

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: If the Committee desires to delete the clause, I shall not feel greatly concerned. A similar provision appears in the Commonwealth Navigation Act.

Mr. Marshall: Do not be guided by the Commonwealth, for heaven's sake!

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I think the object is to enable the law to be enforced under conditions where the people on the ship alone would be able to say what had happened. If we delete the provision, it might be that a person who should be punished will go free.

Mr. Graham: Does it matter much whether the clause is included or not?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I am not going to argue the point in view of the not unreasonable dislike of the member for Murchison to this type of clause.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: We have fought against this principle whenever we have found it in our legislation. The former member for West Perth promised me that after the 1933 election he would go through all the Acts and have that provision struck out, but unfortunately for me and many other people, he did not come back.

Clause put and negatived.

Clauses 210 to 221, Schedules, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray-Wellington): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Thursday, the 21st October.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 11.11 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 21st October, 1948.

CONTENTS.	Page
Boulder electorate, seat declared vacant ...	1771
Questions: Miner's phthisis, as to number of sufferers ...	1793
Mine Workers' Relief Fund Act, as to increasing benefits ...	1793
Potatoes, as to increase of price ...	1793
Tractors, as to allocation and use ...	1793
Canning Highway, as to widening, Causeway to Canning Bridge ...	1794
Shipping, interstate, as to transport of racehorses ...	1794
Motions: Urgency, grasshopper menace, withdrawn ...	1772
Land Sales Control Act, to disallow exemptions regulations ...	1800
Fishing Industry, to inquire by Select Committee ...	1810
Select Committee appointed ...	1816
Bills: Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 1r. ...	1795
Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment, 1r. ...	1795
Administration Act Amendment, 1r. ...	1795
West Australian Club (Private), report ...	1795
Western Australian Marine, recom. ...	1795
Government Railways Act Amendment, Message ...	1799
Western Australian Government Trams and Ferries, Message ...	1799
Road Districts Act Amendment, 2r. ...	1799

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

### BOULDER ELECTORATE.

*Seat Declared Vacant.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the certificate of the death of a member as follows:—

We, the undersigned, being two members of the Legislative Assembly, do hereby certify that Philip Collier, a member of the said House, serving for the Boulder District, died on the 18th day of October, 1948, and we give you this notice to the intent that you may issue a writ for the election of a member to supply the vacancy caused by the death of the said Philip Collier. Given under our hands this 21st day of October, 1948. (Signed) A. R. G. Hawke, Jas. Murray.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray-Wellington) [4.34]: I move—

That the House resolves that owing to the death of the late Hon. Philip Collier, member for Boulder, the Boulder seat be declared vacant.

Question put and passed.

**MOTION—URGENCY.***Grasshopper Menace.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie:—

In view of the serious position of many farmers, particularly those situated in parts of the North-Eastern wheatbelt and marginal areas, owing to the ravages of grasshoppers to crops and pastures, I desire to inform you that it is my intention at the sitting of the House today to move, "That the House do now adjourn" in order to call attention to the matter. Extreme urgency dictates that a full and frank review of the situation be undertaken by the Government immediately, as hundreds of farmers, already seriously affected through adverse seasonal conditions, are now faced with the grim necessity of disposing of the major portion of their flocks.

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

Seven members having risen in their places,

**MR. KELLY** (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [4.36]: In September, 1936, Mr. Warner, then member for Mt. Marshall, moved the adjournment of the House on this very same subject. In October, 1942, Mr. Boyle, then member for Avon, acted in a like manner. In November, 1942, Mr. Berry, then member for Irwin-Moore, moved for a Select Committee to be appointed to inquire into and report upon five aspects of this problem; namely—the incidence of grasshoppers; methods of eradication; compensation to farmers affected by the plague; the need to create a special fund and to appoint special scientific officers with a view to discovering a parasite which would deal with the grasshopper menace; and all other matters pertaining and relevant to grasshopper control.

In the course of the various debates, and through replies given by Ministers to questions, a great amount of ground was traversed with regard to grasshopper infestation. I think that on each of the previous occasions on which motions were moved in connection with this matter, the members responsible said that they felt quite justified in bringing the position before the House. On this occasion, I, too, feel completely justified in drawing attention to the problem, which is one of extreme urgency both to individual farmers and to the State.

So far as I can gather, in going through the various reports, grasshoppers first appeared in this State in any considerable number in 1917. Between that year and 1926, there does not appear to have been a great amount of notice taken of them. In 1926 there were records of mild attacks; but in 1932 plague proportions were reached, and the same occurred in 1936 and 1942. In 1947 grasshoppers were bad in many parts of the State; but in 1948, unfortunately for those most concerned, they have become a far worse menace. Because of the scarcity of feed, through seasonal conditions, they have created more havoc on this occasion than at any time in the past.

Other countries, too, have had to face difficulties with grasshoppers. In one year alone, South Africa found it expedient to spend £2,000,000 on grasshopper eradication. In 1926 that country spent £700,000, and for the three successive years over half a million pounds a year in combating this menace. The South African Government levies a tax on all rural lands, and is thus in a better position than the Governments of some other countries to deal with this menace from the financial aspect. South America—particularly the Argentine—and Russia, have experienced grasshopper worries at various times. In Russia the control of grasshoppers—and, in fact, all rural activity—is under the direct control of the Government. I think it may safely be said that in some of those countries where huge sums have been spent reasonably effective control has been exercised during bad periods.

The grasshopper invasion has reached the proportions of a national menace in this State. I understand that the area affected is roughly from Mullewa to Esperance. Some 600 miles of country have been subjected to the depredations of these insects and the destruction of crops and pastures has reached an unprecedented magnitude. Because of the late rains the backward growth of most pastures has been eminently suited to the spread and increase of the 'hoppers this year. Wherever cultivation has taken place, huge concentrations of grasshoppers have devoured all the feed and have then left to go to districts that have not previously been infested. Some farmers are practically eaten out. On two occasions I have seen farmers in tears. That

may sound like drawing the long bow, but it is so. They have been totally eaten out and are now faced with ruin. The stock they have left is not in a fit condition to obtain anything like a decent market price. The Agricultural Department officers, in conjunction with those of the Rural and Industries Bank, have, over the years, faced up to an impossible task.

After 20 years of attempted control there is little apparent improvement in checking the pest in this State. The so-called marginal areas remain, as always, a buffer in stemming the tide of the grasshoppers and preventing them from invading the more southern and western wheatgrowing and stockraising districts. The time is opportune for a full dress review of all the past activities as well as the future measures to be taken in dealing with this devastating pest. The facts must be faced, and a satisfactory longview policy launched at once. Past experience, I suggest, should dictate our future approach. Shortage of finance in combating the menace is a very lame excuse because when amounts, purely for the destruction of grasshoppers, have been provided on the Estimates, it has been on only a few occasions that they have been spent, or exceeded. It is interesting to know the sums that have in the past been allocated, and what has been spent. Commencing from the year 1935-36 the figures are as follows:—

	Vote.	Expenditure.
	£	£
1935-36 ..	Nil	750
1936-37 ..	Nil	3,843
1937-38 ..	12,000	21,161
1938-39 ..	11,000	8,486
1939-40 ..	4,000	903
1940-41 ..	4,000	289
1941-42 ..	2,000	259
1942-43 ..	500	4,305
1943-44 ..	18,000	5,004
1944-45 ..	10,000	4,996
1945-46 ..	14,000	13,648
1946-47 ..	14,000	6,023
1947-48 ..	10,000	4,991

During the 10-year period 1935-36 to 1945-46 the Government spent £63,643, but I venture to suggest that that would not be an excessive amount if it were divided into three years instead of 10. In the last two years, 1946-47 and 1947-48, the amount spent was less than half what was allocated. I find there is evidence that successive Governments have not been fully extended in their treatment of grasshopper-infested

areas. The figures I have quoted amply bear out that contention. Undoubtedly the entomologists and other officers of the Agricultural Department have achieved considerable results from their research work, but I am afraid there has not been sufficient field work to follow up the excellent job done by them.

As I have said, only £4,991 was spent out of the £10,000 provided in the 1947-48 Estimates. Because of the adverse reports received from time to time, and the actual results experienced in connection with the 'hoppers last year, there is no excuse for the £10,000 not having been exceeded. The grasshoppers were bad during that time, but, within the last twelve months, many Yilgarn settlers were refused grasshopper ploughing during the period when some good results could have been achieved. They were advised—I was myself, in fact—that the present policy did not provide for expenditure in that area. The department felt that ploughing of isolated parts, such as the Yilgarn district, should not be encouraged. Yet, over the years, this district has been one of the grasshopper-infested and breeding areas.

Mr. Marshall: Are grasshoppers capable of travelling long distances?

Mr. KELLY: Some reports say that they travel about 15 miles, but I can recall areas where grasshoppers have not been in plague form, and then have appeared all of a sudden to create as much havoc as anywhere else, and they had 30 miles to travel over uninhabited country. In October-November, 1947, the grasshoppers came to the Yilgarn area, but only in mild plague form, because there was not sufficient feed to detain them for any length of time. During the period they were there, however, the stock-carrying capacity of the district was greatly reduced. It is rather significant to recall that with only £4,991 spent last year, the Deputy Premier, in his policy speech, had this to say under the heading of "Vermin"—

The losses suffered owing to depredations of vermin have been estimated by a recent Royal Commission at not less than £2,000,000 per year. We will provide vigorous action by the Government and financial assistance to local authorities where necessary to help in their eradication.

The Premier: The local authorities have been helped in this case.

Mr. KELLY: Evidently not to a great extent, because the Government has spent less than half the sum allocated.

The Premier: More than that.

Mr. KELLY: The Deputy Premier continued—

The position is particularly bad in the North-West. The Commission recommended a contribution of £12,000 per year for five years from consolidated Revenue and we will undertake an expenditure of further money.

Late in the year, when hundreds of farmers are suffering great hardship and are being practically forced on to the roads through the destruction caused by this pest, we find that less than half the sum allocated has been spent. The Deputy Premier went on to say that he would be very generous where the eradication of emus was concerned, but that is another story and I will not deal with it at present.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Did he not say something about introducing legislation to give full effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission?

Mr. KELLY: Yes; but I will not refer to that. I am afraid I am modest, when it comes to leading the attack.

The Minister for Education: In other words, you are afraid of the Standing Orders.

Mr. KELLY: The policy of spending small sums has been proved over the years to be inadequate to meet the situation in this State. The Government would achieve more lasting and effective results if an all-out drive were launched, covering a period of three or five years. I feel that we could make far more use of scarifying on a wide scale. It should commence with the end of the egg-laying period and should continue through the summer months until the early rains come. A great deal of good would come from a policy of shallow ploughing or scarifying during that period, as the disturbing of the ground would unearth the egg deposits and expose them to the hot rays of the sun. If those methods were adopted I believe a marked improvement would result.

I understand that the grasshoppers lay their eggs at the time when almost all of the available feed has been consumed. The pest goes through the crawling stages and then takes wing. After that a period of several

weeks generally elapses, until most of the available food is consumed, and it is then that the eggs that will hatch in the coming year are laid. The 'hoppers bore into the hard ground—sandy soil is of no use to them—and form little cylinders in each of which they lay 16 or 18 eggs. They then seal the cylinders off against any moisture that might otherwise spoil the eggs. By ploughing the eggs up during the months when the sun is strongest a great deal could be done to overcome the grasshopper menace. Although some of the eggs would not be destroyed by the ploughing or scarifying, the surviving hoppers could be accounted for when in the crawling stage by an abundant supply of poisoned bait. That would apply particularly if the bait was made available ahead of time in the affected areas, instead of waiting until the grasshoppers got on the wing.

Express delivery should be used for the distribution of the poisoned bait to the areas affected. That should continue throughout the period while the young grasshoppers are in the crawling stage, and until the winged stage is reached. If a vigorous and generously-financed policy of that nature were implemented on a carefully planned basis, covering several years, I feel that the ravages of the grasshoppers would be quickly curtailed. Quite apart from the expedients I have suggested I think an experienced officer of the Department of Agriculture should be appointed to take charge of the control of grasshoppers. We should not wait until we are overtaken by a grasshopper plague but should appoint such an officer now and give him full authority to engage the staff of entomologists, inspectors, and so on necessary for the work. He should be given the right to act independently and free from all interference. He should be entrusted with the setting up of an efficient organisation. For that position we would require a man competent to make quick decisions, as it is impossible to foretell exactly where outbreaks of the pest will occur.

A great deal of mapping is done by the Department of Agriculture and many egg-infested areas are known to the officers of that department, but the grasshoppers are always appearing in fresh places. The officer to be appointed should be one who could make quick decisions and act promptly. He should be charged with the responsibility of

formulating a plan of approach to this problem, which is of great magnitude. The grasshopper menace can be dealt with successfully only over a period of years, irrespective of whether the insects appear in plague form or in the milder form in which they are seen in some years. Most of the attempts of the department so far to deal with the pest have met with failure. That has not been due to the fault of any individual officer, but only to the policy followed. By that I mean that if we had an officer solely responsible for the control and eventual destruction of grasshoppers in the infested areas there would be no need for him to consult anybody else. If he knew that a specific sum had been set aside for the control of the pest he could plan efficiently to destroy the grasshoppers in their early stages.

I think failure to control the pest in the past could be brought under a number of headings. One of the faults has been that our efforts have been made piece-meal, with little or no co-ordination. There was a period when the farmers took almost no notice of the encroachments of the grasshoppers; when road boards sounded a note of warning but, owing to the poor response in many quarters, more or less forgot about the pest. When the Government of the day tried to obtain some co-operation from those most affected it did not receive a great deal of assistance. Most of the attempts to control the grasshoppers in the past have failed, as I have said, owing to the piece-meal methods adopted. Another contributing factor has been the tendency towards niggardliness. Various amounts have been allocated over a period of years, but on many occasions only half the sum voted has been spent, and I feel that the controller of the purse strings must have been niggardly during those years otherwise a more concerted action would have been taken. I find, too, that a contributing factor is delayed decision. Very often too little, too late, to use a term that I have heard used internationally!

On one occasion the Yilgarn Road Board applied for bran, molasses and poison, a long period ahead of its actual receipt into the district with the result that, when these items did arrive, the 'hoppers were on the wing and little advantage would have been gained by spreading poison. I have spoken

of the various units that have contributed to the lack of co-ordinated policy. By bringing these matters under the control of one specific officer I feel that a co-ordinated policy would be possible. Another matter that has contributed to the spread of this menace over past years in no uncertain manner, has been the laxity shown when the grasshopper appearance did not assume plague proportions. It must have been the usual course, when there were not many complaints regarding 'hoppers, for little, if any, work to be done. At least, if it had been done then the expenditure, should have reflected the amount of work accomplished.

Vigilance during the period when the 'hoppers are not considered to be in menace proportions, should be the time when we wage an unending war in an endeavour to prevent a recurrence in poorer seasons. Although a sum of £15,000 has been mentioned in the report of the Royal Commission on Vermin, I feel that amount should be exceeded very greatly, if the grasshopper menace is not to drag out over a period of years, as has been our experience in the past. If a sum of £25,000 or £30,000 were earmarked as an item of possible expenditure it would go a long way, in one or two seasons, towards stamping out this pest. The ploughing of Crown lands and abandoned properties held by the Rural and Industries Bank, as well as occupied farm lands, would be a policy that would make a heavy drain on any amount allocated, but I think that method of approach is the one that has the most merit: therefore the bulk of the expenditure should be used in scarifying and light ploughing through summer periods. I feel sure that particular method would yield the best results. Land, if ploughed and treated, whether on Agricultural Bank abandoned properties, Crown lands, or even on land held by various farmers, must be taken into account if we are to have a well-organised plan for the eradication of grasshoppers. A large proportion of the money expended could be recouped if some reasonable proposition were put to the farmers for the after working of their land.

The present allocation for ploughing as paid to farmers and contractors, is insufficient. It does not cover costs as far as the farmer is concerned, even after taking into consideration the fact that the land broken

up is an advantage to the farmer and enables him to grow a crop. The price of 5s. per acre paid to contractors is not nearly enough to make them anxious to undertake the work, and consequently there is a reluctance on their part to do any of it. I have had conversations with a number of them who state that in the past 5s. might have covered their efforts, but today, with rising costs, they are not sufficiently compensated for their expenditure, work and the wear and tear on their expensive plant. An increase to 7s. or 7s. 6d. an acre should be offered, if we are to get sufficient ploughing done at the right time to benefit the various districts affected in the fight against this scourge.

Most farmers find that the half crown per acre allowed does not enable them to cope with present-day costs, and I suggest that that sum be raised to the amount now allowed to contractors, namely, 5s. If those suggestions were carried out, and a sum of 7s. 6d. paid to contractors and 5s. to farmers, it would ensure that a sufficient amount of ploughing would be carried out at the right time. If the amounts are increased on these lines, or somewhere approaching those figures, it should then be compulsory for farmers in affected areas to carry out a certain amount of ploughing annually. I do not think it would be possible to instruct farmers to plough a huge amount in any one season, for financial reasons and for the reason that they have other work to do at the same time. However, I do think that some compulsion is necessary, not for all farmers, but because unfortunately we have a number who are not sufficiently interested in their own and their neighbour's welfare, and perhaps I might add to the welfare of the State, to carry out the plan unless it is made compulsory. There must be no half measures if success is to be achieved. All known resources must be combined in an all out effort to strike a death blow at this grasshopper menace.

It is rather opportune that I should have decided to bring this matter before the House today, because I have received several letters which more or less bear out the urgency with which this matter is viewed over a wide area of the State. The first letter I have is from the Yilgarn Road Board addressed to me, under date the 19th October, 1948, as follows:—

#### Grasshopper Control.

In connection with the above, I am enclosing copy of a letter forwarded to the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture.

It would be appreciated if you would give your full support to our request.

The board's request is under the same date and heading, and is addressed to the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture. It reads—

At the meeting of the Yilgarn Road Board held on 15th October, 1948, my board resolved to request that the subsidy paid to farmers for the ploughing of grasshopper egg-bed infested land on their own properties be increased to 5s. per acre.

It was considered that the increase was fully warranted owing to the increased cost of plant, repair parts, fuel and labour, and the urgent necessity to bring the pest under control.

It is trusted you will use every endeavour to see that this request of my board is approved.

The other letter is one received by me at the same time from the Mukinbudin Road Board, and I understand the member for Mt. Marshall has full knowledge of it. This letter reads—

#### Grasshoppers.

Attached please find a copy of the minutes of a conference held at Mukinbudin on the 13th inst. on the above problem. You will notice a minute seeking the assistance of our Parliamentary representative in the presentation of our views.

The minute is actually badly worded and you may accept it that the intention was to seek your assistance in ensuring that an adequate grant of money is made available for the campaign against the pest, that it is available early, and that the seriousness of the problem is not lost sight of in responsible quarters.

I have a copy of the resolutions made at this conference, which consisted of delegates from the following boards:—Koorda, Mt. Marshall, Nungarin, Westonia and Mukinbudin. I will not weary the House by reading all the resolutions, but I would like to give support to my contentions by quoting one or two of them. Under the heading "Outer Areas," it was resolved—

That this conference is of the opinion that the "outer" or "stock areas" must receive preferential treatment in the allocation of money for the suppression of grasshoppers.

In commenting on that resolution, I am pleasantly surprised that this conference adopted two words which are of great significance and which correct a misnomer under which these districts have laboured for

many years. They are, in the first instance, "outer," and in the second instance, "stock areas," thus replacing the term "marginal area" which, as I say, is a misnomer and should never have been applied to any of the lands in this State. Another resolution is under the heading "allocation of plant," which reads—

That the settlers in these "outer" or "stock areas" must receive some measure of preferential treatment in the allocation of plant capable of efficiently suppressing grasshoppers.

That, too, is a very important resolution because, without the plant necessary for the great amount of work to be accomplished in these areas when these people get some preferential treatment in regard to the release of tractors, we are faced with an insufficiency of heavy plant to deal with the large amount of country infested. The next resolution is—

That the policy of ploughing three inches deep in winter be changed to 1½ inches in summer, where practicable.

That, of course, bears out my earlier contention that a large amount of scarifying could be done during the hot periods of the year. Another resolution was in connection with the re-selection of land. It was moved and resolved—

That in the outer areas before land, which has been eaten out by grasshoppers is re-selected, the Government, through either the Department of Agriculture or the R. and I. Bank, shall have it completely broken up as part of the grasshopper destruction policy and, where necessary, the whole cost shall be borne by the Government.

It should be evident to any thinking person that it is totally wrong to re-allocate disused farm lands where the grasshoppers have had a free go over a period of years. It is also evident that it is totally unfair that this land should be re-allocated to any settler before it is treated in an endeavour to stamp out the grasshopper. Under the heading of "Farming Practice" it was resolved—

That we recommend that a system of tillage of not less than once in every five years be made compulsory in the Koorda, Mt. Marshall, Mukinbudin, Nungarin and Westonia Road Board areas.

Further, under the heading of "Poison Bait Supply," it was resolved—

That the Government Entomologist be asked to have poison and bran sent to every vermin board centre by the 1st May each year, irrespective of whether grasshopper infestation is apparent or not, and so avoid the wasteful

and useless practice of getting bait half way through a bad grasshopper season.

The last resolution has bearing on the remarks I passed a short time ago, when I stated that too little too late had, in some cases, retarded the control of grasshoppers. Finally, under the heading, "Vermin Board Action," it was resolved—

That the boards here represented, each early in the year, bring to the notice of its rate-payers the necessity for and efficiency of benzene—hexachloride in destroying grasshoppers with a view to securing their co-operation.

It has always been contended that the method of poisoning by any other than the bait system would not be effective, but apparently from these centres comes the reassurance that there are other forms of treatment, and I feel that these too, in a recommendation to the Government, should be the subject of a great amount of research. The motion is an honest attempt to improve the outlook for many suffering farmers plagued with this pest, and I feel that it should give the Government an opportunity of outlining to this House and the State what its policy is in this connection. There is no time like the present for that consideration to be given, because hundreds of farmers are looking to the Government for an indication of its future movements. I can assure the Premier that if he were to see those infested areas and observe some grown men actually in tears because of the desolation that has been brought to their homes by the grasshopper on this occasion, he, too, would be moved to the most generous actions and treatment of those people. I move:—

That the House do now adjourn.

**MR. LESLIE** (Mt. Marshall) [5.20]: In speaking to the motion—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Are you supporting it?

**MR. LESLIE**: I am pleased that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has brought this question before the House. I am happy at any time—

Hon. A. H. Panton: You don't look it.

**MR. LESLIE**: —to direct the attention not only of the Government and members of the House but also of the people to the situation in a portion of Western Australia that has not received in the past and, unless a battle is put up, will not, I am afraid, receive in the future in many respects the

justice to which it is entitled. I am careful at all times to draw attention to the requirements of my electorate and of the neighbouring constituencies. I am afraid, however, that we are a little late at the moment in attempting to deal with the depredations of grasshoppers for the present season.

Mr. Fox: Whom do you blame for that?

Mr. LESLIE: The major portion of whatever damage the grasshoppers can do this year has already been accomplished. Some damage could still be done to the standing crops although they are reaching the ripening stage which makes them a little safer from the inroads of the 'hoppers.

Mr. Kelly: They could deal with the matter of eggs now.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes, and safeguard the position with regard to next season. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has generalised in connection with the present grasshopper plague. I have told the House before and will continue to repeat whenever necessary, that general statements are always dangerous. In the Mt. Marshall electorate and the three road board districts mentioned by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie, we have the grasshoppers in plenty. We have always had them as far back as my memory goes and certainly back to 1928 or 1929. Generally speaking, we do not have them to the extent that we had in 1931 and 1932 when the infestation assumed proportions that demanded the attention of the Government. At that stage the district received the attention necessary. Since then the inroads fortunately have been in somewhat isolated parts. The damage that they have done and their concentration have not been as general as in 1932 when they really advanced on the north-eastern wheatbelt in a wide column.

