdam, Henderson, and Read, February, 1938; Mr. Darcey, 1928. 3, £3 per day for each day of sitting (or proportionately for part of a day, with a minimum fee of one guinea), provided that no member shall receive more than £450 in any financial year. If employed by any State instrumentality an allowance equal to the difference between their total emoluments (including house allowance) and the remuneration of £3 per day.

QUESTION—SHEPHERD'S LUCERNE.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Agriculture: In view of the encouragement that is being given in certain quarters to the growing of shepherd's lucerne for use as a fodder for sheep, and as this weed—which is closely related to wild turnip, wild radish, and hoary cress—is highly detri-