Mr. Kelly: Was it not in 1936?

Mr. LESLIE: At any rate, the infestation that was so serious took place during the depression years, and some discussion arose then concerning the use of the unemployed in an attempt to deal with the scourge. That was the year—it might have been 1933—when I saw the grasshoppers advancing under conditions somewhat similar to those I had experienced in South Africa. There is a difference, however, between the two instances. What we know as grasshoppers are there referred to as locusts but in South

Africa the insects are of a different type and their advance is by wing. I was in Johannesburg during a plague of locusts and at that time the trains were held up. All sporting activities had to cease.

Mr. Kelly: A train on the Mukinbudin line was held up.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes, I am aware of that fact. However, in Johannesburg it was impossible for the people to make their way to the sports ground, and those who had to go out on the streets made use of umbrellas to keep the insects from settling on their heads. In one area I saw large tracts extending over some 80,000 acres of land eaten out by locusts within three hours. The insects had advanced on a 30 mile front and came from the Bechuanaland desert, a distance of some 200 miles away. When they advanced it was as though there was one long, dark cloud overhead. I think it was in 1932 that I saw the grasshoppers invade our north-eastern wheatbelt under somewhat similar conditions.

I consider that the best means of dealing with the grasshopper pest would be the adoption of something similar to the lines followed by the South African Government. In that dominion the Government compelled the growers themselves, under the provisions of legislation that was enacted, to assist not in destroying the 'hoppers but in permitting the authorities to carry out destructive measures. It became an offence of a serious nature not to comply with the requirements of legislation that was enacted, to assist not could be laid against any farmer on whose area grasshoppers were found to be breeding and who had not in the previous year notified the Government that the insects had landed on his property. He was not required to do more than that and, the farmer having notified the authorities that the locusts had landed on his property, the Government took the necessary action to destroy them.

The problem is not a serious one in South Africa today. There the authorities face the future because of the operations of the legislation, with a reasonable amount of confidence that, though the pest may not be completely eradicated, it will be better controlled. Naturally they cannot get rid of the locust in the Bechuanaland desert but they have what are known as watchers paying close attention to the pest in the desert. By



that means the breeding is largely restricted to those areas where there is little for the insects to eat, and the Government has obviated the pest's multiplying in the agricultural areas.

In Western Australia the previous Government established a very fine scheme under which a body, known as the Grasshopper Council, was set up. I have discussed this problem with members of that body and have been informed that there is no necessity for action along the lines I have indicated, provided the growers will play their part in the attempt to control the grasshopper menace. My experience in the Koorda, Mt. Marshall and Mukinbudin districts is that while there is always the odd man that will not come in, the close co-operation between the local authorities and the Grasshopper Council has been gratifying. If it is learnt that there is a grasshopper infested area in a district, the local board notifies the council accordingly and I have yet to be informed of any instance where finance has been refused for any work, the necessity for which was apparent.

I agree that because of the present-day limitation upon the availability of materials and manpower, it might be difficult to get work done at specific times but nevertheless, with the assistance of local governing authorities and co-operation between them, the Grasshopper Council and the Department of Agriculture, I have yet to learn that any infested area has been left lying unattended. At one stage it was extremely difficult to secure sympathetic action on the part of the Department of Agriculture respecting infested areas on abandoned properties that were held as securities by private financial institutions. We had considerable difficulty some years ago in convincing the Department of Agriculture that these infested areas were as great a danger to the surrounding districts and the State as was an infested Rural Bank property. However, this difficulty was overcome during the term of the previous Government, which said, "We will do the lot." My experience of the previous Government and of the present Government enables me to say that I know of no case where there has been anything like a wilful or even unwitting neglect of any opportunity to deal with a grasshopper-infested area once the attention of the department was called to it. There has been co-operation right through.

I agree that perhaps there have been farmers who have not been as assiduous in their own interests and in the interests of their neighbours as they might have been, that they have not notified the authorities of danger patches existing on their properties or on adjacent properties, and I believe that this is the reason why today there are grasshoppers in the areas mentioned by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. In portions of the Mt. Marshall and Mukinbudin areas—I speak of these because I have personal knowledge of the conditions—there is this season a heavier infestation of grasshoppers than there has been for some few years, but they are present in isolated patches and not showing anything like a solid front. Today one might travel over many miles of country carrying good crops and find grasshoppers present only in small numbers, and as they are seen in any other area. On the other hand, one may see isolated, badly infested patches that are undoubtedly causing much loss to the individual grower and proving a heart-break to the farmer as the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie mentioned.

I am not prepared to say that the farmer himself is responsible; it may be that the grasshoppers were bred, not on his property but on neighbouring land, either privately-owned or Crown land. Therefore the individual cannot be blamed for that and he deserves all sympathy. In the eastern part of the Mukinbudin road district, the infestation is heavier, and I believe this is due to there being a larger area of uncultivated land in that region, such as Lake Brown and Lake Campion and adjacent to the border of the Yilgarn-Coolgardie electorate that offers opportunity for breeding. Some growers undoubtedly will suffer the loss of practically the whole of their crops but, as I have pointed out, there are reasons for the infestation in many instances and the individual grower himself cannot always be condemned.

Let me revert to the tie-up between the local authorities, the Grasshopper Council and the Department of Agriculture. I can only repeat that, with such a set-up and the co-operation that exists, I find little cause for complaint. I agree with the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie that the half-crown and five shillings provided are, in view of present-day costs, inadequate. Although I can arrange for tillage on that basis, it is difficult to get anyone to undertake ploughing contracts because of the

smallness of the payment. Where there is a property to be ploughed by the department and the adjacent farmers cannot do the work, it is extremely difficult to arrange ploughing contracts with farmers not immediately surrounding the infested area.

How the problem is to be overcome other than by the methods now being adopted, I do not know. There is one way in which to ensure a minimum infestation of grasshoppers and other pests, but particularly grasshoppers, and that is by giving effect to the proposal made at the meeting held at Mukinbudin for rotational tillage of the soil. While we have the present limitation on production in the areas previously referred to as the marginal areas—I have long protested against the use of the term “marginal areas”—so long shall we be affording an opportunity for the breeding of grasshoppers. Some years ago, in the course of negotiations with the Rural Bank and the Wheat Stabilisation Board, I suggested that the marginal areas restriction should be eased to permit of a grower's cultivating annually one-fifth of his cleared land and of his growing oats or wheat, as he preferred, and selling it as he liked. If he grew wheat, he should be allowed to sell it as grain.

I travelled through the Koorda, Mukinbudin and Mt. Marshall road districts and put that suggestion before growers, and said that if the proposition was acceptable to them I would submit it to the Government. However, I required their backing. I said that if they obtained what might be regarded as a concession for the marginal areas, they must be prepared to accept legislation compelling them to cultivate one-fifth of their cleared land, which would be only fair, if by way of compensation they were permitted to dispose of the produce raised as they thought fit. The growers agreed, and the resolution from Mukinbudin is based on the series of meetings I held three years ago. In the course of discussions with the Rural Bank authorities however, I found that they were not in favour of the proposal. Realising that this opposition represented a serious hurdle, I modified my views and have now suggested that a grower in the marginal areas should be compelled to till at least one-fifth of his cleared area every year, but in return he should be allowed to grow as much as he likes, of what he likes, the only restriction

being that a specific proportion of what he does grow must be reserved for use on his farm as stockfeed, say, half or one-third, as the case may be. I made that suggestion in view of the fact that these districts have now become stock-raising areas.

There is insufficient natural feed and unfortunately some of the farmers are not growing enough feed to carry their stock through the dry months. This is one way in which we can induce fodder conservation. By adopting this course the farmer would not have to dispose of his stock, in the event of his feed having been destroyed by grasshoppers, emus or rabbits, at a time when the disposal would mean a financial loss. In at least half of the area I have mentioned that proposal has been accepted by the growers as a reasonable one. I have not yet had time to talk to the other growers; but feel convinced that they, too, will accept it. It will then be put before the authorities, both Federal and State, as a long-range or permanent method of dealing not only with the grasshopper, but with other vermin as well, and it will permit of the cultivation of the land upon a reasonable basis.

It is unreasonable to compel a man to spend money for the preservation of his own and his neighbours' property and at the same time deny him the opportunity to reap a reward for his labour. It is unreasonable to say to a farmer, “We will pay you 5s. per acre to cultivate your land and you must then leave it.” That is uneconomic. It is far better to say to him, “We will pay you 5s. per acre to cultivate your land, but you must grow fodder on it for the use of your stock.” We must encourage the tillage of that land as much as we possibly can as a general policy.

Mr. Kelly: There is no general policy today.

Mr. LESLIE: Yes, there is.

Mr. Kelly: No. It is not operating in my electorate.

Mr. LESLIE: Which policy?

Mr. Kelly: Any policy.

Mr. LESLIE: A policy regarding grasshopper destruction?

Mr. Kelly: Yes.

Mr. LESLIE: I grant that that is not operating, but it is the policy I want to see operating. It is the only sound policy and

it would encourage the growers to do as much as they possibly can of their own volition to destroy the vermin on their properties. If necessary, they should be compelled to do so, but at the same time they should reap a reasonable reward for their work. I know of no instance where the Grasshopper Council, acting on the advice and recommendation of the local governing authorities—who know their districts—has declined to let a contract for grasshopper ploughing.

Mr. Kelly: Does the council make the amount available to certain parts of the State only?

Mr. LESLIE: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie alluded to the fact that in last year's Estimates the sum of £4,000 or £5,000 only of the £10,000 made available was spent. The Government provided the money for that specific purpose. I suggest that the money was there to be spent if it were required.

Mr. Kelly: Why was grasshopper ploughing refused for Yilgarn only? It is only lately that we have been able to get it at all.

Mr. LESLIE: I am afraid the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie must speak for his area, as he knows what is best for it. I am speaking now of the three road boards which he mentioned in his opening remarks as being tied up with the North-Eastern district, the Koorda, Mt. Marshall and Mukinbudin boards. I know of no instance where grasshopper ploughing has been refused in those districts. I myself have travelled through them and if some farmer has reported an infestation of grasshoppers, or the faintest suspicion of an infestation, recommendations have at once been made that ploughing should be done, even although the local Rural Bank officer, who is the inspector, was not certain about it. There was a consultation between him, the secretary of the road board and the members of the board, a recommendation for ploughing was made and a contract for the work to be done was never refused by the authorities.

I can readily understand why only £4,000 or £5,000 of the £10,000 provided was spent last year. It was because grasshopper depredations last year were small; the biggest trouble was the army and web worms. Action can only be taken if the facts are

brought to the attention of the department concerned. As regards my electorate, I am constantly in touch with the Agricultural Department and the Rural and Industries Bank, both of whom are responsible for the expenditure of the vote for grasshopper destruction. From my own knowledge of the circumstances of my electorate, the number of grasshoppers last year was small. I readily concede as regards some parts of the district which were infested by grasshoppers last year that possibly the farmers did not notify the authorities. Those eggs therefore hatched and so have become a serious menace. However, had the infestation been notified to the Grasshopper Council, I guarantee that, so far as the Mt. Marshall electorate is concerned, it would have received attention. I would not have been told that there was no money to destroy the pest. I do not say that in my own electorate there are no grasshoppers and no areas left unploughed which should have been ploughed; but I assert that the road board, the Grasshopper Council, the Rural and Industries Bank and the Department of Agriculture cannot be blamed for it.

Mr. Reynolds: Whom would you blame for negligence?

Mr. LESLIE: I would not blame anyone for negligence. I would say that possibly some land was left unploughed which should have been ploughed, as a farmer cannot inspect every inch of his property all the year round. He is otherwise engaged. He would not be aware whether some part of his property was infested and needed ploughing.

Mr. Kelly: Does this Grasshopper Council reside permanently in your district? We do not see anything of it.

Mr. LESLIE: If the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie would examine the minutes of the Mukinbudin meeting, he would find that Mr. Aitken, a member of the Koorda board, was also a member of the Grasshopper Council. He explained that he was present at the conference as a member of the Grasshopper Council. I will say this for Mr. Aitken, that he is assiduous in the discharge of his duties as a member of the council. He has visited the Mt. Marshall and Mukinbudin areas. He is one man with whom I have been connected in regard to this matter and I have had no difficulty whatever in any

way so far as the grasshopper pest is concerned. The amount expended last year was entirely dependent upon the calls that were made upon it; and I am speaking from a knowledge of my own district, and of the case that was established concerning the necessity for ploughing. Even in doubtful instances, I know that authority for ploughing has been given. Had even double the amount been voted, I do not know that any more would have been or could have been spent unless it was specifically asked for.

With odd exceptions—and exceptions prove the rule—the farmers in my electorate have been fully conscious of their responsibility with regard to grasshoppers and other vermin. I have received notification of suspicious areas and generally the farmers have contacted the local governing authority or the Rural Bank inspector, and given information of likely danger spots which have been subsequently investigated and in connection with which action has been taken. Eventually the responsibility must rest on the grower unless the Government is to be asked to employ a host of inspectors constantly touring the areas and examining places where infestation is likely to occur. The farmer, in his own interest, must co-operate to a big extent.

Mr. Fox: Are there inspectors?

Mr. LESLIE: Yes; there are inspectors of the Rural and Industries Bank.

Mr. Kelly: There are too many with a finger in the pie. There should be some co-ordination under one head.

Mr. LESLIE: I do not know how there could be better co-ordination than exists today. There is an excellent set-up. There is the local authority with a member in each ward, in each little area, who does his job. These men are able almost to give the location of every stone and stick on the road. They know whether a farmer has a good crop or a bad one, and can almost tell the number of sheep that are carried. They do their job properly; and they are the ones who can and do supply information to the central body—that is, the local road board—which says to the Rural and Industries Bank, or to the council or the department, "Here is an infested area;" and the matter is handled.

Mr. Kelly: Then why the necessity for that big meeting?

Mr. LESLIE: They realise that unless something is done beyond merely ploughing isolated areas of country, we are going to have a constant repetition of this trouble. The infestation this year in my area is bad but apparently not as bad as that in the electorate of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. But in two years' time, unless something is done, the position will be much worse if there is any relaxation of effort. The relaxation will be on the part of the farmer himself. He is the one who is likely to relax, when he thinks he is safe. These men want an arrangement under which there will be no fear of this trouble being intensified in the future or of their having to be constantly on the watch. They desire some safeguard. The farmers are concerned as individuals. I have a letter here from one of my electors in the Mukinbudin district, in which he says—

I am writing to you in the hope that perhaps through some channel the damage we are suffering from grasshoppers should be recognised.

The estimated damage on my property is £500 this year and for years now the figure has been round about that.

The 2s. 6d. an acre which we receive does not compensate us.

I know what this man wants. He wants compensation for loss of crop, not for ploughing the land. There are so many different viewpoints. This man wants compensation for his loss just the same as does the man who suffers from the effect of drought. His property has been infested with grasshoppers and he feels he should be compensated. He says—

The Mukinbudin Road Board seems quite perturbed because a few hoppers are finding their way into the town. They have great plans for poisoning next year but the individual farmers have not got much chance of coping with the pests. . . .

It is very hard to go on like this every year, what with their marginal area scheme of cutting out wheat and growing oats, etc. I have got 100 acres of oats eaten bare to the ground with hoppers and they still say grow oats. I have bought more oats for seed than ever I have grown. The wheat on fallow this year is 100 per cent. better than oats as far as I am concerned.

That is what the farmers are asking for—a change of policy, something that will enable them to view the future with a sense of security and to say, "I have not to worry about grasshoppers every year because they will be provided for." The

Government assists as far as possible in the tillage of this country in the early stages to ensure that the grasshoppers will not breed. But it will take years to eradicate them, as it has done in South Africa. The meeting at Mukinbudin was held on a Wednesday, when the House was sitting, which unfortunately precluded my attendance, as I told them. Reference was made, as the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie mentioned, to the outer areas receiving preferential treatment in the allocation of money for the suppression of grasshoppers. I think the reference in that connection was to the area that the hon. member spoke of because I know of no reason why there should be any preferential treatment in the Mt. Marshall electorate as between the central and northern part of the area. One of the resolutions carried was—

That the settlers in these "outer" or "stock" areas must receive some measure of preferential treatment in the allocation of plant capable of sufficiently suppressing grasshoppers.

I point out that a considerable number of tractors at present in the northern part of the Mt. Marshall electorate were allotted by the control officer simply because the men were able to produce to him contracts that they were undertaking grasshopper ploughing. They therefore had preferential treatment. I could enumerate cases where men were not entitled to any consideration, or a very small priority, except for that reason, which gave them in my opinion, a No. 1 priority—and I was able to convince the controller of that. It was desirable to provide a tractor for a man who was prepared to plough 3,000 to 5,000 acres at the right time in order to destroy grasshoppers. This was of more importance than allotting one to a farmer for the purpose of putting in 700, 800 or even 1,000 acres of crop, which might be eaten out if the grasshoppers were not destroyed.

Mr. Kelly: Why should those five boards resolve to send here motions like that if there was no need for any preferential treatment?

Mr. LESLIE: I cannot tell the hon. member. The possibility is that meetings like this are attended sometimes by a number of people who are not always fully aware of what is going on. They still want preferential treatment. I know any number of farm-

ers who want a tractor for grasshopper ploughing just on their own property, and the board desires to give preferential treatment in the allocation of plant to those who are capable of efficiently suppressing grasshoppers. I have had some difficulty in convincing the allocation officer that for a farmer in the north-eastern area who had a license to grow only 250 acres of wheat and, perhaps, 150 or 200 acres of oats for stockfeed, a Fordson tractor, which he was prepared to allot, was no good because the farmer would need a heavier machine, which he had applied for, in order to cope with the grasshopper ploughing in the summer months. It is doubtful whether a light tractor would do that job satisfactorily. I presume the reference there is to the fact that a particular type of machine should be allotted to individual growers in these areas. I do not disagree with that, or that fencing material should be given as a first priority to these people to combat the inroads of emus. They should get the particular type of tractor for which they apply in order to do grasshopper ploughing, and also if they will co-operate in destroying grasshoppers on the properties of their neighbours who might not be so fortunately circumstanced as to be able to afford the heavier-type tractor. Again, the conference recommends—

That a system of tillage of not less than once in every five years be made compulsory in the Koorda, Mt. Marshall, Mukinbudin, Nungarin and Westonia Road Board areas.

I claim credit for a suggestion along those lines, it being one of my brain children.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What is that?

Mr. Graham: One of your brain storms!

Mr. LESLIE: I said, one of my brain children. The conference also recommended—

That the Government Entomologist be asked to have poison and bran sent to every vermin board centre by the 1st May each year, irrespective of whether grasshopper infestation is apparent or not, and so avoid the wasteful and useless practice of getting baits halfway through a bad grasshopper season.

That is a matter of departmental administration for which, I suppose, the Minister is ultimately responsible but the agricultural members of the House know the extreme difficulty that is experienced in obtaining bran and pollard—bran in particular. I have had a lot of trouble in obtaining adequate supplies, and it has been practically impossible to get any at all for vermin de-

struction. The Minister, in conjunction with departmental officers, has made every effort to have bran made available, not only for grasshopper destruction but also for rabbit poisoning. But the "cow cocky" and the "chookman" who are breaking their necks to get adequate supplies for productive purposes consider that to use bran for vermin destruction is purely wasteful.

I assure members that no effort has been spared by the Department of Agriculture in an endeavour to obtain supplies of bran for these areas. I suggest, therefore, it is only reasonable to assume that this is a matter which will rectify itself, but it has been included because we have been extremely busy in connection with it. The conference also suggested that the Parliamentary representatives for the areas concerned be supplied with a copy of the minutes of the conference and their support and assistance requested in presenting the case for the marginal areas. I agree with that. If we can get a few more people to put up a battle on the lines suggested, we will have more chance of success. Bran has arrived late, but it is not due to the fact that nobody is aware of the seriousness of the grasshopper menace.

Not all the necessary machinery has been supplied but that is not because no-one realises the necessity to have adequate machinery to deal with the pest. In my area, the farmers have been given all the finance they need, and, therefore, preferential treatment in the allocation of money to them does not necessarily apply. The question of the outer areas which have been eaten out was also raised at the conference, and it was suggested that they should not be re-selected until they are completely broken up, and that the whole cost should be borne by the Government. Even if that will help to eradicate only a temporary menace, I agree to it. Anything at all is justified, but we shall never overcome the trouble until we modify the present policy in regard to these areas. To do that, we must, evidently, contact the Federal Department of Commerce and Agriculture.

The Minister for Education: You will never get that department to drop the marginal idea, as far as I can see.

Mr. Reynolds: What policy do you suggest would overcome the trouble?

Mr. LESLIE: I have already told members what it is, and I do not want to weary them by repeating it. If the hon. member cares to read "Hansard," he might find himself enlightened. I want now to make a reference to the Royal Commission on Vermin that visited these areas in 1945. They were able, there, to see the grasshoppers in great numbers. Members who were on that commission will recall a farmer exhibiting the bare stalks of vegetables that had been almost completely eaten by the grasshoppers. They will recall visiting places almost as far out as Wilgoyne, where dead grasshoppers could be picked up by the shovelful alongside the road. In that year the infestation was limited to certain areas. So far the serious infestation has not come further southward this year than it did in 1945, which to me indicates that we are holding the invasion where it is and are, by our present methods, to a great extent limiting the damage in the areas where the grasshoppers are to be found.

Mr. Kelly: We are doing insufficient there.

Mr. LESLIE: I agree that so long as we continue with our present methods we will experience a cycle of events such as this, and all the money that the Government provides—it is evident that the Government has provided sufficient funds as only half the sum allocated has been used—will not overcome the difficulty. A complete change of policy is necessary, and if the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie is prepared to assist the Government in making representations to the Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Agriculture at Canberra that it is criminal to restrict production in one of the most fertile areas in Western Australia, and that it should alter its policy, he will achieve far more than he can hope to achieve by bringing this question up for discussion in this Chamber.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION**  
(Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning) [6.10]: I have no doubt at all that the activities of the Department of Agriculture in this matter, during the past year, have been as energetic and as successful as the circumstances and conditions warranted. I am somewhat surprised at the absence of any representations, as far as my information goes and my inquiries have carried, from the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie prior to

his bringing this motion before the House. There seems to have been a complete absence of any indication from him of the urgency of the conditions existing, arising or about to arise in or around his constituency, until this afternoon. It would, I think, have been a little more reasonable for at least some representations to have been made—as has been the practice adopted in the past—if the hon. member desired to achieve a state of affairs different from that which existed and which was unsatisfactory to him.

Mr. Kelly: That would have been going the long way round.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I presume the hon. member would in all other matters do as most members would, and make some approach to the responsible authorities and, if that failed to produce any results whatever, then possibly consider it desirable to proceed with a motion of censure such as, of course, this motion is.

Mr. Kelly: It was only just recently brought to my notice.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I guessed the hon. member might make that assertion. The then member for Mt. Marshall, Mr. Warner, observed that his representations had been unheeded and he was taken to task by the then Deputy Premier, Mr. Troy. Illustrations were given to him by the then Minister for Agriculture, the member for Gascoyne, of the circumstances which have existed throughout the ages and the virtual impossibility of the total destruction of grasshoppers by any means known to man. If the hon. member would like me to read some of that interesting document, I am prepared to do so. Not only was I here at that time, but I have recently examined a great part of that document and I think it would be fair to say that the opportunities of the present officers of the Department of Agriculture are not much greater than those of officers at that time. The then Deputy Premier, Mr. Troy, threw scorn and contumely on the suggestion of the then member for Mt. Marshall that anything better could be done than was being done.

I do not propose to dwell on that but before the tea suspension would advise the hon. member that baiting material has been forwarded to his district in greater quantities than to any other district. I find that

five tons of baiting material was sent to the Westonia area and 23 tons to the Yilgarn district as against Mukinbudin seven tons, Bencubbin 10 tons, Koorda two tons, Cunderdin five tons and Nungarin 14 tons. Of a total of 83 tons of that substance, 28 tons went to the electorate of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. The hon. member has suggested that the amount payable to contractors for ploughing should be increased. I take this opportunity of informing him that the department had already decided on that course. The question of whether any increase shall be made in the allowance paid to farmers for ploughing their own properties is one that presents other facets for consideration.

Mr. Kelly: All farmers' costs have risen.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** Admittedly, but is it more desirable that the whole cost of this work should be paid by the Government or that the farmers, who in these days are receiving a greater return for their produce than they did a few years ago, should indulge in a considerable measure of self-help?

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

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I was dealing at the tea adjournment with the question of one aspect of activity in which the Department of Agriculture had indulged in regard to the matter. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie also referred to the expenditure of £4,991 as disclosed in the State accounts. That, of course, ranged only for the accounts paid up to the 30th June but I am advised that a further expenditure of approximately £6,000 was incurred and has since been met, or is in the course of being met. This year, although the amount disclosed by the Estimates is £10,000, in view of the representation made by the Rural and Industries Bank, the Treasurer has informed me that it is proposed to make £16,000 available for the purpose. So while the hon. member, of course, has not misled the House—I am not suggesting that for one moment—it is a fact that the whole of the £10,000 actually allocated during last year was spent as a consequence of operations.

Mr. Kelly: I quoted early periods.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** The period for which the estimate is made unfortunately does not coincide with the

period over which the work is carried out and, as at the 30th June last year, there was about £6,000 unpaid and in some cases accounts were not even rendered. My advice is that the amount is now either paid or in the course of payment in respect of contracts let during that period which might be said to be payable out of the allocation of last year.

The member for Mt. Marshall very wisely drew attention to the fact that the deliberations of the meeting to which the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie made reference, while they took place some time ago, were also in the nature—in my view, and I think in his—of bringing the best side to London, as it were, by declaring the maximum that they wanted. The Department of Agriculture has been very busily engaged in endeavouring to evolve some better methods of dealing with these insects.

The insects are a difficult problem when they lay their eggs in the ground as they do, many of them, in fact, in inaccessible places—thickets and the like—were even if they are found, which is extremely unlikely, it is almost impossible to engage in destructive methods by ploughing. Moreover, they are essentially a dry weather difficulty. Past experience in this State particularly has evidenced that fact. Unfortunately that type of dry season, which we have to a great extent experienced this year, particularly in the areas represented by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie makes ploughing of all land for the destruction of egg beds extremely difficult because grasshopper eggs cannot be destroyed by breaking up the ground in hugh lumps.

Mr. Kelly: You can do it in the summer time.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, but not in the later period of the year when the need for it becomes apparent.

Mr. Kelly: I suggested that baiting should be more extensive in the period when ploughing would not be successful.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As I told the hon. member earlier, the materials for baiting were supplied wherever they were asked for, and in quantities more considerable in his own district than in any other part of the areas involved. I told him that of one total of 83 tons of baits distributed, 28 could be said to have gone entirely into the district represented by the

hon member, so that that aspect was not lost sight of. If a person is going in for ploughing in the later part of the year, which was contemplated this year, as I understand the position, that person must pulverise the ground and not break it up into lumps, in order to prevent the growth and development of grasshoppers.

Mr. Kelly: One method I suggested was by shallow ploughing.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: When I was taking evidence on the Royal Commission I was struck by the fact that in some areas particularly it was extremely doubtful whether the shallow ploughing suggested by the hon. member would have the desired effect. However, I have with me a copy of a report from the Assistant Government Entomologist on the season and the progress of the grasshopper, some extracts of which I intend to read to the House. He reports—

I commenced a tour of the Eastern wheat-belt areas where grasshoppers are generally prevalent. The following districts and road boards were visited:

Northam  
Kellerberrin  
Merredin  
Westonia  
Southern Cross  
Nungarin  
Mukinbudin  
Trayning  
Bencubbin  
Koorda

Of these areas, some had had a fair season, for example, Northam, Kellerberrin, Trayning and parts of Bencubbin and Koorda, while the rest had experienced for the most part very dry conditions. Crops are short and poor, feed is sparse and short, and practically no water has been collected in dams. Therefore it is not surprising that grasshoppers are more active and noticeable this year, especially when farmers generally in these areas have been apathetic to baiting in the past.

This year a special effort was made to stimulate baiting.

The new bait, consisting of benzene-hexachloride and bran has been widely acclaimed for its ease of mixing, effectiveness and rapidity of kill. Every road board secretary and farmer spoken to who had seen it work was greatly impressed, and its use this year will, I think, go far in stimulating baiting for grasshoppers next year.

The grasshoppers are, of course, now flying, and in most areas egg-laying is taking place. That, I might say, is dated the 19th October.



Continuing the quote—

All the feed is dry and, as the crops have not quite dried off, some damage was observed where grasshoppers were prevalent. However, the crops are rapidly approaching the stage where the 'hoppers should not do much more damage, so I doubt if damage will be very extensive.

A good example of protection of a crop by early and carefully laid bait was seen east of Nungarin, where the adjacent paddock was baited and millions of grasshoppers lay dead at the time of my visit. Little damage has been experienced in the crop.

I interviewed Mr. Herbert of Nungarin and Mr. Aitken of Koorda who are members of the Grasshopper Committee. These men were greatly impressed by the effectiveness of the new bait, and Mr. Herbert observed the killing effect of the dry bait at least seven days after distribution.

Inquiries regarding ploughing of grasshopper egg beds showed that at Merredin only half the estimated area was ploughed. This was due to seasonal conditions being adverse for ploughing. At Nungarin the whole estimated area has been ploughed, and at Beneubbin and Koorda ploughing was accomplished on occupied holdings, but no contractors could be found to plough abandoned properties at the present contract price of 5s. per acre.

The impression was gained during the trip that greater interest is being taken in the grasshopper problem by the farmers with respect to the relative parts that ploughing of grasshopper egg beds and baiting play in its control. More important still, many more are realising the agricultural practice that should be adopted in these areas where they are now carrying sheep, and do less cropping. This will, I think, play a major part in controlling grasshoppers in these areas.

I think that does support the arguments advanced by the member for Mt. Marshall but it was not my intention to advance it for that reason. My object was to endeavour to show that the officers of the Department of Agriculture have done a reasonably good job in regard to the insects, especially at a time when their prevalence was not early suspected in any great numbers. I am informed that there are always some in every part of Western Australia.

Mr. Leslie: That is so; one can see them in the metropolitan area.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** Whenever they develop in what may be classed as plague form there have to be seasonal conditions entirely suitable for their heavy multiplication. Only today, on the advice I have received, the Minister for Agriculture and the officials of the Rural and Industries Bank have been discussing

the question of greater activity, if it be practicable, in the coming months in order to avoid any greater increase of these creatures. I cannot but feel that as of yore, in Western Australia nature itself plays the most prominent part in the question whether we are going to have a great number of grasshoppers or the reverse. If it rains hard, as it did in 1946 and 1947 in a great part of these areas, then virtually nothing is heard about the plague form of grasshopper and indeed this year nothing was heard about him until comparatively recent days.

There was, however, no let-up on the activities of the department because its attitude was that wherever practicable, and where egg beds were observed and application was made for assistance, it was prepared to let contracts by providing a subsidy to the occupier for the purpose of ploughing the land and distributing baits so as to prevent any incidence at all, so far as one can do, of the grasshopper problem. I know for a fact that the officers of the Department of Agriculture are ever ready to do all they can and, when the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie talks about requiring some person to co-ordinate the activities, it seems to me that there is a very close approach to that state of affairs when the Government Entomologist and the Under Secretary for Agriculture seem to be, broadly speaking, in charge of the operations.

The Government Entomologist is one of the most skilled men in this country and I would not be prepared to say he is not competent to decide what are the best things that can be done. As to the suggestion of wholesale ploughing of grass lands whether they contain grasshopper egg beds or not that was proposed in 1936, Mr. M. F. Troy, who was then dealing with the matter, pointed out that even at 5s. per acre it would be asking the State to provide not less than a quarter of a million pounds. Those arguments apply with equal force today.

Mr. Kelly: Do you not think that that would be money well-spent when you say that £2,000,000 is lost through the pest?

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I have not said that £2,000,000 was lost through grasshoppers and it was not suggested that that was so.

Mr. Kelly: You indicated that in your Policy speech.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** The grasshopper is not the only type of vermin and other submissions were also made regarding rabbits and kangaroos. But I would not question the fact that there is considerable loss occasioned by these insects from year to year, particularly at intervals when they do reach some kind of plague form. However, I do say this: that if it was not reasonable to spend a quarter of a million pounds in 1936 when they did constitute a plague of the worst form that Western Australia had experienced in my knowledge—and that was the opinion of the Hon. M. F. Troy—then I question whether we are justified in spending still more, because the price per acre would be greater than he calculated upon for a wholesale ploughing up of areas, when we certainly run the risk of missing many in which the grasshoppers are to be found.

I do not think the Department of Agriculture or any member of this House can evolve a complete and copperplate method of cleaning up every grasshopper that might be found in Western Australia; I do not think anyone can do it.

Mr. Kelly: It would be a great help to the farmers if it could.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I admit that greater efforts might be made by the people on whose properties, or adjoining properties, grasshopper egg beds are found and that they might advise the Department of Agriculture more often than they do and be more willing than appears to be the position at the moment to undertake the work. I can understand, as I have said, the contractor desiring to be paid a profitable price for the work, but I cannot understand the occupier of the land asking for more than his bare costs.

Mr. Kelly: He has not got that now.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** I have no evidence that he has not unless the hon. member is taking the cost of his labour into consideration.

Mr. Kelly: No, his general outlay; never mind about labour.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** If the hon. member can satisfy me on that, I may change my mind. I would

certainly agree that the occupier should have his bare costs but no more than that, and I am prepared to pay the contractors something better than they have been obtaining in the past. Of course, poison has been supplied free to the road boards and distributed without cost to the farmers in the areas concerned. The supervision has been under the direction of officials of the Rural and Industries Bank. I have already told the hon. member that it is proposed greatly to increase the amount available for this purpose this year, and I cannot help reminding him, too, that the expenditure of that money will be under the control of people, who, in my humble opinion, know their job. I think he ought to be well satisfied. Unfortunately, he has brought this matter before the House rather late. If his representations had been made a little earlier, it might have been possible to have taken further action.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It would have been too early then!

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** No. The first time the member for Mt. Marshall brought this matter forward was in September, 1937, and on the second occasion it was early in October.

Hon. A. H. Panton: But the grasshoppers came a little late this year.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** The difficulty is that at this late period the 'hoppers are at the flying stage when, I am advised, it is most difficult, if not impossible, to control them. Nevertheless, I have pointed out to the hon. member, and to the House, that the usual practices were followed. The usual provision was made; the usual expenditure was incurred. There is no intention whatever of minimising the expenditure on anything that can usefully be done. It has already been pointed out that a considerable additional amount will be made available in anticipation that it can be profitably spent, and that consideration will be given to increasing the subsidy payable to owner-ploughers, while already the position has been reached of increasing the amount payable to contractors. In all the circumstances, I consider there is nothing to justify the hon. member in pursuing this motion further.

Mr. Kelly: You ought to tell that to the farmers concerned.

**MR. PERKINS (York) [7.54]:** A motion dealing with grasshoppers does not directly concern the York electorate, but, on the other hand, that electorate adjoins the constituency represented by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie.

**Mr. Marshall:** You are a member of the inner circle.

**Mr. PERKINS:** I do not view with any favour the prospect of grasshoppers belonging to the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie's electorate travelling to my constituency, and therefore I am concerned in seeing that proper measures are taken to deal with the pest in those parts where it originates. I think that applies to many other members as well, so that we are all more or less interested in the problem of grasshoppers. I can confirm to some degree the statements made by the Minister for Education. When the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie says that this is a very recent problem and an immediately urgent one, I assert very definitely that he is not on sound ground. I believe the matter should have been raised much earlier.

**Mr. Kelly:** I told you the grasshoppers were late this year.

**Mr. PERKINS:** They were not late.

**Mr. Kelly:** Of course they were. You do not know the country.

**Mr. PERKINS:** I do. Over a month ago I happened to be in Merredin and was approached by one of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie's electors. I understand the man has quite a good wheat crop on his farm north of Burracoppin. He was concerned about the number of grasshoppers that were on a neighbour's property.

**Mr. Kelly:** Did you do anything for him?

**Mr. PERKINS:** That farmer asked me to make representations to the controlling body to get a tractor released to enable his neighbour to plough up a large area of country where the grasshoppers were breeding. It is not customary for a member to interfere with the domestic matters of an electorate of a fellow member, and I advised that particular farmer to tell his neighbour to get in touch with his local member to see what could be done. I understand that the farmers in that particular area were able to secure proof that the authorities were willing to take the

necessary action to ensure the destruction of the breeding grounds.

I do not know whether any representations were made to the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie or to any other member of the House, but I say emphatically that that was the time the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie should have made investigations in that particular area to ascertain what actually was the problem. I can assure him that over a month ago the 'hoppers were there in sufficient numbers to justify assistance being rendered to the settlers if they were not able to deal with the problem themselves. When nothing further was heard of the matter, I assumed that the necessary action had been taken. Judging by the statement of the Minister for Education, the Government has taken the necessary steps to help the settlers concerned. This is one of the directions in which the right course for any Government to pursue is to work in collaboration with the settlers affected.

If the Government were to embark on its own account upon a policy of ploughing huge areas, possibly a large amount of public money would be partly wasted. I believe that any expenditure to be incurred in the destruction of grasshoppers could be more profitably spent if the Government worked in co-operation with the settlers concerned. It is very evident from what the Minister for Education said, that there have not been many requests proffered that the department has not satisfactorily dealt with. In my opinion, at this juncture, all the necessary steps that could be taken in the areas concerned have been dealt with as the necessary machinery became available. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie did not deal with that aspect. I hope that in his reply—

**Mr. Kelly:** I will have no opportunity to reply.

**The Minister for Education:** You are not entitled to reply.

**Mr. PERKINS:** In that case, possibly some other member might discuss it. However, I make the particular point I stressed at the start, namely, that this is an important question that affects electorates far distant from the areas that are the breeding grounds for the grasshoppers, and that we are all interested in seeing that the pest is properly dealt with. The right course for adoption is for the department to work

in co-operation with the people in the areas concerned, and I have every confidence that the necessary action was taken by the Government in this matter. I feel that some of the statements made by the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie were not entirely correct, because he has not been fully informed of the situation in the particular areas concerned.

**MR. HOAR** (Nelson) [8.0]: As a member representing one of the districts of the South-West, I am not vitally concerned in the matter of grasshoppers, but I appreciate the fact that the outer wheat areas are largely buffers for those more favourably situated. The difficulties settlers in those areas have to contend with influence to a very great extent the productivity of the rest of the State, for the reason that unless due regard is paid to the menace of grasshoppers and sufficient money is provided by the Government for attempts to overcome the depredations of these insects, and effective co-operation exists between the various departments and the work of those departments is co-ordinated, every part of the State must suffer.

I consider that the Minister should not have taken the view that the mover should have approached the Minister in charge of the department responsible for this matter. It seems to me that, had the problem which the hon. member had in mind been applicable to his own district only, he would automatically have adopted that line of action and approached the department on the question as something peculiar to his own area, but the hon. member was speaking for many districts comprising a large area of land where great losses occur as a result of the inroads made by grasshoppers. I am of opinion that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie did the right thing in airing his views tonight to impress upon the Government and the House generally—and even on the minds of members like myself who do not live in the outer areas and therefore do not experience these difficulties—the effect this pest must have on the economy of the State if co-ordinated action be not taken by the Government departments.

After listening to the Minister, I felt that he had made a speech entirely different from what he would have made had he been sitting on this side of the House.

**Mr. Kelly**: It is very interesting to hear you say that.

**Mr. HOAR**: I well remember when the Minister, then occupying the position of Leader of the Opposition, moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the depredations of vermin throughout the State which, of course, included grasshoppers. The Select Committee was converted into a Royal Commission, and when the report was tabled and the hon. member made his speech on it, he left no doubt in my mind that he expected the then Government to take action instantly. In effect, he said, "There should be no delay tactics about it." The conditions arising from the inroads of vermin into the wheat areas, especially of grasshoppers in the outer areas, were so serious that he as chairman advocated something entirely different from what he has said in the House this evening. Members sufficiently interested to read the report will notice a recommendation that large areas of country should be ploughed. In fact, the Rural Bank official at Merredin, whose opinion was regarded so highly that his remarks were included in the report, stated that, in his opinion, no less than 90,000 acres should be ploughed over yearly on a three-year term, but that it should be done systematically. We, as the body making the inquiry at that time, agreed with him.

The Minister for Education: Approximately an area of 50,000 acres was done last year.

**Mr. HOAR**: In my opinion, the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie had no need to go to the officers of the Department of Agriculture. What he is concerned about is the system under which we are working, which seems to deny to this important problem effective co-ordinated effort. The hon. member has suggested that an officer should be appointed with full authority over all interested departments to ensure that this co-ordinated effort be put into operation at the right time each year and that a sufficient sum of money be made available to be drawn upon for the purpose. I consider that that is a very commendable suggestion to put before the House. It is good to hear such a suggestion and the Government would be wise to take notice of it because, in spite of what has been said, no particular sum was taken into account in

the Commission's report as representing the loss to the State arising from the depredations of grasshoppers. Yet we know that this adds up to a considerable amount.

We are also aware that it does not matter how hard a farmer may work on his own property and how hard his immediate neighbours may work to combat the pest, so long as vacant bank holdings are unattended and so long as destruction is not undertaken on Crown lands and those almost inaccessible places to which the Minister referred, whatever we attempt to do will really be of little effect towards eradicating the pest. What we need is a definite policy on the part of the Government, the local authorities and the farmers to ensure that the problem is treated as an important one, that sufficient money is provided for the purpose and that power is given to the right individual to ensure that the work is done. I regard the question as a very important one, and the mover should be commended rather than criticised for having introduced it.

**HON. J. T. TONKIN** (North-East Fremantle) [8.7]: The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has been chided by the Deputy Premier for having introduced the motion, which he regarded somewhat as a motion of censure on the Government, without first having made an approach to the Department of Agriculture. The hon. member has taken a step which he felt was desirable to focus attention upon the state of affairs that undoubtedly has arisen in his district. He was waited upon by a deputation at Walgoolan on Saturday last, and the members of the deputation made it very clear to him they considered they had a right to expect some new policy to be put into operation forthwith to prevent a repetition of what had occurred. The Deputy Premier said that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie had referred to a combined meeting that had been held some time ago. That conference was actually held on the 13th of this month, which is a very short time ago, and did not leave the hon. member very much opportunity to approach the question in the usual way by first making inquiries at the Department of Agriculture.

The desire of the hon. member is not that measures should be adopted now to deal with the position this year; what he desires is a commencement of the policy

which the people of the State were led to believe would be initiated when this Government took office.

Mr. Kelly: That is the point.

**HON. J. T. TONKIN**: We must not forget that members of the present Government, during the election campaign, told the people almost daily that the previous Government was entangled in cobwebs and that its policy was one of the *laissez faire* and could not lead the State anywhere. It is therefore somewhat strange to hear the Minister for Education say tonight that the activity being carried out by the Department of Agriculture does not differ at all from the methods which were being pursued under the previous Government. Of course, that is true. There was no laxity under the previous Government so far as this matter was concerned. The officers of the Department of Agriculture are competent; they had a policy which they were pursuing, and that is the policy now in operation. But the Government is to blame for any suggestion of censure, because it made such extravagant claims with regard to the new era that was to be ushered in immediately it took office. Let us refresh our memories by a few excerpts from the report of the Vermin Commission, of which the Minister for Education was the chairman, in order to ascertain whether he has undergone any metamorphosis since that time. This is interesting—

#### Future Attitude to Vermin.

But your Commissioners (although sympathetic to these difficulties) cannot subscribe to any policy of despair or of *laissez faire*. After great consideration we are of the opinion that vermin can not only be controlled, but for most practical purposes eradicated in many parts of the South-West land division and substantially checked in other areas of the State.

That was the opinion of the Minister for Education and the other members of the Vermin Commission.

**HON. J. B. Sleeman**: Was he the chairman?

**HON. J. T. TONKIN**: Yes. The commission had this to say with regard to grasshoppers in particular.

Our policy should be to face up to the future with courage and efficiency. There are, it is clear on evidence of official witnesses, vast areas untouched where egg deposits are to be found. Whether or no the right sort of heavy rain will fall and prevent hatching is very problematical. We prefer to assume it will

not, which, on past experience of the areas concerned, is the more likely. Preparations must therefore be made to "shallow plough" these great areas starting nearest the more settled parts and extending finally to the "outback."

Those were the ideas of the members of the Royal Commission. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that many members of the present Government, when on this side of the House, supported a motion deploring the fact that I had not taken action fully to implement the report of the Vermin Commission and calling upon the then Government to take immediate action because of the urgency of the matter. When subsequently I introduced a Bill to amend the Vermin Act, the present Minister for Education declared that it was of very little value. He said it was like offering a slice when a loaf was required, and he followed that up on the hustings by making this very definite declaration. He said that if his Government were returned to power, steps would be taken to bring in legislation to give full effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. This matter, when I was Minister for Agriculture, was so terribly urgent that we had to have a special motion. Yet the present Government went through all last year with not a sign of a Vermin Bill.

We have passed the major portion of this year, but still there is no sign of the Vermin Bill which was so terribly urgent. The most remarkable part about the matter is that the member for Mt. Marshall, who was so vocal before, is now almost silent on the question. The tremendous urgency which previously existed and which demanded immediate action on the part of the past Government to implement fully the recommendations of the Royal Commission, has all gone, and the Minister for Education is now content to allow the officers of the Department of Agriculture to continue to carry out the policy of the previous Government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we should be pleased to learn that at least the present Government realises it did not know very much about the situation before, that its criticism was ill-founded, that the previous Government was doing a good job and that the officers of the Department of Agriculture were dealing with the matter in a thoroughly satisfactory manner, because the policy has

not been altered to the slightest degree. The people have the right to put the present Government upon its mettle, because it told them that the previous Government was entangled in cobwebs and it said it would introduce a new policy to infuse life where previously there was none. I therefore consider that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has carried out a duty to his constituents by drawing attention in this way to the existing state of affairs and by reminding the people that nothing has since been heard of this new life and this new legislation so vehemently promised by the Minister for Education when he was on the hustings.

**MR. REYNOLDS** (Forrest) [8.16]: I regret I was not in the House when the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie moved this mild motion of censure; but I know that what he said is sane and reasonable. He was evidently endeavouring to do something in the interests of the farmers in his electorate. I notice that a special grasshopper conference was held on the 13th of this month to discuss this important question. I listened to the Minister for Education mildly chiding the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie for bringing this matter up so late in the year; but, of course, it is not too late for the next season, nor was it for the special conference held on the 13th. I notice also that a letter was sent by the secretary of the Mukinbudin Road Board on the 18th October and another letter by the secretary of the Yilgarn Road Board on the 19th October. Therefore, the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie has acted with all speed and I think he is to be commended.

The conference to which I referred was attended by representatives of the Koorda Vermin Board, and by representatives of the Mt. Marshall, Nungarin and Mukinbudin Road Boards. Those four boards are in the electorate of the member for Mt. Marshall, and it is a wonder he did not have his eyes and ears to the ground to learn something of a matter which he should have brought to the notice of the appropriate Minister.

Mr. Leslie: I did that long ago.

Mr. REYNOLDS: If so, I apologise. Evidently, what he did was not very effective, as otherwise the road boards concerned would not have convened the special meeting to discuss the question. I note that the

depth of ploughing the conference suggested is  $1\frac{1}{2}$  ins. I have had considerable experience of grasshoppers, because during the year 1932 and again during the years 1935, 1936 and 1937, I lost thousands of bags of wheat owing to their depredations. Grasshoppers seem to come to life in the crawler stage about the middle of August, and they are well on the wing about this present period. The Government would be well advised to heed the remarks of the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie. He has suggested that the Government should attempt to have these infested acreages ploughed in the summer months.

There is another point. This conference suggested that the land should be tilled every five years. I think that is very necessary. During the period from 1934 to 1937, the Labour Government found thousands of pounds for the ploughing of large areas. I remember one man getting a 10,000 acre contract. The Labour Government tackled this question very vigorously, and I hope the present Government will do so. Rather than that the member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie should be censured, I think he should be thanked for bringing this matter before the House and disclosing that the Government is not doing what it said it would do if it were elected.

**MR. KELLY** (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [8.23]: I ask permission to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

## QUESTIONS.

### MINER'S PHTHISIS.

#### *As to Number of Sufferers.*

**Hon. E. NULSEN** asked the Minister for Health:

(1) How many men have been turned down under the Miner's Phthisis Act from its inception?

(2) How many of them are still alive?

The **MINISTER FOR HOUSING** (for the Minister for Health) replied:

(1) From the inception of the Miner's Phthisis Act until it was superseded by the Mine Workers' Relief Act on the 1st February, 1933, 645 men suffering from tuberculosis only or tuberculosis with silicosis were prohibited from employment in the mining industry.

(2) Of this total, 39 were still living and receiving compensation on the 30th June 1948.

### MINE WORKERS' RELIEF FUND ACT

#### *As to Increasing Benefits.*

**Mr. MARSHALL** asked the Minister presenting the Minister for Mines:

In view of the easing of the means test under the Old Age and Invalid Pension Act, will he immediately amend the regulation under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund Act to give the increase permissible from the Mine Workers' Relief Fund to those who are beneficiaries under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund Act?

The **MINISTER FOR HOUSING** replied:

This matter is now receiving the consideration of the Mine Workers' Relief Board, whose report is awaited.

### POTATOES.

#### *As to Increase of Price.*

**Mr. BOVELL** asked the Attorney General:

(1) To what extent has the price of potatoes been increased to consumers recently?

(2) What is the main cause of the increase?

(3) Are growers also receiving less for potatoes since the 30th September?

(4) If so, why?

The **ATTORNEY GENERAL** replied:

(1) From 1s. 9d. to 2s. 5d. per stone.

(2) Discontinuance of the Commonwealth subsidy.

(3) and (4) Approximately the same for local sales.

Whether growers will receive more or less overall will depend on prices obtained for export sales.

### TRACTORS.

#### *As to Allocation and Use.*

**Hon. E. NULSEN** asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) On what grounds was a D6-65 tractor allocated to Mr. C. K. Le Mercier of Brunswick Junction, some three months ago?

(2) Do those who sponsored this D6 to Mr. Le Mercier know its present whereabouts, and that it is common knowledge that this machine is about to be taken from the specific work for which it was sponsored to be put in to a totally different sphere of activity, namely, private dam-sinking in the Carnamah district?

(3) In view of the foregoing, why is it that a sponsorship—if it has not already been given—is about to be given to this same man for yet another D6, in spite of the fact that another applicant for this machine is prepared to devote it exclusively to urgent work of national importance, namely, the development of farms for soldier-settlers?

(4) It is obvious, in view of the fact that Mr. Le Mercier has only had the original D6 for a few weeks, that it could not possibly have carried out the programme for which it was sponsored, and bearing this in mind, is there any assurance—if controlling bodies persist in allocating yet another D6 to this same man—that it will be used to fulfil the work for which it was sponsored, or will it, in a few weeks or months, follow to the same fate as the first one?

(5) Does the controlling body responsible for the allocation of these heavy tractors, which are in such short supply, know that Mr. Le Mercier already owns a 56 h.p. International JD14, a 65 h.p. caterpillar D6, and a 35 h.p. caterpillar D4, all of which are comparatively new?

(6) It is known that a contractor willing to undertake land settlement work exclusively has only a 57 h.p. Allis Chalmers HD7 purchased by him second-hand ex-Army surplus stock, and with which he is endeavouring to carry out the large programme of difficult work required by War Service Land Settlement so that some 20 or 30 ex-soldiers may be rehabilitated? (The contractor mentioned has recently received sponsorship for a TD14 56 h.p. tractor, and as the HD7 must return to farm work for which it was originally sponsored the TD14 alone will be totally inadequate to carry out the work required for soldier-settlers.)

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Minister for Lands) replied:

(1) General purposes, clearing, dam-sinking, etc.

(2) No.

(3) It is desirable to locate a bulldozer in the Forest Grove, Witchcliffe, Karridale, Rosa Brook and Rosa Glen districts. A number of farmers have taken a part interest in the machine.

(4) Mr. Le Mercier has signed an undertaking that the machine will not be removed from the district for two years and that he will place the machine at the disposal of the Soldier Settlement Department for any work within this area.

(5) Particulars of Mr. Le Mercier's plant are known. Two machines are available, each of approximately equal horsepower—one machine has been allocated to Mr. Le Mercier, and one to Mr. Higgins (the other contractor referred to in the questions).

(6) It is known that Mr. Higgins proposes to utilise his existing plant on farm work.

### CANNING HIGHWAY.

*As to Widening, Causeway to Canning Bridge.*

Mr. YATES asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the widening of Canning Highway from the Causeway to Canning Bridge?

(2) If so, when is the work likely to be completed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied:

(1) Not in the near future.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

### SHIPPING, INTERSTATE.

*As to Transport of Racehorses.*

Mr. GRAHAM (without notice) asked the Honorary Minister for Supply and Shipping:

In yesterday evening's "Daily News" I noticed the following:—"West Australian gallopers Lady Lucia, Balkona, Fine Tek and Gay Fern, who have been racing in Melbourne, will leave for Perth by ship on Friday." Is this a result of the Minister's alleged efforts to secure greater quantities of urgently needed goods for Western Australia?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

I consider the question frivolous and therefore have no answer for it.



**BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.**

- 1, Nurses Registration Act Amendment.  
Introduced by the Minister for Health.
- 2, Stipendiary Magistrates Act Amendment.  
Introduced by the Attorney General.
- 3, Administration Act Amendment.  
Introduced by Mr. Leslie.

**BILL—WEST AUSTRALIAN CLUB  
(PRIVATE).**

Report of Committee adopted.

**BILL—WESTERN AUSTRALIAN  
MARINE.**

*Recommittal.*

On motion by the Minister for Housing,  
Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clauses 114, 115 and 169.

*In Committee.*

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Minister for Housing in charge of the Bill.

Clause 114—Rating A.B.:

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: When we previously discussed this and the next clause, the member for Fremantle raised the point as to whether the minimum age of a man in the stokehold of a ship should be 18 or 20. I informed members that it should be 18 in order to have uniformity with other legislation in Australia, but the hon. member said he was advised it should be 20. I have since made inquiries, and it is correct that the minimum age is now 18, but I am informed, and I believe, that the Commonwealth Maritime Commission has given consideration to the question and has in view amending the existing regulations to provide that it shall be 20. My advice is that the probability of that action being taken is sufficiently strong to make it a reasonable risk that we should insert 20 years in the Bill, as it is quite likely that before long that will be the age prescribed by the Maritime Commission, and therefore will become the general usage throughout Australia.

If the hon. member desires to move an amendment that the minimum age shall be 20 years, I shall be glad to accept it. The other evening I moved an amendment, by the addition of further words to Subclause (4), and it was agreed to, to make clear

that the minimum age should be 18 for employment in stokehold. In the succeeding clause, Clause 115, the minimum age for employment in a stokehold is set out at 18 in accordance with the previous practice and the existing regulations. I think the words added to Subclause (4) of Clause 114 are not necessary as the position is sufficiently covered by Subclause (2) of Clause 115.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I am pleased that the Minister for Housing has acceded to my request. It seems that the age of 18 crept in as a wartime measure.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I move an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause (4) after the word "sea" the words "and who is less than 18 years of age" be struck out.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: Should not the word "eighteen" in the fourth line of Subclause (1) be struck out and the word "twenty" inserted in lieu before we proceed with this amendment?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It seems to me that the position will be met if the word added the other evening are now struck out, and the next clause amended by altering the age from 18 to 20.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The words referred to by the member for Kimberley relate to an able-bodied seaman. What we are dealing with is a special provision applying only to people who serve in stokeholds.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended, agreed to.

Clause 115—Minimum age for employment at sea:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I move an amendment—

That in line 5 of Subclause (2) the word "eighteen" be struck out and the word "twenty" inserted in lieu.

Amendment put and passed; the clause as amended, agreed to.

Clause 169—Accommodation for seamen and apprentices:

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I told the Committee that following certain queries raised by the member for Fremantle I would make inquiries and let the Committee know the result. The query on this clause raised by the member for Fremantle

was in connection with subparagraph (i) of paragraph (a) of Subclause (1). The clause prescribes the minimum accommodation for each seaman or apprentice. The hon. member raised the question whether it should not be altered in such a way as to ensure a scale of accommodation of a greater size or volume.

My advice is that these are minimum requirements and while in the case of certain interstate vessels which are of some 12,000 tons burden, it is possible to provide accommodation in excess of this minimum, in the case of smaller ships of a few hundred or a thousand odd tons, such as those operating in the coastal trade of Western Australia, it would not be practicable to provide accommodation for each seaman or apprentice equal to that on a ship of a much larger size.

I am informed that the figures set out in the Bill represent the basis upon which the Commonwealth surveyors throughout Australia are working today, and the minimum basis which they are required to see is observed, acting under Commonwealth law. I am also advised that this particular paragraph is taken from the Commonwealth Navigation Act as it now operates, whereas at the present time the minimum standards for the accommodation of seamen in this State for coast-wise vessels are laid down by the English Merchant Shipping Act, and that Act provides for a standard of accommodation which is less than the minimum contained in the Bill. If the Bill is passed in its present form it will ensure that accommodation will be provided equal to that laid down by the Commonwealth under the Commonwealth Navigation Act, and will provide a higher standard than now obtains.

If we provide a higher standard than that which is at present provided for in the Bill, and thus higher than that which obtains in other parts of Australia, there might be difficulty in getting ships for our coast-wise traffic, because they might be built under less exacting specifications and therefore not be available for service on our coast. In view of the fact that our coastal trade shipping must to a large extent consist of ships of a comparatively small burden and, however desirable the best of accommodation might be, the size of the vessel might make more extensive accommodation a matter of difficulty or impos-

sibility. If the Commonwealth or any other authority should prescribe at some future time a more exacting standard, or a better standard, then it would be very proper for this State to amend any law on the subject in order to ensure that ours would be at least equal to other standards.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It seems to me that the Minister is trying to argue that because we have small ships trading on the Western Australian coast, the men should have different conditions from those obtaining on ships trading interstate. I cannot see a bit of difference and I think that only the best is good enough for Western Australian workmen. I am trying to steer the Minister clear of industrial trouble. If he will not be steered the blame is on him. The Australian Shipbuilding Board and the Seamen's Union are in agreement over the scale of accommodation for seamen and their scale should be taken into account. What is the use of building ships to specifications if when they are built the seamen will not man them? I would not blame them either if the accommodation were not up to the proper standard.

It is futile to argue that these are the minimum requirements because we know that a great many people always make the minimum the maximum. What is the difference in a man trading out of Wyndham, Broome, Derby or such places and one who is trading between here and the Eastern States? So I hope the Minister will not insist on this going in. I think the fittings and accommodation for the seamen trading around Wyndham, Albany or Esperance are just as important as those for seamen travelling interstate. I move an amendment—

That in Subclause (1) (a) subparagraphs (i) and (ii) be struck out.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The hon. member referred to the "Coramba," which, by reason of inadequate accommodation, had, after visiting this State, to go back for a refit. I am advised by perhaps the best authority in the State that she is the finest ship for seamen that ever visited Western Australia, and all she went back for was for adjustments to one room or berth. The hon. member was good enough to give me a copy of his proposed amendments which, I think, are not on the notice paper, and I presume he intends to move them. If these particular words are struck out, we

shall have the words, "the standard as set by the Seamen's Union and the Australian Shipbuilding Board." That, I think, is too vague to go into an Act. I do not know where the standard is to be found as set by the Seamen's Union. It may be changed from time to time. The union is not an authority to set standards, whatever may be its authority in industrial matters which, I admit, is a very important one. The Australian Shipbuilding Board, the other party referred to, is not a statutory board to determine dimensions of shipping, which is done by the Maritime Board or the Commonwealth Navigation Act. So we would leave the whole thing in an unworkable position.

Laws must be exact; otherwise people will not know where they are. This is a minimum standard which at present is being maintained by the Commonwealth Parliament, and if that Parliament and other authorities alter their standard to make it better, then this Parliament should certainly conform to that improvement. But the Commonwealth has been most insistent in its advice to the States that in shipping and maritime matters uniformity in laws between States is of the utmost importance, and we can well understand that if it is not so, much difficulty could be occasioned. If we do not pass the Bill, we leave the standard as that prescribed by the British Merchant Shipping Act, which is lower than that contained in the Bill and in the Commonwealth Navigation Act. I hope the Committee will retain the clause in its present form.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Minister has mentioned the Seamen's Union and the Shipbuilding Board. He seems to have some objection to the Seamen's Union. If it will please the Minister, what about substituting the Australian Shipbuilding Board which, I would say, is a board of some importance? Seeing that it already has a standard, then we could conform to it.

Mr. Graham: Will you give us some idea of what you intend to move?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The Minister said that, because of one cabin not being up to standard, the "Coramba" had to go into dock. That shows the fallacy of having accommodation below the standard. I do not want to see any trouble on the coast but if the Minister defies the Shipbuilding Board

and the Seamen's Union, they will say, "Send her back to Sydney and see what can be done." The men do not want ships hung up between the outports but, if the standard is not kept up, there will be no ships. That is why I am asking the Minister to keep out of trouble and do something that is reasonable. The Seamen's Union is only fighting for proper accommodation for its members.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I appeal to the member for Fremantle to show some reason in this matter and not to get me into trouble, which will happen if the amendment is agreed to. The Bill will not be worth the paper it is written on.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Why would it get you into trouble?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: Because I shall be introducing a variation from the degree of consistency which is desired to be maintained in Australian maritime law. If there is a different law in every State, and a ship is built in Western Australia, when she reaches Adelaide, she may be held up because she does not conform to South Australian laws. If she sails to Melbourne, she may be in trouble with the Victorian law.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: The Minister would not be afraid of the Legislative Council, would he?

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I am prepared to defend this provision against any House of Parliament or member of it because I think it is in advance of the law that now applies. In view of the consequences likely to arise from variations in the law, I do not think it would be safe to include in the State legislation the amendment proposed by the member for Fremantle on account of the difficulty that might be involved in the interchange of shipping between the different parts of Australia. The whole trend of conference of maritime authorities these days is towards as much uniformity as possible in minimum standards. Should the Commonwealth alter its standards, we should follow suit. In the meantime we must keep in line with the latest requirements that are sought at meetings of maritime authorities, harbour boards and shipping people. We have proceeded satisfactorily with this important consolidation Bill up to this one point.

urge the Committee not to agree to the amendment and thereby risk the utility of the measure, particularly as we do not know what the effect of it might be.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: It is refreshing to hear the Minister express his love for the Commonwealth and its provisions. However, it is a pity that we cannot proceed along the lines that Western Australia leads and others may follow. We will not go far wrong if we stick to the Australian Shipping Board. If we provide for two feet more than is necessary, there will be no trouble; but if we send our ships away with two feet less than is essential, we shall have trouble. I cannot see the force of the Minister's arguments, particularly when he suggests that on this occasion we should stick by the Commonwealth.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: I will not take up much time in endeavouring to convince the Minister, who has apparently made up his mind that he wants the clause in the Bill.

The Minister for Housing: I have been very reasonable. The member for Fremantle has had his way almost all through the Bill.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY: What the Minister said was quite true when he remarked that the clause will be an improvement. What he did not make clear was that the principal Act is so much out of date that although this provision is an improvement, it is not in conformity with what is required to bring the legislation right up to date. The member for Fremantle's amendment should be accepted and thus place the responsibility on the Australian Shipping Board. We have nothing to be afraid of. That board has already made provision for improved conditions for seamen on the latest boats to be placed on the Western Australian coast. The Minister will be aware of the many thousands of pounds spent on alterations to the "Koolinda" and the "Kybra," and he is aware of the need for satisfactory accommodation being provided for seamen who work along the Nor-West coast. Those men have laboured in the past under very crude conditions particularly in view of the sub-tropical climate they experience and the broken shifts and long hours they work in order to keep the coastal trade moving. I make one last appeal to the Minister to accept the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: I am advised that the Australian Shipping Board is the shipbuilding authority for the Commonwealth but has no authority to lay down standards for others.

Hon. A. A. M. Coverley: It laid down the standards respecting shipping that the Government has obtained for the coastal trade here.

The MINISTER FOR HOUSING: The Australian Shipping Board is like Harland and Wolf; it builds ships. I agree that the Bill, which consolidates laws that were first made in this State 41 years ago, should have been introduced long ago. The law embodied in its clauses is now contained in 13 Western Australian Acts and in one British Act—the Merchant Shipping Act. In the preparation of the Bill, the law has been made in conformity with the latest legislation of the States dealing with this subject, notably the Queensland, New South Wales and South Australian Acts. I hope the Committee will not accept the amendment, so that the Bill may go forward as a satisfactory and practical measure.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I appeal to the Minister not to risk an industrial strike for the sake of a few inches.

Mr. Grayden: Are we to have one?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: If the Minister persists in his attitude and trouble should arise later on, we do not want him coming to us and saying, "What can we do about this?" The Minister will have brought it on himself and he will have to stew in his own juice. The fact that the "Coramba" has had to go East on account of one room should indicate to the Minister that it is time he woke up because seamen will not work the ships if decent accommodation is not provided.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	..	..	..	19
Noes	..	..	..	21
				—
Majority against	..			2
				—

# AYES.

Mr. Brady  
Mr. Coverley  
Mr. Fox  
Mr. Graham  
Mr. Hawke  
Mr. Hegney  
Mr. Hoar  
Mr. Kelly  
Mr. Marshall  
Mr. May

Mr. Needham  
Mr. Nulsen  
Mr. Panton  
Mr. Reynolds  
Mr. Sleeman  
Mr. Smith  
Mr. Styants  
Mr. Tonkin  
Mr. Rodoreda

(Teller.)

## NOES.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Murray
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Bovell	Mr. Niammo
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. North
Mr. Doney	Mr. Seward
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Shearn
Sir N. Keenan.	Mr. Watts
Mr. Leslie	Mr. Wild
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Brand
Mr. McLarty	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Bill again reported with further amendments.

**BILLS (2)—MESSAGES.**

Messages from the Lieut.-Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the following Bills:—

- 1, Government Railways Act Amendment.
- 2, Western Australian Government Tramways and Ferries.

**BILL—ROAD DISTRICTS ACT AMENDMENT.***Second Reading.*

**MR. YATES** (Canning) [9.15] in moving the second reading said: Since the original legislation was passed in 1919—some 29 years ago—many changes have taken place in the communal life of Western Australia, and I feel that the time has arrived when the Act should be amended to enable road boards, if they so desire, to sublet any one of their halls to an organisation within the district for a worthy cause or object.

Some two or three years ago, a community centre was formed in the district of South Perth and since then it has enlarged its activities until they have assumed very large proportions. In fact, I can claim that it is one of the best conducted community centres in Australia. The organisation produces and publishes a monthly newsletter or newspaper, a copy of which is distributed to every home in the district, containing information of the activities of every organisation that cares to contribute items of interest. The road board supplies particulars of its activities each month and so do the R.S.L., the boy scouts, the girl guides and various other bodies, and this work is done quite voluntarily by a band of enthusiasts.

The organising body of the community centre found that the time would not be far distant when it would require a headquarters building or hall in which to conduct its activities. With this end in view, the road board was asked to assist in securing a hall. At the time many Army huts were available for sale and the board purchased one of them. After many early difficulties, the hut was dismantled and conveyed to South Perth and erected on a block of land in Collins-street, in the eastern part of the district. The land being the property of the board, when the hall was erected on it, that, too, became the property of the board.

In its wisdom the board decided to sublet the hall to the community centre on condition that it in turn might sublet to any organisation requiring the use of the hall. On that understanding, it was released to the community centre, and since then the arrangement has worked quite satisfactorily. The board is assured of an annual income without having the worry of cleaning, repairing or furnishing the hall, which work is done by the community centre by means of voluntary labour. I can state quite honestly that the work done by the community centre since acquiring the hall has been a credit to the district. It has engaged in all sorts of activities for the benefit of the people and I heartily endorse the action that has been taken.

Unfortunately, a Government auditor raised the question that the hall was sublet by the South Perth Road Board to an independent organisation and therefore he could not give a clear audit certificate to the Government, as the provisions of the Act were not being complied with, the road board having no power to sublet the hall. I then approached the Minister for Local Government and discussed the matter with him. Eventually a deputation from the South Perth Road Board put the problem before him. After a very cordial half-hour or so in his office, the Minister conceded that the work which the organisation was doing merited some consideration being given to an amendment of the Act. In the meantime, the community centre is still in possession of the hall pending the result of this small amending Bill.

It is the board's purpose to have two of its members on the committee of the

community centre. That would be the hall committee which looks after the hall itself. Therefore, the road board would be represented on that committee when any matters relating to the hall were dealt with. I may here point out that other organisations might desire to use road board halls in other districts of the State. In past years some road boards have built two, three and sometimes four halls in their districts; the South Perth Road Board has built three. This Bill will confer upon a board having more than one hall in its district power to sublet one of the halls to an organisation, which, in turn, must be approved by the Minister controlling local government. By this means the Government would have control of the subletting of these halls, and the Minister would not be likely to permit subletting to an organisation which might be subversive or which, in his opinion, might not be working in the interests of the people of the district.

To safeguard an organisation which might secure one of these halls, it is intended that it shall have a lease of not more than 21 years. This, however, could be renewed at the discretion of the Minister and the road board. The Bill therefore will assist not only the community centre at South Perth, but any similar organisation throughout the State. The Bill itself speaks of an "organisation." It would not be possible to include the names of all the organisations that are doing good work, such as the Red Cross Society, infant health centres and others. They are too numerous to mention; I believe that at present they number 50, but this number might be increased in a couple of years owing to the formation of new organisations which otherwise would not come within the scope of the Bill. It is not anticipated that any great rush will take place for the use of road board halls, because, unless a road board itself desires to sublet a hall, no organisation can secure it. This Bill will give the boards power to sublet to an organisation should they so desire. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by the Minister for Local Government, debate adjourned.

## **MOTION—LAND SALES CONTROL ACT.**

### *To Disallow Exemptions Regulation.*

Debate resumed from the 13th October on the following motion by Hon. A. H. Panton:—

That Regulation No. 1 made under the Land Sales Control Act, 1948, and published in the "Government Gazette" of the 28th September, 1948, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 28th September, 1948, be and is hereby disallowed.

### **THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION**

(Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning) [9.25]: The principal objection of the member for Leederville, as I understood his speech on the motion for the disallowance of this regulation, was in regard to the complete decontrol of business premises. Apparently the hon. member either felt he had no occasion to object to the decontrol of urban lots of less than one acre and of licensed premises, or alternatively he felt that their presence in the regulation was not so important as that which affected commercial premises of a non-residential character. I feel that the regulation, as it was presented to Parliament on the day upon which it was gazetted, ought to be accepted. It is no use indicating, as by implication the member for Leederville did, that there had been some desire to deceive Parliament on this subject.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: This House was definitely deceived.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I say, quite frankly, that the House was not.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: I say it was.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I have seen the hon. member waving his arms about before and declaiming about proof up to the hilt, but I will have a word or two to say as well. It is my desire to try to explain to the House what I understand about this regulation. If the House does not accept the reasons which I advance, then that is the business of the House; but at least I am entitled to advance my reasons.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: That is so, but I think the Assembly was deceived and I am entitled to say so.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think the hon. member is, too, but he should at least allow me to proceed. He took the

opportunity on a previous occasion—and I should say he was not in order—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: You are reflecting on the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: On the occasion in question, Mr. Speaker was not in the Chair.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It was a reflection on some occupant of the Chair.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Maybe it was. If you, Mr. Speaker, regard it in that light, I am quite prepared to withdraw the reflection and say the hon. member took advantage of the opportunity which was afforded to him to make certain observations on a previous occasion. Whether or not he should have done so is a matter for decision subsequently. But now let us get back to the question of whether this House was deceived. The regulation was gazetted in a special "Government Gazette" at about two o'clock, I understand, on the afternoon when the papers were tabled. Therefore, the quickest possible action was taken to acquaint this House officially with the decision of the Government. That does not, in my opinion, tally with any desire to deceive. If there had been such a desire, I would suggest that the fullest time allowed by the Interpretation Act would have been utilised before the papers were tabled, instead of which an exactly opposite course was taken. Hardly five minutes was allowed to elapse.

But the matter goes deeper than that. It is perfectly true that when the Minister for Lands, who unfortunately is away at present, introduced the Bill—I think on the 13th of last month—he, while making it quite clear that urban vacant lots were to be decontrolled, expressed the opinion that commercial premises of the nature covered by this regulation could be dealt with on a 15 per cent. over 1942 prices, plus 15 per cent., basis. At that time I think the hon. gentleman had no reason to question that that was likely to be the future progress of the matter. But he did not say that any Cabinet decision had been reached on the subject, and the Bill, some 24 hours later, went to another place; and there, as is well known, amendments seeking to incorporate the terms of this regulation—and indeed something stronger—in the Act itself, were brought forward.

The Minister at that time in charge of the Legislative Council, Hon. G. B. Wood, sought instruction as to what he should do about these regulations and what undertakings he could give; and accordingly a Cabinet meeting was held, and he was told that he could agree to say that regulations could be made, but that such provisions would not be accepted in the Act, because if that were done the Government could not vary them afterwards if they were found to be unsatisfactory. It was agreed that we would be prepared by regulation to allow these premises to be decontrolled but that we definitely were going to have the right, if we felt they were being abused in any way or proving unsatisfactory, to alter them by other regulations. If they were in the Act itself, we would have no prospect of doing that except by bringing down other legislation, which we could not do if Parliament were not sitting; and which, in our humble opinion, we would have difficulty in having passed, if Parliament were sitting.

So the net result was that the Legislative Council insisted on these regulations or wording similar to the regulations—but a little stronger, as I said—going into the Act; and we in this House told the Legislative Council that we were not going to agree to that proposition. In the reasons we gave for objecting, we informed the Legislative Council that we were not going to have these provisions incorporated in the Act, because the Government could not alter them without an alteration to the Act. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Votes and Proceedings of that day he will find that that reason was given to the Legislative Council. So it was quite clear that the attitude of the Government to the Legislative Council's proposals in the Bill was not that they were undesirable as a means of controlling or decontrolling land sales, but that they were thoroughly undesirable if they were to be incorporated in the Act, because they deprived the Government of any authority in the matter at all, which authority I insist to this day is absolutely essential and may have to be exercised, though there does not seem any prospect of it now, in the event of circumstances becoming such as to warrant that activity.

This is the reason which was submitted to another place in connection with the

amendment to incorporate business premises in the Bill: "None of the States except South Australia has accepted these items in their legislation. These are matters as to which the Minister and the Government must be left to act under the powers given by Clause 14 of the Bill. If this amendment is adopted, control could not be reimposed without amending an Act of Parliament." We have acted under Clause 14 of the Bill and included business premises in the items not subject to the Act, but we are, if the position arises and we think it necessary, in a position to reimpose some measure of control.

The value of business premises, so far as I can understand the position, is based substantially on the value to an individual purchaser. It is what he thinks it is worth to him. It has been suggested that a person will pay an exorbitant price for purely commercial premises because he can charge what rent he likes for them, and therefore may inflict upon his tenants the result of paying some increase in the price beyond what he may have paid had the position been controlled. I am advised, and I have no doubt of it myself, that that is not so. The Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act applies to land and land includes any land and premises of any description or any part thereof, and where land is leased together with goods and chattels, includes such goods and chattels.

Therefore, the person who buys commercial premises during the continuance of that legislation, which will be on the statute-book for at least the next 14 months, is obliged to take into consideration the fact that he cannot of his own volition substantially increase, or indeed increase at all, the rent which his tenants are going to pay. He may therefore, in my opinion, be assumed to take on the premises and pay a value for them which is consonant with what he thinks they are worth. During the time of the control, many curious things took place and, in my view, some extraordinary things were done.

There was one building for which, with the land on which it stood, the purchasers were quite prepared to pay £16,000. The treaty was purely a private one. The sub-Treasury, which was then in control, was of the opinion that £13,000 was all that should be paid; yet the clearest evidence

was submitted to it, in that particular case, that the premises, leaving the land entirely out of calculation, would have cost far more than £16,000 to erect in their then state. So there was reasonable justification to say that at that time the premises were worth £20,000. But the sub-Treasury was adamant: £13,000 was all that was allowed; so the sale fell through. The institution that desired to purchase the premises was an honourable one which would not go on any black market, where I daresay this transaction could have been completed, as many other transactions were. As I say, the sale fell through, with considerable inconvenience to the proposed purchaser who also, I might say, had no intention of making a speculative advantage out of the proposition, but simply required the accommodation.

There were any number of instances where it was quite apparent that the regulated prices bore no resemblance to a fair price and so resulted in two things: one, an almost unlimited quantity of black marketing by people who were determined to have their way—and there are plenty of them—leaving honest citizens to be deprived of their reasonable requirements; and two, a considerable loss to the State revenue because the stamp duty was always paid on the written amount whereas the transactions were effected at some figure not disclosed. It is a well-known fact that scores of thousands of pounds have been lost by the State over a period of years on that account only. In these circumstances, it is difficult for us to say that control of premises of this nature is required. A man is unlikely, as a commercial proposition, seriously to overcapitalise himself. Existing legislation restricts him from going bald-headed for increased returns by way of rental from his premises, and also it is improbable that he would pay a price greater than he thought the premises were worth, having regard to the cost of placing them there at the present time, less depreciation to bring them into their present condition.

Mr. Marshall: Do not you think pressure of circumstances would force one into that invidious position?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think it would very much in regard to commercial premises. I am inclined to



agree that pressure of circumstances would do so in regard to residential premises, and that is why I would not subscribe, up to the present—I do not know about the future—to their being decontrolled, because I see a very different state of affairs arising that might inflict grave hardship on individuals. But the regulations have not purported to decontrol residential premises, nor is there any suggestion that I know of to that end. There are, however, some sound reasons why commercial premises of a non-residential character should be decontrolled. We shall see what the experience will be. If it can be established that there has been any grave detriment to the community, or any large portion of it, as a consequence of such action, then the regulations can be amended as was indicated was the intention of the Government in the reason it gave to the Legislative Council for its objections.

When we realise that the statistics indicate that during the year ended the 31st August, 1948, only 52 transactions involving commercial premises were registered in Western Australia, we begin to understand the state of affairs that had been reached in respect to transactions concerning this type of premises under the regulations as they stood. It is almost incredible that during that period of 12 months all sorts of commercial premises had not changed hands. I have here a statement showing the different positions in the several States in connection with this matter. New South Wales has exempted vacant home sites and factory sites. It has agreed with us in regard to what we might call vacant home sites—blocks of less than one acre in extent—and factory sites, but not other commercial premises. Victoria has exempted vacant town lots, licensed premises, theatres and transfers of mortgages. South Australia has exempted commercial and factory premises, except when portion is residential, licensed premises and vacant land over one acre.

That is virtually the same position as we have here. Unfortunately, in South Australia the provision is contained in the Act. Queensland has controlled sales of all land and buildings except shop, office, commercial and factory buildings and sites therefor. In respect to the matter on which I have been dwelling, the Queensland Government has taken virtually the same action as we have taken here. So I submit that,

while there is by no means uniformity, there has throughout the several States—I might say I could not obtain any details from Tasmania up to this morning—to which I have referred, been an approach of one type or another towards the decontrol of commercial premises. The values that were imposed and maintained by the Commonwealth regulations were purely stagnation values. We boast, and with some justification, of the industrial development which has taken place in this State since 1942. The present position has been arrived at by the efforts of the member for Northam and, to some degree, by myself, together with, in both cases, those of the officers of the Department of Industrial Development.

We tell the public about the greatly increased number of factories, employees and volume of production, and yet we are prepared to say—or some people might be prepared to say—that the panic prices we would have got for premises in 1942, plus some small percentage, are what we should get today. I do not know that this is the right way to go about it. I feel that the law of supply and demand in a matter of this nature is one which might very easily be satisfactory. Most of the people who require these premises which are likely to be changing hands have enough sense to look after themselves. Quite a different view would I hold in regard to residential premises but my attitude has been and still is that if there is evidence forthcoming, and it is not forthcoming as yet, that these regulations or the business of control in this particular case will occasion something of a detrimental value to the community, or a substantial section of it, then I would be prepared to amend them to cope with the problem of the time. So far as I can see it has not yet arisen.

Surely with the war ended three years ago, we are entitled to expect that in some directions there shall be a lessening of control. We are entitled to expect that in everything, except where the good of the greatest number of people is concerned, controls should be relaxed. It is only when we have to consider the good of the great number of people, such as we have to do in a housing question, or in rent control, or as we might have to do in price control, that we are prepared to subscribe to the continuation of a control system. However,

in a case where it seems to me that people can very well look after themselves, and where we are asked to continue controls, I am not by any means convinced that it is desirable to continue them.

I think there have been, up to the moment, no complaints from the public who may be concerned in this matter and the situation seems to be comparatively satisfactory. We have the other States of the Commonwealth all making some move in the direction which we have made—some nearly all the way, one all the way and perhaps further because it is in the Act and cannot be altered without Parliamentary activity, but at least all of them making some progress in the direction of decontrol.

So I appeal to the House not to disallow the regulation at this stage. I say quite frankly that if we can be shown that the continuation of these “decontrollings” is going to react to the detriment of any substantial section of our people, then we will be prepared to amend them but at the moment we are by no means satisfied of that: in fact, the contrary is the case. We are satisfied, however, that an honest man may now have some chance of paying what he is prepared to pay and having his transaction lawfully recorded. The State is receiving what it is entitled to receive under its stamp duty laws and we are quite satisfied that it previously was not able to do that. If the regulation is left alone for the time being it will give us an opportunity of establishing the bona fides of these proposals or if necessary deciding to amend them if the contrary is the case.

I think I have made it clear that a decision was arrived at on this matter much on the lines of the regulation finally gazetted. Because of the activity of the Legislative Council it was felt that a decision must then be arrived at although normally in my view it would have waited until the Bill became an Act. But the earliest possible opportunity was taken as soon as the regulation was gazetted. In fact I think the ink was scarcely dry upon it, to lay it upon the Table of the House. The House would be well advised to allow the regulation to stand and leave it to the Government—ever watchful of the circumstances as will have been gathered from what I have said—to make the final de-

cision as to whether they should be amended or not, especially as the rent question is governed in respect to all premises by the Increase of Rent (War Restrictions) Act.

**HON. J. T. TONKIN** (North-East Fremantle) [9.56]: The other evening I interjected and said that this Government changes its policy overnight. The Minister for Lands denied that and I said that I would prove it. Tonight when the Deputy Premier referred to some belief on this side of the Chamber that the House had been deceived, I stated that the House had been deceived and that I would prove it. This I propose to do by quoting what actually did occur and leaving it to the House to judge whether or not the two statements which I made were correct.

The Minister for Lands introduced the Land Sales Control Bill on Tuesday, the 14th September, and before a Minister introduces a Bill it is presupposed that full discussion has taken place in Cabinet on the contents and that it represents Government policy after all the arguments for and against the proposed course have been fully considered. The Deputy Premier has advanced tonight a number of arguments as to why the control over the sale of business premises should be lifted, and I assume that those arguments must have been available to Cabinet before it decided on the introduction of the Bill in the form in which it appeared. When all possible arguments had been considered the Bill was introduced in the form in which it reached this House and this is what the Minister for Lands had to say when moving the second reading:—

In order almost to defeat the black market which has been rampant in the sale of vacant metropolitan, suburban and country town lots it is proposed to release these properties from control . . .

He also said—

it has been decided not to continue to control the sales of boarding houses.

The next statement by the Minister for Lands, in my opinion, cuts the ground completely away from the feet of the Deputy Premier. The Minister for Lands said—

The course proposed by Western Australia is similar to that of New South Wales and Victoria where control is being maintained over all sales with the exception of vacant metropolitan, suburban and country town lots.

There was the Government's declaration to this Assembly that its policy was to follow that of New South Wales and Victoria and the Minister stated what that policy was. He stated that control is to be maintained over all sales—

The Premier: I thought the Minister told you just now that we were following New South Wales.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No. What the Minister told us just now was that Victoria and New South Wales were still controlling business premises but they had exempted vacant factory sites. An entirely different matter.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Entirely different.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So there we have the declaration of Government policy after all the arguments had been considered in Cabinet—to maintain control over business premises. The debate proceeded in this House on that policy and before the Bill left here the Minister for Lands replied to the debate—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Now they have seven over there and there will be 22 voting against it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —on the 15th September and he had this to say—

I said last evening that it was proposed to lift completely the control over vacant lots in town and country. In reference to business premises we do intend to allow an increase of 15 per cent. plus the basis. If members will work that out it will show an increase of 32 per cent. on the 1942 levels. . . . It might have been better to lift the lid right off but the Government gave earnest consideration to the matter.

After the debate had proceeded along the lines initiated by the Government and the Minister had replied, he did not give this House an inkling of any change of Government policy. Not an inkling! So far as we knew, Government policy on the 15th September was precisely the same as it was on the 14th and that was to follow the example set by New South Wales and Victoria by retaining control over business premises, the Minister even going as far as to say in reply just how sales of business premises would be carried out. "The West Australian" on the 16th September, in reporting the Minister's reply, had this to say—

More concessions on land sales. Fifteen per cent. increase for rural properties. An addi-

tional price increase of 15 per cent. in sales of business premises and rural land would be permitted, the Minister for Lands, Mr. Thorn, announced in the Legislative Assembly last night.

If it were the Government's intention to lift control over the sale of business premises as from Monday, why make the provision for the 15 per cent. over and above the 15 per cent. on 1942 levels? So right up to the last moment the Government led this House to believe that its intention was to retain control over business premises but allowing a different basis for sales. The Bill was rushed through because it was necessary to have a decision by Monday. Whilst we in this House were under the impression that the Government was also to retain control over business premises, we found the Minister representing the Government in another place not doing what the Deputy Premier told us he did—not that at all—not giving a reply on amendments proposed saying that the Government intended to do certain things by regulation. What the Government's representative in another place did was, in a second reading speech, to make a declaration that the Government's policy was to lift control on business premises. So we find this in "The West Australian" of the following day—the paper must have been amazed—

Hon. A. H. Panton: Perhaps they had something to do with it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: —because having reported the previous day that it was the Government's intention to retain control over business premises and allow a 15 per cent. increase over the basis previously ruling, "The West Australian" had to announce this in its issue of Friday, the 17th September—

When the State takes over land sales control from next Monday an additional 15 per cent. increase will be allowed in the present maximum permissible price to be charged for private homes. Business premises without dwellings attached will be excluded from price control.

Would the Premier like me to read that again? That is the declaration of his Minister in his second reading speech in another place, not in reply to any suggested amendments but in announcing the Government's policy in that House. This is his declaration—

Business premises without dwellings attached will be excluded from price control.

Now this is the situation we find ourselves in: The Minister in this House announces that the Government's policy is to retain control over business premises and to allow a 15 per cent. increase. That policy is reiterated in the Minister's reply without any suggestion of an alteration, but when the Bill was introduced in the Legislative Council the Minister there in his second reading speech declared the altered policy. So I asked: "Who was responsible for this altered policy?" Was it the Government?

Hon. A. H. Panton: Mr. Watson.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: If it were altered by Cabinet, I asked what was the date! The answer I was given was that Cabinet was responsible for the alteration of policy and the date was the same as that upon which the Government's representative in another place introduced the Bill. Unless the Government was to be completely contemptuous of Parliament and the Opposition it had a right and obligation to tell the House of the altered policy, if altered policy there was, as a result of Cabinet decision. But did it do that? No, not a word! Not the slightest inkling in this House that there was a change of Government policy! And because of the speed at which the Bill was being rushed through how were we to know? It was impossible for us to see a printed "Hansard" or a copy of the Minister's speech and we had to assume—as we were entitled to do—that the Minister's speech in another place would be in conformity with the policy in this place and concerning which no alteration had been mentioned. But the Government, knowing full well of the change of policy, allowed managers to be appointed in this House and go into a conference and sit for hours working upon points completely in the dark regarding the Government's changed policy. Is that not deceit? Were we not deceived?

The Premier: I do not think you were deceived. There is a difference between putting something into an Act and putting it into a regulation.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Let us go back and see whether we were deceived. What was this House told of the Government's policy? It was told that its policy was to retain control over business premises and to allow an increase of 15 per cent. In effect the Government changed its policy overnight and did not tell the Assembly. Is not that

deceit? The Deputy Premier challenged me to prove it and then cleared out of the Chamber so that he would not have to listen to my arguments.

The Premier: I do not think that is a fair remark.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Well, where is he?

The Premier: He has just gone out for a short while.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: He will then say later that I have failed to prove my case. What is the situation? Did any member of this House know when we went into conference that the declaration by the Government's representative in another place was entirely different from that in this place? Did any member know that, apart from the members of the Government? And because we did not know and the Government took no steps to inform the Assembly, I say we were deceived, and deliberately so. I would not blame the Government if some additional arguments were advanced to cause it to change its policy. That is possible. But what I do blame it for was that it neglected to inform this Assembly of its altered policy and allowed us to believe, as we had every right to believe, that the policy was the same as when the Bill was introduced.

Where will we get if we have to be looking round all the time to ascertain for ourselves whether there has been a change in Government policy between the time a Bill is introduced here and when it reaches another place? It is unprecedented in the Parliament of Western Australia. What was the reason for it? Does it mean that the Bill in the first place was not given proper consideration by the Government, which thus came to wrong conclusions? It introduced the Bill in a certain form and declared, through its Minister, that its policy was to follow New South Wales and Victoria. Yet, having declared that policy, and having allowed argument to develop along those lines, the Government replied to the debate and reiterated what its policy would be, without giving the slightest indication that it had in mind an alteration in that respect. Then when the Bill went to another place, the Minister there made the declaration I have read. He said—

I do not think that the time has yet arrived when all controls of land should be removed but I am of the opinion, and the Government as a whole agrees, that although we do not want all controls removed the time has come

when a number of them can be done away with. . . . It is proposed under the Bill to release control over vacant city, country town and suburban lots . . . It will be done by regulation. Business premises will be entirely decontrolled . . . that means business premises where no dwelling is attached. . . . Purely business premises and boarding houses will be completely decontrolled.

There was no mention of it in the second reading speech and there did not appear anything like it in the utterance of the Minister here. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, this question: Was this Legislative Assembly deceived in the matter? It was deceived, because vital information was withheld from it. It was that after having introduced the Bill here, the Government had altered its mind. In acting thus, the Government treated this Assembly with contempt. It is useless for the Government to endeavour to explain it away by arguing the desirability of the new provision. That argument must have been available to it before it made up its mind originally.

Mr. Marshall: No, the St. George's Terrace guinea pigs had not got at the Government then.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Cabinet hurriedly changed its mind and reversed the decision it had reached previously. Its new decision was quite unannounced in this House but was acted upon in another place. Then we went through some show here of appointing managers to go into conference to argue upon the policy of the Government, when the Government had already capitulated and had reached another decision. That is the situation in which we find ourselves. I made two definite statements. One was that the Government changed its policy overnight. I think I have proved that statement.

Mr. Marshall: Undoubtedly! Right up to the hilt!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I have proved it through the answers by the Minister to the questions I asked. The second statement I made was that the Government had deceived the Legislative Assembly, and I think I have proved that too.

The Minister for Housing: No, and you cannot do so.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then what has to be done to deceive anyone?

The Minister for Housing: You have shown it by your own argument.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What must one do to deceive another?

The Minister for Housing: You have answered that by your own argument.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Does not one do that by withholding vital information? The Minister for Housing is a lawyer and knows that a contract can be upset on the ground of deceit, if one party to a contract withholds information that is available to him and which should be confided to the other party, but he declines to do so.

The Minister for Housing: Not this contract.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Why not this contract?

The Minister for Housing: It would not work under this one.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What is the use of the Minister talking that way?

Hon. A. H. Panton: What is the good of talking to a lawyer anyhow?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister knows it is practising deceit if one withholds vital information affecting an action to be taken, where that knowledge was in the possession of one party and the other party was entitled to have it as well. In this instance, if there were a change in Government policy after the Bill was first introduced in this House, members here were entitled to know of it. They were not told. They had no way of finding out about it, because the Bill was being rushed through and the ordinary processes were not available to them. I repeat, however unpalatable it may be to the Government, that its action amounted to pure deceit and nothing else. Because of that, there is a very strong reason why the Government should not be allowed to have its way regarding this regulation, because it is contrary to the policy it announced to this House and which members believed was the Government's policy until they saw the statement in the Press.

The Minister for Housing: Your speech is the best defence of the Government I have heard.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Is that the Minister's opinion?

The Minister for Housing: It completely answers your own case.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What a stupid remark that is!

The Minister for Housing: Only because it is unpalatable.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I would like to know what one has to do to prove a case such as I have submitted. I have given the House, not opinions, but facts. I have stated what happened, what did not happen and what should have happened. If those facts do not convince the House that it was deceived, nothing will. In any event, the House will be the judge of whether or not it was deceived; it will not be told by the Minister for Housing. Members will go on the information I have submitted to decide whether or not they have been deceived.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Some of them will.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is the important thing. There is another important point regarding the merits or demerits of the regulation. Members on the Opposition side of the House strenuously opposed any increase in the price of business premises because we feared that any such increase would inevitably find its way into the price structure. If we were to permit a man to pay a larger amount for factory, shop or warehouse premises, we would merely aggravate the position.

The Premier: They are doing it every day of the week, and you know it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No.

The Premier: Showing a contempt for the law; just a farce!

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Government will never hold the position against that, because any increase in price would subsequently be reflected in the charges for products.

Mr. Marshall: That is the point—reflected in prices.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is what I was attempting to say when the Premier endeavoured to frustrate my efforts. So that there will be no misunderstanding and that the position may be perfectly clear, I will repeat my contention.

The Attorney General: Not more than once or twice.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The reason why we objected to an increase respecting business premises was that we felt any such increase would inevitably find its way into the price structure.

The Minister for Housing: The things that mostly affect the price structure are those operating through the black-market.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Are they? If the Government permits an increase with respect to a factory, the increase will be passed on in prices despite the Government, which will not be able to hold the position; and that will inevitably mean a steep rise in prices with disastrous results for the general community.

The Attorney General: That is a weak argument.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is not a weak argument; it is what we want to prevent. The Minister knows that already there have been substantial increases in the prices of fish, ham and bacon.

The Attorney General: You know that those increases are due to the withdrawal of subsidies and to overseas contracts.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am aware of that, but I know that there has been a steep increase in those prices. Is the Minister aware of that?

The Attorney General: There has not been a steep increase.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, there has.

The Minister for Housing: Your slogan is, "Control for ever."

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No, it is not. There are times when it is essential to maintain controls over certain things. The Deputy Premier has stated quite clearly that he believes the control over dwellings should continue. Perhaps the Minister for Housing does not agree with him. At any rate we know where the Deputy Premier stands on that question. So it is conceivable that, in the view of some people, there are sound reasons for retaining control of business premises, and one of our reasons is to prevent, if we can, these increases from entering into the price structure, which affects our people more than anyone else. That is what we want to safeguard and we will do our level best to safeguard it.

The Minister for Housing: We will be with you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then the Minister will have to agree to the disallowance of this regulation, but I cannot see his doing that. For these reasons, firstly, that the Government deceived this Assembly and,

secondly, that we do not want these increases to enter into the price structure, I ask the House to agree to the motion.

**MR. SHEARN** (Maylands) [10.22]: It would be difficult to find a subject on which there is such a wide divergence of opinion as that which relates to any form of price control. In the few remarks I propose to make on the motion for the disallowance of the regulation, I should like to refer briefly to one statement made by the member for Leederville when moving the motion. He said that the members of the Real Estate Institute would be very happy as a result of the lifting of this control.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I said its members ought to be very happy.

**Mr. SHEARN**: That makes a difference, because I desired to tell the hon. member that I am in a position to say that that is not so. Members will immediately appreciate the point that if anything is done to introduce instability in regard to real estate, conditions will immediately become chaotic and disastrous. The member for Leederville doubtless has sufficient knowledge of affairs to realise that the members of the Real Estate Institute know something of the position, and I suggest that men who have been established in the city for many years and who represent considerable interests—and they are not all wealthy interests—also have an appreciation of the situation. I believe that the Government is anxious to serve the community generally, and I cannot see how its action in this respect was directed other than to the best interests of the community. At the same time, I thought the Minister might tell us more fully the position as it appears to him. I am in agreement with the member for Leederville in one respect. If I understood him aright, he was concerned only with what is contained in paragraph (b) of the regulation.

Hon. A. H. Panton: That is all.

**Mr. SHEARN**: With the hon. member, I find myself unable to do anything to deal with that specific point except to oppose the schedule as a whole. Taking into account the law of supply and demand, and the changes that are occurring, the Government assured us that it would reimpose control if necessary. With regard to licensed premises mentioned in paragraph (c), however, there are ways in which they are already controlled

quite outside any regulation relating to land sales. So, while the Government is in a position to reimpose control of vacant land, if necessary—I do not think it will be necessary—there are other ways in which licensed premises can be and are controlled.

What I am concerned about is business premises, factories and shops. I understood the Minister to indicate that there had been certain sales of business premises during the last 12 months, and I think he quoted a figure to indicate that there was not much to worry about on that score. I would remind the Minister that one of the contributing factors to this state of affairs is that many owners of such premises, whether firms or individuals, selling their premises would be faced with the problem of having to re-invest their money, and it is common knowledge that there is more money available for investment at present than there are investments to absorb it. That is an argument which might well be submitted in regard to the Minister's statement.

My concern, however, takes a different angle. May I say that over two months ago I wrote to the Attorney General with regard to a matter affecting rents of city property. Since this regulation has been published, I have been approached by a considerable number of people—one a man occupying small factory premises, another a professional man and also people occupying shop premises—and they are alarmed at the prospect of this exemption. They fear that the premises that they are occupying may be sold at higher prices than those on which their present rents are based and that in consequence their present rents will be increased.

Let me give a slight indication of the justification for their fear. Today I had a case brought to my notice of a certain building the rent for which has been raised the equivalent of 30 per cent. The Minister might ask, "What about the fair rents Act?" Let me explain the process that is adopted. The owner of the building, through his representative, approached the tenant and suggested that the present rent was uneconomic and stated that he would be prepared to grant a three years' lease. Alternatively, the property was likely to be put on the market and might or might not be sold. As the position was represented as being unstable, it was suggested that the

occupier sign a lease for three years, which would be in the form of a consent, the rent to be equivalent to an increase of 30 per cent. Under present conditions, if the matter were taken to a magistrate, he would almost inevitably make an order, because it is a consent arrangement.

The Attorney General: Not at all. That is not right.

Mr. SHEARN: I can give the Minister dozens of instances of it. I suggest, therefore, that the Government withdraw this regulation voluntarily, but re-introduce paragraphs (a) and (c) immediately. This would be in the interests of the community, which I am sure the Government has at heart. It should immediately set about discovering means to deal effectually with the position I have briefly outlined. I could go into great detail in regard to this matter, but I do not wish to bore members at this late hour. The Attorney General has suggested that various other Acts dealing with rental would cover the position; but I point out there is a definite loophole that can and will be taken advantage of by some people. I would have no objection to a regulation permitting the exemption of these premises if they are entirely occupied by one firm for the carrying on of its own business. I am, however, concerned about the shortage of accommodation in the city.

Take the Minister's own example of a tenant placed in the position outlined by him, a man who has been established for a number of years, who has built up a certain goodwill as a result of his location, who, in these days, would find great difficulty in getting a telephone installed, and who is faced with the risk of losing those premises unless he meets a demand for an increase of 30 per cent. in the rent. Such a man would say to himself, "Where can I go? What is the best course to pursue?" Being human, he would be compelled to submit to a form of duress and the result would be that he would sign the agreement. I assure the Attorney General, if he does not know it—and I am surprised that he, being a legal man, is not aware of it—that there are dozens of cases where rents have been increased in that way. I hasten to add that I do not for one moment suggest that a magistrate presiding over such a case would have any idea of the circumstances leading up to the increase.

I am a member of the Real Estate Institute, but I have to regard this matter not from the point of view of what would suit the institute but from the point of view of my duty to the community. I cannot conceive that the institute would be behind a proposal entirely and unconditionally to exempt these premises. I find myself in agreement with the member for North-East Fremantle, because, in many cases, the capitalisation and rental basis of properties must ultimately be reflected in the price structure and be to the disadvantage of the community. I suggest to the Government, therefore, rather than let this motion go to the vote, that it follow the course I have outlined, as otherwise it might lay itself open to a charge of representing sectional interests, and I do not suspect the Government of that. I shall support the member for Leederville if the Government does not adopt my suggestion.

On motion by the Premier, debate adjourned.

## MOTION—FISHING INDUSTRY.

*To Inquire by Select Committee.*

Debate resumed from the 13th October on the following motion by Mr. Leslie:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the condition of the fishing industry in Western Australia and means whereby greater supplies of local fish at reasonable prices can be made available to the consumer.

MR. FOX (South Fremantle) [10.35]: The mover of the motion for the appointment of a Select Committee has, I think, given ample reasons why it should be appointed. The Minister for Fisheries has also given the House several reasons why it should not be appointed. The mover told us that over the last 20 years numerous inquiries have been held into all the ramifications of the industry, and the Minister told us that all the evidence that is likely to be obtained is already on the files of the Fisheries Department. Very little organisation of the fishing industry has taken place over a large number of years. In fact, very little was done until 1945, when the Western Australian fishermen formed themselves into an organisation in an endeavour to improve their conditions of labour. After having held many meetings, the consensus of opinion was that, in their own interests



and in the interests of the public, a board should be appointed to control fish from the time they were caught until they were marketed.

In 1945, as a result of agitation by members of the fishing organisations throughout Western Australia, the member for Leederville, who was then Minister for Fisheries, called a conference of all the fishing organisations in the State, wholesalers and retailers, and departmental officials, the result being the appointment of an advisory committee which met about nine times and drew up a comprehensive report of everything pertaining to the industry, including cold storage. That report was presented to the Minister. Later, another conference was held, at which a committee was appointed to consider the preparation of a Bill for the creation of a board. That was the position up to the end of 1946. Had the Labour Party been returned to power at the last election, the Minister for Fisheries would have brought down a Bill to constitute such a board and I am convinced that our fishermen would have been satisfied with it. Now we have a declaration by the present Minister for Fisheries that the Government has no intention at all of introducing legislation for the creation of a board.

Until quite recently, nearly all the marketing of fish—in fact, 95 per cent. of it—was under the control of about five men in the metropolitan area. The handling of fish must be very profitable to a small body of men, who do none of the hazardous work, but who take out of the industry a sum totally disproportionate to the labour they put into it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise.

Mr. FOX: Those men are always able to call the tune and very often they refuse to buy all the fish the fishermen catch. Fishing is not a pleasant industry. The sea takes its toll of fishermen and also its toll of boats. Some two years ago, six fishermen were drowned just outside Fremantle. So much delay took place in assisting the fishermen that the Fremantle fishermen decided to form a co-operative company.

The Minister for Fisheries: That was done at my suggestion.

Mr. FOX: At the Minister's suggestion?  
The Minister for Fisheries: Yes.

Mr. FOX: Do not put that over us. The fishermen did that themselves. The Minister did not.

The Minister for Fisheries: I suggested it.

Mr. FOX: I will read the Minister a letter in a few minutes showing exactly where he stood. I suppose he did not know I had it. Before I finish, I shall show exactly where the Minister stood in this regard. I think he is on the side of the big wholesalers of Perth, on the side of big business and of private enterprise. As I was saying, a certain number of fishermen in Fremantle decided to start a co-operative company with subscribed capital of £2,087. The secretary presented the first balance sheet on the 30th of June and up to that date very substantial profit had been made. At present there are 88 members in the company and the secretary assured me he expected to have over 100 in the very near future. The company will not accept outside capital and a man must be actively engaged in the industry before he can become a member. It has taken a lease of the Fremantle fish markets which had really been a white elephant up to the time of its being taken over. It is paying the Government £25 a month and the Fremantle Electric Light Company £12 a month.

The company has a refrigerator at the markets in which to store fish and has also a store at Robb's Jetty. The fish are retailed daily to the public and the aim of the company is to establish a shop in Perth, when it has the capital to do so, and eventually to have shops in all the large country centres of Western Australia. Its object is to give the best possible service to the State, to increase the consumption of fish, and provide decent conditions for the fishermen. The following figures relating to the prices of fish were given to me by the secretary of the company about a week ago. They indicate the prices ruling at the markets—that is, the retail price to the public; and also prices charged in Perth shops. They are as follows:—

	Markets.	Perth Shops.
Snapper	1s. 8d.	2s. 0d.
Herring	1s. 1d. (up to)	1s. 9d.
Whiting	1s. 6d.	1s. 8d.
Flake		
(shark)	1s. 3d.	2s. 9d. (filleted)
Mullet	1s. 2d.	1s. 4d. to 1s. 6d.

During the herring season, quite a number of herring were brought from Albany, Bunbury and Busselton. These were sold in Perth and brought 4d. and 5d. a pound. They were retailed in the shops in Perth and at other centres at 1s. 1d. per pound. The co-operative company bought fish from those places, paid the fishermen 9d. a pound, and sold the fish for 1s. a pound. In that respect the company did a good job for the fishermen at Bunbury, Albany and Busselton. It has made application to the Government for funds to assist in establishing the industry at Fremantle, but unfortunately with very little success.

The Minister for Fisheries: That is not right.

Mr. FOX: Let the Minister wait until I have finished! Evidently he does not know all the facts even though he is Minister for Fisheries.

The Minister for Fisheries: I know a good deal.

Mr. FOX: I am aware of what assistance was given. The Government provided £900 to help the company to install the refrigerator. The company found £600, but the Government owns the asset. That is not giving those concerned very much help. The Minister cannot say that by allowing the company to put £600 out of £1,500 into the installation of the refrigerator and then holding the asset, it is helping the fishermen.

The Minister for Fisheries: The Government does not own the asset. It takes security.

The Minister for Housing: I will send you a legal textbook!

Mr. FOX: What I have said is correct. I have my information from the company, which should be in a position to know.

Mr. Styants: They need to sack their negotiators.

Mr. FOX: What else could the company do?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Minister for Housing has had enough.

The Premier: I should think so!

Mr. FOX: The asset belongs to the Government. In the same way the company paid the Public Works Department £100 to alter the markets and put in coppers to

cook crayfish, and they belong to the Government also. I propose now to read some extracts from the 1947 report of the Queensland Fish Board to show what the Queensland Government is doing compared with the very little assistance that the Government of this State is giving to this industry. If members of the Government want to make good fellows of themselves, let them act somewhat on the lines of the Queensland Government. They have every opportunity to do so. But the Government does not intend to do anything for the industry during the next 12 months, because we will soon be out of session, and it has been announced that there is no intention of bringing down a Bill. So outside of giving the industry some financial assistance, the Government cannot help it in any way. If Ministers want to give the industry a hand and an application is made for financial assistance, let the Government provide it on the lines of that given by the Queensland Government. In the first place, the Queensland Government advanced £25,000 to the Fish Board in order to give it a decent start.

The Premier: Advanced?

Mr. FOX: Yes. That was to be paid back over 30 years. The board has not missed one payment up to the present and has still a large amount of money in reserve. The 1947 report states—

The most important event during the year as regards the extension of marketing accommodation was the letting of a contract for the erection of a market building at Townsville the estimated cost of which is £25,000. The site has frontages to Flinders-street and Ross Creek and is in a central position. When erected, the premises should provide one of the best fish markets in the Commonwealth. Funds to defray the cost of the undertaking were provided on loan by the State Government. It is expected that the building will be completed in December or January next; in the meantime marketing operations at Townsville are being continued in rented premises.

New depots for the Metropolitan district have been opened at Wynnum and Mooloolaba in rented premises and a depot erected by the Board at Cleveland was opened last month. The depot at Caloundra, which had been temporarily discontinued, was re-established in other premises. A new market in premises erected for the purpose has been opened at Bundaberg and another in rented premises was established at Innisfail in December last. Both of these buildings were constructed to meet the Board's requirements.

That is one thing the Queensland Government has done. It has also assisted in the marketing of fish. The report states—

An important event in the transport of fish was the establishment of a regular air transport service to towns in the South-west and Central-west of Queensland. To assist the venture, the Queensland Government granted a subsidy to the service, which has now been operating for some months. It is understood that the service is much appreciated in the Western districts, with increasing support. The rapid transport at high altitudes provides an ideal method of conveying fish from the seaboard to these places in a satisfactory condition.

A similar service, also with Government subsidy, has more recently been inaugurated at Townsville to serve towns in the North-Western part of the State.

In order to facilitate the transport of fish by rail under suitable conditions between North and South Queensland, the Board procured a quantity of refrigerating equipment and, by arrangement with the Commissioner of Railways, this was installed in railway wagons for use, as required, in such transport. This, it is anticipated, will prove of much benefit, particularly in the North Queensland mackerel season.

The Government may be in a position—we know how difficult it is to transport fish from Shark Bay—to help by aeroplane transport, as has been done in Queensland. That is a contrast between what is occurring in Queensland and here.

Mr. Bovell: How long has this been going on in Queensland?

Mr. FOX: Since 1935—about 13 years.

Mr. Bovell: Why did you not think about it?

Mr. FOX: We would have established a board this year. It was only in 1945 or 1946 that the fishermen asked the Government to establish a fishing board, and if my party had been returned to power at the last election—by a miracle it was not—that board would have been in operation now. For the information of the member for Sussex, the amount of fish marketed in Queensland was 3,457,800 lb. in 1935-36 and in 1946 it was 6,205,624 lb. That gives some indication of the increase.

Mr. Bovell: A better comparison would be obtained by using tonnage figures. Money values do not help.

Mr. FOX: I have given the figures in pounds weight. I can give the hon. member the money figures. They are as follows:—

The total proceeds of sales conducted by the Board amounted to £255,388 6s. 11d., an increase of £11,793 4s. 8d. on the previous year.

The co-operative company is run very efficiently. It employs three men and one girl. In the summer the work is carried on from 4 a.m. to 3 p.m. and in the winter from 5 a.m. to 6 p.m. The employees work in the early morning to supply petrol, bait, gear, etc., and at night they are there to receive the fish. The company is also embarking on another phase. It intends to supply the goods that are necessary for fishermen such as ropes and, later, when it has sufficient funds, gear and everything else that is essential to the fishing industry. This should result in a great saving to the fishermen. I might state what is being done in Queensland in this regard—

As intimated in the last report, the granting of loans to fishermen by the Board for the purchase of boats has been superseded by an arrangement with the Industrial Finance Department of the Commonwealth Bank to provide such assistance to applicants recommended by the Board.

In pursuance of the scheme to ensure that adequate supplies of nets and other fishing gear are available for professional fishermen, arrangements have been made by the Board to import cotton and hemp nets and fishing lines from Britain. Supplies of all classes of fishing gear are also purchased for the same purpose from firms operating in Australia. When so desired, fishermen can secure allotments from these stocks under an arrangement for the cost to be deducted in instalments from payments due to them by the Board for fish marketed by them.

The board in Queensland has embarked on a policy of supplying all the necessary materials. That means the middleman will be cut out which will result in a great saving to the men engaged in this hazardous occupation. The company has about 47 boats working for it, and employs a large number of men. It has entered into an arrangement with the fishermen by which an agreed price shall be paid for the catch until next May. Consequently it will be able to stabilise the price during that period. If the company had sufficient money, and a site were available, it would open a shop in Perth. The secretary states he would have no difficulty in selling £70,000 or £80,000 worth of fish in the year. I feel sure that if this company had shops in different centres there would be a greater consumption of fish in the State and that the fish would be sold at a much reduced price. As

we all know, fish is very dear at present, and it is difficult for families who are on only a margin above the basic wage, and with two or three children, to have fish more than once a week.

Mr. Perkins: Why does not the company start more shops?

Mr. FOX: Money is needed to do so. The only one it has at present is the retail shop in the markets. Anyone can go there and buy whatever fish he wants. A considerable amount of fish is sold there. If the company had the capital it would extend throughout Western Australia. That would be for the benefit of the State and the fishermen. I am sure if it did extend in that way, it would bring down the price of fish.

Mr. Bovell: It strikes me it would get a monopoly.

Mr. FOX: How could it be a monopoly? And who is more entitled to everything that comes from the industry than the men who go out to sea and catch the fish?

Mr. Bovell: It is all right so long as you do not restrict the men who go out to sea.

Mr. FOX: There is no talk of that. It is not an industry that is rushed by many people. Numbers of fishermen have come from overseas and have been naturalised. Many have married Australian women and are rearing Australian families. I do not call them foreigners. They are naturalised Britishers and have the same standing in the community as any other Britisher. This is not a nice industry, and Australians do not take too kindly to it, although a few more have gone into it recently.

Mr. Bovell: All the fishermen in my electorate are British.

Mr. FOX: That may be so, but the hon. member represents only a small section of the industry compared with Shark Bay and Fremantle. There is no fish market in his electorate from what I am told.

Mr. Perkins: How much money would be required to open shops?

Mr. FOX: I do not know. I believe negotiations have been entered into in an endeavour to open a shop in Perth. I suppose a substantial amount would be necessary. As the company would manage the shop itself it would be able to run it more cheaply than any business man could. I

was told the other day that a proposition has been put forward in a certain place, and there is a chance of the company getting some money. At the same time, if the member for York has any influence with the Government I would like him to use it in order to assist the men who are trying to help themselves to get established in the fishing industry.

Mr. Perkins: Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. did not get any money from the Government.

Mr. FOX: That company had handed over to it a valuable asset at the North Wharf. It did not pay for that asset.

Mr. Perkins: Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. did not get any money from the Government.

Mr. FOX: I did not say it did, but the bulkhandling facilities at the North Wharf, which are a big asset, were simply handed over to it.

Mr. Perkins: It is only leasing it.

Mr. FOX: The Mandurah Fishing Company has been subsidised. I am told that it is not really a co-operative company, as I believe vested interests have taken a hand in it. I do not know whether the Premier can tell me—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Minister could tell you.

Mr. FOX: May be the Minister could tell me whether the company has been subsidised.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Premier should be able to tell you because it is in his electorate.

Mr. FOX: There is no answer, but I can tell the House that it is a subsidised company.

The Premier: Yes, Government money is in it.

Mr. FOX: Vested interests are now in the company so it is not truly part of the co-operative movement. If outside people who do not engage in fishing are in the company—

The Premier: I think the amount advanced was about £1,500.

Mr. FOX: There is no chance of outside people getting into the co-operative company at Fremantle. To be a member of that company one must be a full-time fisherman and one cannot leave the industry and

still belong to the company unless through sickness, and even then only for a limited period. If a person does leave the industry he must get out of the co-operative company altogether.

I would like to point out the difficulties under which the fishermen are labouring at Fremantle. The Minister for Works has some idea of the difficulties because he went down to look at them. There are no proper facilities available for unloading fish. Recently a boat came down from Shark Bay with 26,000 lb. of fish on board and it took two days to unload. There has never been a road out to the fish market, and I do not want to be told that it should have been done during the 14 years that our Governments were in office.

The Minister for Fisheries: Just like the cob-webs.

Mr. FOX: I got in early with my remark, because I knew some of the brainy gentlemen on the other side were sure to say that it should have been done while we were in office. It is impossible to get a truck out to the deep-water jetty and the boats are brought in to the landing place in the river to unload. Usually there are no berths available in the river, and if they do get a berth for a while they have to shift out somewhere else to make room for a ship coming in. In view of the revenue that the Government is getting from fishermen I think an effort should be made to form a decent road out to the jetty. The road was not made for the fishermen in the first place as it was used in the cartage of stone for the extension of the breakwater.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: The Minister is not listening.

Mr. FOX: The Minister knows all about it because he went down to have a look at it, but I do not think he has given an answer yet. I might also state that a large sum must be available to the Minister for Works, or to the Government, from the petrol tax. Most of the boats engaged in the industry use petrol and a percentage of the tax is paid to the State Government; yet the fishermen have no money spent on their facilities. All that is wanted is about 200 or 300 yards of road to enable them to unload from the deep water at the end of the jetty and bring the fish down to the market and take supplies back to their boats. It is not right that the boats should have to go into the river to

take on supplies and unload fish, but that is what they are compelled to do at present.

I am not sorry the Minister has stated that he is not agreeable to the creation of a fishing board, because I believe that would have been detrimental to the co-operative company. It would put the company on the same level as a retail fish shop. The big men in the fishing business in Perth fear the co-operative movement and these big men are in favour of the creation of a fishing board. I believe the co-operative movement will spread and if, as the Minister states, he intends to do nothing and a Select Committee is appointed to inquire into all the ramifications of the industry, it will give the fishermen an opportunity to say whether they favour the formation of co-operatives in different parts of Western Australia, a central co-operative, or the creation of a board. For that reason, I will vote for the appointment of this committee.

There are only two ways of helping the fishermen; one is by the co-operative movement where those who do all the hard work will get any profit that comes out of the business, and the other is by the creation of a board. In Queensland the fishing industry is well organised. There are fish markets in every big town right up to Innisfail, that is about 800 miles from Brisbane. There are eight to ten marketing towns which are served by good railways right along the coast, the fishermen have a good sea journey down, and they have aeroplane traffic. They are in a much better position for marketing than we are in Western Australia. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie said that it cost 10-1/3rd pence to put fish into the Perth market. That is a high charge on fish, and it is no wonder when fish come from Shark Bay that it is retailed at a high price. If the Premier had been a little more reasonable and adjourned the House earlier I would have been able, when next the motion was debated, to deal more fully with the industry.

Mr. Hegney: Keep going.

Mr. FOX: No, I am not going to weary the House any longer. When the committee is appointed there are several aspects that I intend to bring before it in the interests of the fishermen.

Mr. Hegney: Let us have them now.

Mr. FOX: No. I know members want to get home but if they tempt me too long I will keep going for another hour. Although

fishermen will have an opportunity over the next 12 months to ascertain whether the co-operative movement is to be a success or not, the appointment of this committee will give them a chance to make their choice between that movement and the creation of a board to control fish.

**MR. LESLIE** (Mt. Marshall—in reply) [11.8]: I want to thank members for the way in which they have received the motion. It will be clear from the differing viewpoints expressed during the course of the debate that it is necessary for an inquiry to be made into the fishing industry. The member for Yilgarn-Coolgardie and the member for South Fremantle wanted some assurance that the Government would do something on the committee's recommendations. Neither I nor any other member can give that assurance and I do not think it has ever been given in the past, nor is it likely that the Government will automatically accept the recommendations

of any particular committee or Royal Commission. That would be too much to expect. I am hopeful that as a result of the committee's inquiry the recommendations submitted will indicate to the Government the line of action that should be taken to meet the needs of the fishermen themselves, the fishing industry and the consumers who are earnestly seeking fish, an essential commodity, at a reasonable price.

Question put and passed; the motion agreed to.

*Select Committee Appointed.*

On motion by Mr. Leslie, a Select Committee appointed consisting of Hon. E. H. H. Hall, Messrs. Brand, Fox, Kelly and the mover, with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned and to move from place to place; to report on the 18th November.

*House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.*

---

For reference to the following tables, see pages 1743 to 1759.

**CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND.  
ESTIMATE FOR 1948-49.**

	£	£	£
<b>DEFICIT FOR YEAR 1947-48</b>			<b>352,032</b>
<b>Add Increases in Estimated Expenditure—</b>			
<b>Special Acts :</b>			
Interest and Sinking Fund	91,686		
Mine Workers' Relief Act	4,856		
Parliamentary Allowances	7,490		
Pensions and Retiring Allowances	11,809		
Superannuation Act	71,435		
		187,270	
<b>Departmental :</b>			
Premier's Department	4,612		
Treasury	4,117		
Audit	8,963		
Government Stores	7,062		
Government Printer	20,505		
Education	79,707		
Department of Industrial Development	14,422		
Child Welfare	22,015		
Forests	17,018		
Native Affairs	6,264		
Lands and Surveys	23,616		
Agriculture	63,262		
College of Agriculture	6,457		
Chief Secretary	6,923		
Registry and Friendly Societies	4,559		
Prisons	4,659		
Harbour and Light	8,417		
Mines	20,042		
Police	103,799		
Public Works and Buildings	181,007		
Crown Law	85,854		
Medical	18,063		
Public Health	39,810		
Mental Hospitals	21,065		
Fisheries	6,740		
<b>Miscellaneous Services :</b>			
Exchange	106,245		
Pay Roll Tax	7,476		
Hospital Trust Fund	155,243		
University—Additional Grant	16,544		
State Shipping Service—Losses	128,942		
Estimated Cost of Basic Wage	400,000		
Dairy Cattle Compensation	14,685		
State Electricity Commission—Loss	115,269		
		944,004	
		1,714,832	
<b>Public Utilities :</b>			
Goldfields Water Supply	15,476		
State Abattoirs	20,485		
Metropolitan Water Supply	12,897		
Other Hydraulic Undertakings	27,702		
Railways	602,688		
Tramways	37,867		
		717,115	
<b>Sundry Minor Variations</b>		16,697	
			2,636,070
<b>Add Decreases in Estimated Revenue—</b>			
<b>Taxation :</b>			
Totalisator Duty	8,787		
Stamp Duty	12,122		
Probate Duty	34,487		
		55,396	
<b>Territorial :</b>			
Land	22,036		
Timber	32,363		
		54,398	
<b>Departmental :</b>			
Treasury Miscellaneous :			
Rural Bank (Government Agency Section)—Interest	31,245		
Wire and Wire Netting—Interest	11,893		
State Insurance—Pittfalls	26,000		
"Koolama" Commitments	12,970		
		81,108	
<b>Commonwealth :</b>			
Special Grant		1,000,000	
<b>Public Utilities :</b>			
Goldfields Water Supply	18,270		
State Batteries	10,179		
		28,449	
			1,210,361
			£4,207,503

## CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND—continued.

	£	£	£	£
<b>Less Decreases in Estimated Expenditure—</b>				
Special Acts:				
Forest Act—Transfer from Revenue	...	...	21,755	
Departmental:				
Miscellaneous Services:				
Refunds from Revenue	...	44,731		
Interest and Sinking Fund, Wire and Wire Netting	...	21,481		
Rural Bank (Government Agency Section)	...	21,154		
Subsidy Road Transport of Superphosphate	...	48,169		
Subsidy Rail Transport of Superphosphate	...	34,958		
			170,493	
Public Utilities:				
State Batteries	...	...	14,234	
				206,422
				4,001,021
<b>Less Increases in Estimated Revenue—</b>				
Taxation:				
Land Tax	...	10,887		
Income Tax (Commonwealth Reimbursement)	...	682,000		
			692,887	
Departmental:				
Agriculture	...	11,786		
Crown Law	...	65,937		
Forests	...	8,104		
Printing	...	7,508		
Public Health	...	12,255		
Public Works	...	23,715		
Department of Industrial Development	...	15,863		
Treasury Miscellaneous:				
Rural Bank Interest	...	22,472		
Fremantle Bulk Handling—Interest	...	10,200		
Exchange	...	134,479		
Government Workers' Compensation—Surplus	...	22,260		
			180,411	
				334,639
Commonwealth:				
Grant under section 96	...	...	1,623,000	
Public Utilities:				
State Abattoirs	...	31,212		
Metropolitan Water Supply	...	15,987		
Railways	...	954,624		
Tramways	...	167,697		
			1,180,220	
Sundry Minor Variations	...	...	16,492	
				3,830,228
<b>ESTIMATED DEFICIT, 1948-49</b>	...	...	...	4104,723



[Return No. 1]

BALANCE SHEET OF THE GOVERNMENT OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA AT 30th JUNE, 1947, AND 30th JUNE, 1948.

	30th June, 1947.	30th June, 1948.		30th June, 1947.	30th June, 1948.
	£	£		£	£
Public Debt ... ..	99,002,301	100,274,741	Invested in Works and Services, etc. ...	97,079,008	98,247,588
			Balance—General Loan Fund c/d. ...	1,923,293	2,027,153
	99,002,301	100,274,741		99,002,301	100,274,741
Balance General Loan Fund ... ..	1,923,293	2,027,153	Consolidated Revenue Fund ... ..	28,480	380,563
State Taxes, Arrears ... ..	542,158	552,702	Commonwealth Government—Tax Arrears	604,933	616,487
Hospital Fund Contributions, Arrears ...	62,774	63,785	Advances (under Appropriation "Advance to Treasurer") ... ..	316,887	568,835
Reserve Accounts ... ..	9,596	8,274	Expenditure in Suspense ... ..	...	177,006
Suspense Accounts ... ..	29,458	148,312	Stores on hand ... ..	853,108	1,107,908
Trading Concerns ... ..	82,275	100,533	Trust Fund Investments—		
Trust Funds—			Governmental ... ..	2,542,306	2,037,767
Governmental ... ..	5,258,143	5,032,018	Private ... ..	2,060,722	3,272,736
Private ... ..	3,368,714	3,761,058	Banking Account ... ..	2,208,425	1,660,846
Inscribed Stock Exemption ... ..	...	3,000	Cash in hand, etc.—		
			Banks Current Account ... ..	874,809	287,571
			Banks in Eastern States ... ..	25,837	28,992
			Debenture Deposit ... ..	625,000	1,530,000
			In London ... ..	212,080	4,494
			In Transit ... ..	9,313	11,378
			In Hand ... ..	14,511	12,252
	11,276,411	11,696,835		11,276,411	11,696,835

[21 October, 1948.]

[Return No. 2.]

## REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1947-48, COMPARED WITH ESTIMATE.

## SUMMARY.

	Estimate.	Actual.	Comparison with Estimate.	
			Increase.	Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
Revenue ... ..	15,742,650	17,710,310	1,967,660	....
Expenditure ... ..	16,424,428	18,062,392	1,637,964	....
Deficit ... ..	681,778	352,082	....	....
Surplus ... ..	....	....	329,696	....
Net Improvement ... ..			£329,696	

## DETAILS.

Revenue	Estimate.	Actual.	Comparison with Estimate.	
			Increase.	Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
Taxation ... ..	4,838,000	4,984,191	146,191	....
Territorial ... ..	538,000	601,004	63,004	....
Law Courts ... ..	82,000	98,569	16,569	....
Departmental ... ..	1,479,636	1,787,356	307,820	....
Royal Mint ... ..	50,000	53,240	3,240	....
Commonwealth ... ..	2,450,432	3,450,432	1,000,000	....
Trading Concerns ... ..	101,832	114,292	12,460	....
Public Utilities ... ..	6,202,850	6,621,226	418,376	....
Total Revenue ... ..	15,742,650	17,710,310	1,967,660	....
Net Increase ... ..			£1,967,660	

Expenditure.	Estimate.	Actual.	Comparison with Estimate.	
			Increase.	Decrease.
	£	£	£	£
<b>SPECIAL ACTS—</b>				
Constitution Act ... ..	16,910	19,329	2,419	....
Interest—Overseas ... ..	1,327,935	1,336,531	8,596	....
Interest—Australia ... ..	1,902,353	1,888,345	....	14,008
Sinking Fund ... ..	802,000	819,393	17,393	....
Other Special Acts ... ..	711,653	762,769	51,116	....
<b>GOVERNMENTAL—</b>				
Departmental ... ..	5,216,200	5,707,489	491,289	....
Exchange ... ..	490,000	528,755	38,755	....
Unemployment Relief ... ..	1,627	1,871	244	....
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES ... ..</b>	5,955,750	6,997,910	1,042,160	....
Total Expenditure ... ..	16,424,428	18,062,392	1,637,964	....
Net Increase ... ..			£1,637,964	

[Return No. 3.]

## REVENUE.

## STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS FROM 1939-40 TO 1947-48 AND ESTIMATE FOR 1948-49.

Heads.	1939-40.	1940-41.	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.	Estimate 1948-49.
<b>TAXATION—</b>	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Land Tax ....	99,880	122,063	136,455	132,102	122,519	118,134	111,353	112,465	111,113	122,000
Income Tax ....	859,617	1,874,400	2,141,332							
Financial Emergency Tax	1,263,700	295,288	43,206	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	2,546,000	3,384,000	3,807,000	4,489,000
Dividend Duty ....	150,449	186,570	149,323							
Totallator Tax ....	51,669	48,423	48,045	61,870	115,210	121,374	172,141	152,650	168,787	160,000
Stamp Duty ....	260,096	245,067	220,082	209,087	221,813	250,329	325,778	417,491	462,122	450,000
Probate Duty ....	122,925	166,006	182,659	179,288	233,400	275,477	262,280	262,328	309,487	275,000
Entertainment Tax ....	98,722	96,602	98,294	106,061	98,189	98,334	98,196	(a)	(a)	(a)
Licenses ....	88,993	94,185	82,958	82,641	83,760	91,924	90,630	124,166	125,682	124,100
<b>Total</b> ....	<b>2,996,064</b>	<b>3,127,604</b>	<b>3,111,250</b>	<b>3,317,679</b>	<b>3,420,011</b>	<b>3,502,072</b>	<b>3,612,376</b>	<b>4,453,998</b>	<b>4,984,191</b>	<b>5,820,100</b>
<b>TERRITORIAL AND DEPARTMENTAL—</b>										
Land ....	132,757	133,190	127,157	157,730	199,254	190,613	193,405	252,181	322,035	300,000
Mining ....	39,863	34,559	32,579	21,707	21,873	20,089	20,306	37,750	36,000	36,000
Timber ....	143,585	151,079	150,083	137,586	128,732	137,840	134,749	236,442	242,363	210,000
Royal Mint ....	43,274	57,034	65,297	60,769	78,099	99,814	47,323	51,794	53,240	55,000
Departmental Fees, etc.	971,047	958,122	1,101,813	1,248,651	1,434,100	1,700,904	1,259,492	1,562,644	1,787,356	2,057,781
Law Courts ....	84,966	84,704	81,812	68,389	50,857	60,341	75,655	70,981	98,569	94,400
Commonwealth Do.	595,000	650,000	630,000	800,000	850,000	904,000	950,000	1,245,000	1,077,000	3,000,000
Special Grant Do.	....	....	....	....	....	....	912,559	928,000	1,000,000	....
Interest Contributions	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432	473,432
<b>Total</b> ....	<b>2,463,024</b>	<b>2,642,124</b>	<b>2,662,167</b>	<b>2,968,264</b>	<b>3,236,347</b>	<b>3,557,093</b>	<b>4,072,921</b>	<b>4,554,224</b>	<b>5,980,601</b>	<b>6,826,613</b>
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES—</b>										
Bunbury Harbour Board	....	500	11,500	5,000	5,500	3,500	....	....	....	....
Fremantle Harbour Trust	242,333	102,160	186,344	287,241	259,140	326,229	292,209	208,544	263,312	268,000
Goldfields Water Supply	310,723	347,748	300,198	273,779	270,277	306,384	305,053	341,798	303,270	345,000
Kalgoorlie Abattoirs	6,504	6,092	6,225	6,307	5,654	81,089	79,010	89,839	93,038	129,250
Metropolitan Abattoirs and Sale Yards	54,909	61,442	67,370	78,682	81,726					
Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage	501,219	527,180	501,628	563,766	577,680	600,617	592,584	608,395	640,313	665,000
Other Hydraulic Undertakings	61,306	68,502	78,483	82,210	84,057	87,054	86,025	101,787	108,080	112,000
Railways	3,497,529	3,573,979	3,898,808	4,446,370	4,419,766	4,271,283	4,143,413	3,979,404	4,645,370	5,500,000
Tramways, Electric	304,856	334,561	402,893	469,751	515,183	509,530	521,908	480,522	500,303	677,000
Electricity Supply	425,715	437,988	462,789	477,904	540,932	577,979	580,148	(b)	(b)	(b)
State Ferries	7,782	8,404	9,964	11,937	11,546	12,141	10,562	9,678	10,406	10,550
State Batteries	124,424	110,756	70,759	42,723	29,374	22,272	25,196	49,002	58,081	45,902
Cave Houses, etc.	13,641	13,861	10,689	13,955	11,719	12,184	14,408	15,278	18,038	13,500
<b>Total</b> ....	<b>5,550,923</b>	<b>5,683,173</b>	<b>6,066,451</b>	<b>6,759,027</b>	<b>6,812,813</b>	<b>6,808,767</b>	<b>6,651,418</b>	<b>5,384,447</b>	<b>6,621,226</b>	<b>7,766,202</b>
<b>TRADING CONCERNS</b> ....	<b>89,042</b>	<b>79,167</b>	<b>100,281</b>	<b>106,708</b>	<b>119,104</b>	<b>85,958</b>	<b>70,044</b>	<b>89,106</b>	<b>114,292</b>	<b>114,342</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> ....	<b>11,119,943</b>	<b>11,432,068</b>	<b>11,940,149</b>	<b>13,151,678</b>	<b>13,589,175</b>	<b>13,953,830</b>	<b>14,407,557</b>	<b>14,080,875</b>	<b>17,710,310</b>	<b>20,327,257</b>

(a) Included Income Tax Reimbursement.

(b) From 1st July, 1948, taken over by State Electricity Commission

[Return No. 4.]

## STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE FROM 1939-40 TO 1947-48, AND ESTIMATE FOR 1948-49.

Head.	1939-40.	1940-41.	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.	Estimate 1948-49.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Special Acts ...	4,402,868	4,511,542	4,583,533	4,595,471	4,580,235	4,034,708	4,054,844	4,709,004	4,828,367	4,000,551
Parliamentary ...	14,992	14,882	15,867	16,200	16,332	18,227	19,040	20,037	25,535	28,150
Premier ...	17,718	17,998	16,687	12,459	10,540	9,023	14,285	21,270	28,248	32,865
Treasury ...	20,788	34,205	34,313	31,083	30,445	30,445	32,460	35,761	39,728	43,845
Governor ...	2,401	2,382	2,437	2,044	2,793	2,870	3,268	3,336	3,885	4,120
London Agency ...	10,478	10,000	10,619	9,643	10,319	9,601	9,930	15,061	14,450	13,957
Public Service Commission ...	1,675	1,727	957	1,564	1,654	1,882	2,322	2,724	3,238	3,967
Government Motor Cars ...	3,383	2,924	2,443	1,580	1,313	2,748	3,841	2,679	4,780	5,065
Audit ...	10,416	10,053	16,425	17,273	18,799	17,009	18,272	21,337	23,737	27,700
Compassionate Allowances ...	6,230	2,690	3,386	3,056	4,679	4,024	4,716	2,578	3,616	5,511
Government Stores ...	17,135	17,769	19,956	18,104	18,710	18,568	21,072	24,073	28,914	36,068
Taxation ...	33,098	43,739	40,805	12,441	12,067	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
State Housing Commission ...	2,446	2,616	2,381	2,500	3,259	3,233	3,216	3,411	4,579	5,350
Superannuation Board ...	68,356	66,921	67,425	66,415	70,038	71,003	80,161	102,184	137,821	158,328
Tourist and Publicity Bureau ...	7,144	7,109	3,887	1,480	482	740	2,407	11,521	12,980	14,751
Literary and Scientific ...	11,150	11,240	11,802	16,550	11,550	13,150	13,241	15,980	21,552	23,040
Miscellaneous and Refunds ...	640,076	777,850	837,157	1,336,831	1,350,102	1,538,811	1,278,720	1,403,057	1,890,810	2,005,203
Forests ...	28,696	20,146	28,456	77,940	137,100	171,390	151,025	84,056	77,279	94,290
Public Works ...	98,410	90,458	98,062	251,977	238,052	222,370	258,285	270,341	318,488	406,485
Town Planning ...	1,725	1,670	1,787	1,635	1,684	1,831	2,211	2,457	2,939	3,050
Unemployment Relief ...	73,132	41,353	13,355	8,865	3,334	2,075	3,611	2,391	1,871	1,950
State Labour Bureau ...	50,077	56,519	54,202	55,353	61,392	63,122	85,028	110,910	159,884	183,500
Land and Surveys ...	5,072	3,987	2,989	2,679	2,003	1,440	1,360	1,273	1,051	420
Farmers' Debts Adjustment and Rural Relief ...										5
Rural and Industries Bank ...	112,640	108,885	107,550	105,370	112,520	132,920	168,518	182,292	211,863	280,582
Agriculture ...	1,428	1,538	1,595	1,183	1,701	2,025	1,990	3,110	4,623	6,500
College of Agriculture ...	7,402	7,308	7,824	7,520	7,796	7,824	8,415	9,420	11,784	14,000
Labour ...	5,762	5,598	5,277	5,075	5,594	5,490	6,152	7,620	10,181	11,478
Factories ...										5
Arbitration Court ...	3,891	3,630	8,176	4,680	7,412	5,900	16,975	21,107	21,058	35,480
State Insurance ...	193,081	132,145	108,833	78,080	72,674	77,453	70,903	83,142	94,575	116,500
Department of Industrial Development ...	130,698	129,847	123,341	112,264	118,507	128,016	138,482	162,539	185,657	205,699
Child Welfare ...	83,287	81,086	83,278	88,837	104,030	95,203	104,483	115,875	163,466	223,330
Mines, Explosives, Geological, etc. ...	124,400	128,423	134,578	140,240	148,790	147,107	159,468	170,909	217,893	238,048
Medical and Health ...	33,705	35,157	37,440	40,173	40,886	39,162	43,762	47,673	53,771	65,432
Mental Hospitals ...	20,949	32,879	32,373	38,465	46,682	48,482	51,637	53,741	64,652	69,311
Office of Chief Secretary ...	772,556	784,009	831,005	813,439	873,737	888,044	1,002,520	1,223,740	1,648,788	1,728,475
Prisons ...	258,846	269,795	270,743	292,070	292,563	291,693	302,784	337,328	418,425	522,224
Education ...	101,804	87,586	88,272	87,127	104,977	98,980	120,810	149,884	157,011	243,983
Police ...	44,644	44,900	44,000	40,250	41,250	60,200	60,000	64,800	73,738	80,000
Crown Law & Branches ...										
Natives ...	28,411	28,135	29,513	32,243	42,600	39,155	40,658	42,863	44,313	50,730
Harbour and Light and Tetties ...	6,139	6,982	7,980	7,141	8,145	7,521	9,406	11,029	13,151	19,801
Fisheries ...	13	143	86	34	243	183	181	140		200
North-West ...										
Total, Departmental ...	3,032,929	3,142,615	3,218,882	3,843,415	4,035,724	4,282,603	4,340,026	4,886,608	6,238,115	7,707,034
PUBLIC UTILITIES.										
Goldfields Water Supply ...	130,055	136,753	145,022	134,642	141,875	178,002	180,930	195,887	220,024	244,500
Kalgoorlie Abattoirs ...	4,581	4,738	4,551	5,235	5,877	62,040	61,972	69,434	77,083	97,568
Metropolitan Abattoirs ...	34,480	35,172	40,075	49,041	57,738					
Metropolitan Water Supply ...	105,268	106,655	138,205	126,532	181,860	181,691	150,144	180,780	217,008	230,805
Other Hydraulic Undertakings ...	64,960	63,316	61,093	74,878	74,289	80,620	83,021	99,412	118,308	146,010
Railways ...	2,800,850	2,783,203	2,098,484	3,490,171	3,624,320	3,652,094	3,853,437	4,314,899	5,672,312	6,275,000
Tramways ...	249,438	255,500	299,684	345,401	386,908	392,106	427,832	468,243	572,133	610,000
State Ferries ...	8,596	8,157	8,056	10,628	10,585	10,348	18,690	15,583	13,539	13,105
Electricity Supply ...	307,896	304,623	344,577	392,853	451,761	470,250	509,373	(a)	(a)	(a)
State Batteries ...	112,918	106,416	88,350	47,453	38,702	33,434	44,663	75,383	78,708	84,474
Save House ...	11,925	12,261	11,360	11,502	11,280	11,237	12,423	15,234	18,805	19,929
Total Public Utilities ...	3,830,910	3,766,800	4,140,066	4,888,356	4,935,195	5,032,031	5,412,687	5,432,755	6,907,910	7,608,591
GRAND TOTAL ...	11266768	11209557	11088361	13127242	13551154	13049340	14,407,557	15,028,427	18,002,302	20,401,060

(a) From 1st July, 1946, taken over by State Electricity Commission.

[Return No. 5.]

STATEMENT SHOWING ANNUAL SURPLUSES AND DEFICIENCIES OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND,  
FOR THE FINANCIAL YEARS 1900-01 TO 1947-48.

Year.	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Annual.	
			Surplus.	Deficiency.
	£	£	£	£
1900-01	3,078,033	3,165,244	...	87,211
1901-02	3,688,049	3,490,026	198,023	...
1902-03	3,630,238	3,521,763	108,475	...
1903-04	3,550,016	3,698,311	...	148,295
1904-05	3,615,340	3,745,225	...	129,885
1905-06	3,558,939	3,632,318	...	73,379
1906-07	3,401,354	3,490,183	...	88,829
1907-08	3,308,641	3,379,006	...	2,365
1908-09	3,267,014	3,368,551	...	101,537
1909-10	3,657,670	3,447,731	209,939	...
1910-11	3,850,439	3,734,448	115,991	...
1911-12	3,966,673	4,101,082	...	134,400
1912-13	4,596,659	4,787,064	...	190,405
1913-14	5,205,343	5,340,754	...	135,411
1914-15	5,140,725	5,706,541	...	565,816
1915-16	5,356,978	5,705,201	...	348,223
1916-17	4,577,007	5,276,764	...	699,757
1917-18	4,622,536	5,328,270	...	705,743
1918-19	4,944,851	5,596,866	...	652,015
1919-20	5,863,501	6,531,725	...	668,225
1920-21	6,789,565	7,476,291	...	686,725
1921-22	6,907,107	7,639,242	...	732,135
1922-23	7,207,492	7,612,856	...	405,364
1923-24	7,865,505	8,094,753	...	229,158
1924-25	8,381,446	8,439,844	...	58,398
1925-26	8,808,166	8,907,300	...	99,143
1926-27	9,750,833	9,722,588	28,245	...
1927-28	9,807,949	9,834,415	...	26,466
1928-29	9,947,951	10,223,919	...	275,968
1929-30	9,750,515	10,268,519	...	518,004
1930-31	8,686,756	10,107,295	...	1,426,530
1931-32	8,035,316	9,593,212	...	1,557,896
1932-33	8,332,153	9,196,234	...	864,081
1933-34	8,481,697	9,270,609	...	788,912
1934-35	9,331,430	9,498,525	...	167,095
1935-36	10,033,721	9,945,343	88,378	...
1936-37	10,185,431	10,556,638	...	371,205
1937-38	10,819,042	10,829,735	...	10,693
1938-39	10,940,660	11,170,102	...	229,442
1939-40	11,119,943	11,266,768	...	146,825
1940-41	11,432,068	11,420,957	11,111	...
1941-42	11,940,149	11,938,381	1,768	...
1942-43	13,151,678	13,127,242	24,436	...
1943-44	13,589,175	13,561,154	38,021	...
1944-45	13,953,830	13,949,340	4,490	...
1945-46	14,407,557	14,407,557	...	...
1946-47	14,980,875	15,028,427	...	47,552
1947-48	17,710,310	18,062,392	...	352,082

## LOAN EXPENDITURE FOR 1947-48 COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS.

(Up to 1945/46 Loan Suspense Expenditure was not charged to Loan Fund until the year following that in which it was incurred. The figures for 1946/47 and after include Loan Suspense Expenditure incurred during the year.)

Undertakings.	1936-37.	1937-38.	1938-39.	1939-40.	1940-41.	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Railways, including Land Resumptions	178,882	349,393	199,065	102,168	102,478	29,899	23,781	17,856	72,936	72,637	268,379	286,548
Tramways—Perth Electric	35,591	8,512	8,042	125	9,109	29,857	71,949	9,889	6,269	1,388	3,273	64,418
Electric Power Stations	109,837	89,977	17,919	1,097	15,125	22,578	56,186	25,358	15,493	115,081	166,054	735,697
Fremantle Harbour Works	78,781	31,691	34,603	15,845	51,363	97,168	63,817	5,228	24,872	31,393	49,049	69,499
Harbours and Rivers generally	108,065	70,240	57,689	36,081	24,518	3,251	3,401	6,917	9,315	6,765	37,584	89,480
Sewerage—Perth and Fremantle	361,334	263,490	361,400	242,105	115,438	71,112	17,494	6,473	10,717	39,831	115,897	188,624
Water Supplies <sup>a</sup>	831,636	709,742	584,132	611,569	754,452	270,451	73,003	52,595	30,113	202,925	623,749	549,288
Development of Goldfields <sup>b</sup>	20,550	29,071	42,016	55,806	43,453	17,790	187,854	99,490	99,270	201,722	255,367	281,535
Development of Agriculture	187,711	154,555	179,462	205,611	166,747	91,814	23,997	26,529	15,024	59,235	61,948	78,936
Assistance to Settlers, Industries, etc.	8,770	8,471	442	9,198	12,895	8,428	6,948	3,050	2,000	2	—	—
Land Settlement for Soldiers	434	87	540	417	679	8	121	210	1,207	—	—	—
College of Agriculture	—	—	879	443	1,116	775	41	—	—	—	—	1,159
Purchase of Plant (Suspense)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	125,000	75,000
State Saw Mills	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50,000	—
Steamships	53,386	215,325	15,023	3,000	417	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Workers' Homes—Working Capital	35,000	25,000	—	10,000	10,000	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Workers' Homes Board—War Housing	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
State Hotels	4,647	18,922	4,999	9,173	20,702	147	1	—	120,000	—	—	—
Ferries	—	—	12	—	1,648	2,843	2,211	—	—	3,000	—	609
State Engineering Works	—	—	—	—	7,571	39,429	15,571	5,000	4,039	—	—	—
Public Buildings	89,182	91,726	114,954	103,535	57,231	35,239	53,151	38,808	81,217	119,607	132,045	216,988
Hospital Buildings and Equipment, including Grants	—	—	—	3,194	300,000	59,291	75,000	45,000	40,000	110,000	255,000	367,131
Roads and Bridges	83,294	160,038	65,000	325,000	41,734	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sundries	6,448	9,000	9,415	5,000	613	130	—	—	—	—	—	10,724
Bulk Handling of Wheat	—	82,493	7,049	4,478	5,204	—	—	—	31,822	35,963	38,301	781
Boys Quarries	—	600	1,586	2,645	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Air Raid Precautions	—	—	—	—	—	—	80,000	22,363	—	—	—	—
West Australian Meat Export Works	—	—	—	—	—	—	85,000	14,064	70,936	50,000	46,328	84,366
Welshpool Industries	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15,000	—
Native Stations, Hospitals, etc.	470	5,568	5,500	8,294	14,000	11,207	—	—	—	5,000	—	—
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,193,117</b>	<b>2,315,004</b>	<b>1,898,111</b>	<b>1,759,174</b>	<b>1,760,366</b>	<b>791,951</b>	<b>774,606</b>	<b>377,330</b>	<b>695,229</b>	<b>1,081,549</b>	<b>2,230,984</b>	<b>3,030,793</b>
<b>Less Expenditure from Loan Repayments</b>												
Receipts	78,376	154,825	153,105	101,086	140,203	89,867	184,706	198,896	222,494	210,595	192,818	282,155
<b>Net Expenditure from Loan Raisings</b>	<b>2,114,741</b>	<b>2,160,179</b>	<b>1,545,006</b>	<b>1,658,088</b>	<b>1,620,163</b>	<b>702,084</b>	<b>589,900</b>	<b>178,434</b>	<b>472,735</b>	<b>870,954</b>	<b>2,038,140</b>	<b>2,748,608</b>

<sup>a</sup> Including Goldfields Districts. <sup>b</sup> Excluding Water Supplies.  
(Suspense) £40,000; W. A. Meat Export Works £30,811; Total £71,161.

<sup>c</sup> Excludes Recoup to Loan Suspense Account 1945-46. Development of Goldfields £350; Purchase of Plant

[Return No. 7.]

## PUBLIC DEBT.

## (a) LOAN AUTHORISATIONS AND FLOTATIONS.

	£	£	£
Authorisations to 30th June, 1947 ... ..	...	128,448,097	
Authorisations, 1947-48 ... ..	...	4,184,350	
			132,632,447
Flotations—			
Inscribed Stock, Debentures, Treasury Bonds, etc., issued in Australia and Overseas—Net proceeds:—			
	£		
For Works and Services ... ..	106,536,364		
For Funding Deficits ... ..	12,115,087		
		118,651,451	
Discounts and Flotation Expenses (including Cost of Conversion Loans), net:—			
On Works Loans ... ..	4,699,817		
On Deficit Loans ... ..	752,482		
		5,452,299	
			124,103,750
Short Term Debt current at 30th June, 1948—			
London ... ..			2,959,714
Total Flotations ... ..			127,063,464
Balance available for Flotation ... ..			£5,568,983

## (b) LOAN INDEBTEDNESS.

Total Amount raised to 30th June, 1947 ... ..	£	£
		124,381,449
Flotations during the year—		
Counter Sales ... ..	133,500	
Instalment Stock ... ..	254,000	
Commonwealth Loans (Aust.) ... ..	2,258,000	
Premium on Redemption of New York Bonds ... ..	10,340	
Discount and Flotation Expenses of New York Redemption Loan ... ..	26,175	
		2,682,015
		127,063,464
Redemptions—		
Total to 30th June, 1947 ... ..	25,379,148	
During the year—		
National Debt Commission:	£	
Securities repurchased ... ..	723,369	
Instalment Stock redeemed (Australia) ... ..	28,947	
Inscribed Stock redeemed at maturity ... ..	595,750	
Special Deficit Loans redeemed ... ..	61,509	
	1,409,575	
		26,788,723
Gross Public Debt at 30th June, 1948 ... ..		100,274,741
Sinking Fund ... ..		154,496
Net Public Debt at 30th June, 1948 ... ..		£100,120,245

[Return No. 7—continued.]

## (c) SUMMARY OF GROSS LOAN RAISINGS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

<i>Raisings.</i>	£	<i>Disbursements.</i>	£
Total Flotations, as per Return 7 (b)—		Discounts and Expenses—	
To 30th June, 1947 ... ..	124,381,449	To 30th June, 1947 (Net) ...	4,654,338
During Year 1947-48 ... ..	2,682,015	During Year 1947-48 ...	45,479
Receipts from Loan Repayments—		Redemption of Agricultural Bank Mortgage Bonds ...	1,566,000
To 30th June, 1947 ... ..	3,244,000	Deficits Funded (including Discount and Expenses) ...	12,867,560
During Year 1947-48 ... ..	498,087	Expenditure on Works and Services ... ..	109,645,012
		Balance of General Loan Fund	2,027,153
	130,805,551		130,805,551

## (d) NET PUBLIC DEBT FOR HEAD OF POPULATION ON 30th JUNE EACH YEAR.

Year.	Debt per Head.	Year.	Debt per Head.
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
1919 ... ..	116 7 0	1934 ... ..	193 7 6
1920 ... ..	119 7 3	1935 ... ..	197 11 11
1921 ... ..	*124 15 11	1936 ... ..	199 7 10
1922 ... ..	137 1 0	1937 ... ..	201 15 2
1923 ... ..	142 9 6	1938 ... ..	202 19 8
1924 ... ..	146 13 6	1939 ... ..	204 7 1
1925 ... ..	146 3 11	1940 ... ..	203 15 7
1926 ... ..	155 14 8	1941 ... ..	204 18 7
1927 ... ..	157 14 4	1942 ... ..	202 17 4
1928 ... ..	165 10 7	1943 ... ..	202 1 11
1929 ... ..	162 6 9	1944 ... ..	198 19 2
1930 ... ..	163 9 9	1945 ... ..	195 9 0
1931 ... ..	174 2 6	1946 ... ..	195 3 1
1932 ... ..	180 3 8	1947 ... ..	195 16 11
1933 ... ..	187 4 8	1948 ... ..	194 15 9

\* Compared with the previous year, £2 16s. 11d. of the increase is due to an adjustment in the figures of the population at the Census.

## (e) CONTINGENT LIABILITIES AT 30th JUNE, 1948.

	Securities Issued.	Re-deemed.	In Circulation.	Funds Invested.
Metropolitan Market Act ... ..	19,000	2,902	16,098	
Workers' Homes Act ... ..	189,000	24,854	164,146	
Agricultural Lands Purchase Act ... ..	587,471	497,354	90,117	3,949
	795,471	525,110	270,361	3,949
Bank Guarantees in force ... ..	...	...	764,235	
Metropolitan Water Supply Act * ... ..	...	...	14,201	
Total, Contingent Liabilities ... ..	...	...	1,048,797	

\* Principal and Interest on Debentures chargeable on the revenue and assets of the concern.



[Return No. 8.]

## LOAN LIABILITY—STATEMENT SHOWING AMOUNTS MATURING EACH YEAR.

Earliest Date of Maturity.	Latest Date of Maturity.	Interest Rate.	Repayable in—		
			London.	New York.	Australia.
...	1943	%	£	£	£
...	1948	...	...	...	†500
1947	1948	2½	*2,959,714	...	...
...	1948	2½	...	...	706,300
...	1948	3	...	...	1,443,925
...	1948	3½	...	...	1,147,070
...	1948	3½	...	...	1,461,380
...	1949	2	...	...	2,000
...	1949	2	...	...	255,560
1948	1949	2½	...	...	463,230
...	1949	3½	...	...	1,304,220
...	1949	3½	...	...	1,741,310
...	1950	2	...	...	53,000
1949	1950	2½	...	...	813,300
...	1950	4	...	...	1,341,198
...	1951	3½	...	...	3,952,210
1948	1953	3½	864,393	...	...
...	1953	4	...	...	1,238,774
1952	1954	3½	...	...	587,800
1952	1954	3½	...	...	3,167,950
1935	1955	3½	3,204,904	...	...
...	1955	4	...	...	1,239,763
1953	1955	3½	...	...	2,467,805
1952	1955	6	...	1,498,444	...
1950	1956	3½	...	...	954,180
1950	1956	3½	...	...	476,000
1950	1957	3½	...	...	2,510,621
...	1957	3	...	...	140,670
...	1957	4	...	...	1,174,159
...	1957	3½	...	269,598	...
1950	1958	3½	...	...	2,341,950
...	1958	3	...	...	162,193
1955	1958	3½	...	...	1,672,600
1950	1959	3½	...	...	1,159,160
...	1959	3	...	...	340,623
1956	1959	3½	...	...	4,648,865
...	1959	4	...	...	1,167,005
...	1960	3	...	...	429,892
1940	1960	3½	877,408	...	...
1950	1960	3½	...	...	1,187,260
1957	1960	3½	...	...	261,000
1950	1961	3½	...	...	5,696,830
1956	1961	3½	1,739,527	...	...
...	1961	4	...	...	1,216,546
...	1961	3	...	...	296,018
...	1962	3	...	...	175,560
1942	1962	4	4,866,583	...	...
...	1963	3	...	...	185,320
...	1964	3½	...	...	1,566,000
...	1964	3	...	...	150,312
...	1965	3	...	...	30,565
...	1966	3	...	...	434,948
...	1967	3	...	...	522,576
...	1967	3½	...	269,393	...
...	1969	3	...	...	381,778
1965	1969	3½	8,281,487	...	...
...	1970	3	...	...	383,926
...	1971	3	...	...	386,011
1967	1971	2½ -	3,228,661	...	...
...	1972	3	...	...	388,035
...	1973	3	...	...	254,000
1964	1974	3½	8,829,191	...	...
1970	1975	2½	4,134,103	...	...
...	1983	1	...	...	5,159,406
Average Rate 3.220%			38,985,971	2,037,435	59,251,335
			100,274,741		

\* Floating Debt.

† Overdue.

[Return No. 9.]

## SINKING FUND.

## TRANSACTIONS DURING THE YEAR 1947-48.

<i>Receipts:</i>						£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Balances brought forward, 1st July, 1947—											
National Debt Commission ... ..						....			546,284	3	8
<b>Contributions:</b>											
<b>State—</b>											
5s. per cent. on loan liability ... ..						258,984	17	1	....		
15s. per cent. on Special Deficit Loan ... ..						40,425	0	0	....		
4½ per cent. on cancelled securities ... ..						500,826	12	0	....		
3 per cent. under Federal Aid Roads Act ... ..						17,623	7	0	....		
Special contribution on account loan for purchase of M.V. "Koolama"						10,345	5	5	....		
Special contribution under clause 12 (20) of Financial Agreement ...						864	2	7	....		
Exchange on contribution re M.V. "Koolama" ... ..						2,625	2	3	....		
<b>Commonwealth—</b>											
5s. and 2s. 6d. per cent. on loan liability ... ..						197,131	10	3	....		
Net earnings on investments... ..						4,921	0	0	....		
									1,033,746	16	7
									1,579,031	0	3
<b>Disbursements:</b>											
Redemptions and Repurchases, etc., at net Cost (including Exchange)						....			1,424,534	17	9
Balance, Sinking Fund, 30th June, 1948 ... ..						....			154,496	2	6
									1,579,031	0	3

## TRANSACTIONS FROM 1ST JULY, 1927, TO 30TH JUNE, 1948.

<i>Receipts:</i>						£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Balances brought forward—											
1st July, 1927—Endowment Policy (M.V. "Kangaroo"), Premiums paid ... ..						57,607	10	0	....		
1st July, 1929—Crown Agents ... ..						879,347	0	10	....		
									955,044	10	10
<b>Contributions:</b>											
On account M.V. "Kangaroo" ... ..						47,250	0	0	....		
On account, Crown Agents ... ..						40,312	18	5	....		
<b>State—</b>											
5s. per cent. on loan liability ... ..						4,744,918	19	4	....		
15s. per cent. on Special Deficit Loan ... ..						181,700	0	0	....		
4½ per cent. on cancelled securities ... ..						4,073,561	10	10	....		
3 per cent. under Federal Aid Roads Act ... ..						363,648	12	1	....		
Special contribution on account loan for purchase of M.V. "Koolama"						208,905	8	4	....		
Exchange on contribution re M.V. "Koolama" ... ..						52,502	5	0	....		
Payment under Clause 12 (20) of Financial Agreement as amended						73,010	1	3	....		
Profit arising out of Conversion of a Loan in London ... ..						8,812	15	0	....		
<b>Commonwealth—</b>											
5s. and 2s. 6d. per cent. on Loan Liability ... ..						3,203,286	5	10	....		
Net earnings on investments ... ..						306,972	13	11	....		
Accretions to Endowment Policy at maturity ... ..						35,052	10	0	....		
Exchange on remittances ... ..						29,504	6	1	....		
									13,442,437	1	1
									14,397,481	11	11
<b>Disbursements:</b>											
Redemptions and Repurchases, etc. ... ..						12,935,923	2	5	....		
Repurchases from Special Sinking Fund ... ..						80,883	19	2	....		
Contributions refunded to the State ... ..						630	17	11	....		
Contributions to Crown Agents ... ..						39,934	2	8	....		
Premiums on Policy account M.V. "Kangaroo" ... ..						47,250	0	0	....		
Repayment of 1934 Loan (Crown Agents) ... ..						998,353	7	3	....		
Repayment of 1936 Loan (M.V. "Kangaroo") ... ..						140,000	0	0	....		
									14,242,985		
<b>Balance, 30th June, 1948:—</b>											
National Debt Commission ... ..						....			154,496	2	6
									14,397,481	11	11

[Return No. 10.]

## SUMMARISED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS, 1947-48. (a)

Undertaking.*	Loan Liability. (b)	Capital Charges (c).			Net Earnings.	Surplus.	De- ficiency.
		Interest.	Sinking Fund.	Exchange.			
FULLY REPRODUCTIVE.							
State Engineering Works .....	£ 145,880	£ 4,888	£ 1,380	£ 549	£ 7,110	£ 335	....
State Saw Mills .....	305,168	10,179	2,389	1,149	43,030	29,333	....
State Hotels .....	70,805	2,362	559	287	13,240	10,052	....
West Australian Meat Export Works .....	287,519	9,590	2,968	1,083	13,745	104	....
Rural and Industries Bank .....	4,599,982	153,437	33,947	17,325	227,028	22,319	....
Rural and Industries Bank—Govern- ment Agency .....	3,188,046	106,360	29,045	12,009	211,245	63,831	....
Abattoirs, Sale Yards, Grain Sheds and Cold Stores .....	451,553	15,062	2,984	1,701	20,346	599	....
Metropolitan Markets .....	147,227	4,911	1,144	555	7,294	684	....
Small Loans Scheme .....	2,309	77	35	9	133	12	....
	9,199,098	306,844	74,411	34,647	543,171	127,269	....

## PARTIALLY PRODUCTIVE.

Harbours and Rivers (d) .....	6,719,178	224,125	50,644	25,306	207,719	....	92,856
Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage .....	18,586,771	619,313	137,748	69,927	542,060	....	284,928
Wyndham Meatworks .....	1,072,322	35,768	8,243	4,039	25,000	....	23,050
Group Settlement .....	2,956,595	98,620	22,728	11,135	34,442	....	98,041
Agriculture Generally .....	3,425,873	114,274	26,229	12,903	11,356	....	142,050
Mining Generally .....	924,237	30,829	6,355	3,481	793	....	40,372
Assistance to Industries .....	215,414	7,185	1,683	811	670	....	9,014
Loans to Public Bodies .....	79,183	2,641	532	298	2,838	....	585
Miscellaneous .....	689,609	22,835	3,796	2,522	1,795	....	26,858
Plant Suspense .....	410,739	13,701	2,581	1,547	8,849	....	8,980
Roads and Bridges .....	3,439,055	114,713	26,454	12,952	71,930	....	82,189
State Housing Commission .....	687,898	22,946	5,340	2,591	15,143	....	15,734
Stock Suspense .....	11,793	393	104	44	305	....	236
	39,178,667	1,306,843	292,942	147,556	922,948	....	824,393

## TOTALLY UNPRODUCTIVE.

Railways (g) .....	27,396,075	913,323	203,354	103,181	Dr. 11,289,336	....	2,354,294
Tramways .....	1,413,644	47,153	10,458	5,324	Dr. 62,881	....	125,766
Electricity Supply .....	3,048,976	101,635	17,774	11,476	....	....	180,885
State Quarries .....	36,142	1,206	285	136	....	....	1,627
State Brickworks .....	52,197	1,741	400	197	....	....	2,388
State Shipping Service .....	346,396	11,554	2,663	1,305	....	....	15,522
Soldiers' Land Settlement (f) .....	2,059,005	68,680	15,820	7,755	....	....	92,264
Rabbit Proof Fence .....	384,548	11,150	2,572	1,260	Dr. 8,871	....	23,862
State Batteries .....	431,022	14,377	3,307	1,623	Dr. 22,627	....	41,934
Public Buildings, including Schools, Police Stations, Gaols, Court Houses, Hospitals and Institutions .....	5,510,650	183,813	38,147	20,755	Dr. 170,865	....	413,580
Aboriginal Stations .....	115,100	3,839	884	433	Dr. 32,358	....	37,514
Bulk Handling, Bunbury .....	74,331	2,479	571	280	....	....	3,330
Ferries .....	10,204	340	79	38	Dr. 3,132	....	3,589
Pine Planting and Reforestation .....	1,020,234	34,031	7,842	3,842	....	....	45,715
Tourist Resorts .....	75,284	2,511	579	283	Dr. 858	....	4,231
Campion Alluvial Deposits .....	514,090	17,148	3,533	1,936	....	....	22,617
Wetpool Industries .....	108,605	3,023	356	400	Dr. 1,751	....	6,130
	42,544,503	1,410,112	313,633	160,233	Dr. 143,229	....	3,325,207

## SUMMARY.

Fully Reproductive .....	9,199,098	306,844	74,411	34,647	543,171	127,269	....
Partially Reproductive .....	39,178,667	1,306,843	292,942	147,556	922,948	....	824,393
Totally Unproductive .....	42,544,503	1,410,112	313,633	160,233	Dr. 143,229	....	3,325,207
Capital Adjustments and Unallocated Costs of Raisings .....	2,165,914	72,250	25,112	8,158	....	....	105,520
Special Deficit Loans .....	5,159,406	82,200	48,034	....	....	....	100,243
Balance of General Loan Fund .....	2,027,153	67,618	6,882	7,634	....	....	82,134
	100,274,741	3,224,376	761,014	358,228	33,890	....	4,310,228

Public Debt, 30th June, 1948 ... £100,274,741

NET DEFICIENCY £4,310,228.

\*For details see Return No. 11.

(a) This statement distributes the net cost of loan charges for the year over the various assets. (b) Total expenditure from loan funds (including the proportionate cost of raising), after allowing for sinking fund redemptions and other adjustments. (c) Actual expenditure averaged over all assets. (d) To this should be added £558,335 included in Railway Capital. (f) Represents expenditure by P.W.D. on roads, bridges and drainage, and by Lands Department on repurchased estates. (g) Includes £558,335, being part of Capital Expenditure on Harbours and Jetties controlled by Railway Department.

[Return No. 11]

## DETAILED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS 1947-48\*.

Undertaking.	Loan Liability.	Capital Charges. (a)			Net Earnings.	Surplus.	De-ficiency.
		Interest.	Sinking Fund.	Ex-change.			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Railways (b) ...	27,396,075	913,823	208,354	103,181	1,128,936†	...	2,354,294
Tramways ...	1,413,644	47,153	10,458	5,324	†82,831	...	125,766
Electricity Supply ...	3,046,976	101,635	17,774	11,476	...	...	130,885
	31,856,695	1,062,611	236,586	119,981	1,191,767†	...	2,610,945
<i>Harbours and Rivers.</i>							
Fremantle Harbour Trust	2,902,966	96,831	22,009	10,933	234,012	104,239	...
Fremantle Other ...	735,425	24,531	5,510	2,770	12,716	...	20,095
Bunbury Harbour Board	609,708	20,337	4,687	2,296	...	...	27,320
Bunbury Other ...	113,428	3,784	625	427	†753	...	5,589
Geraldton (c) ...	709,578	23,669	5,454	2,672	370	...	31,425
Albany (c) ...	154,232	5,144	1,180	581	†335	...	7,240
Esperance (c) ...	15,851	529	122	60	95	...	616
Busselton (c) ...	20,351	679	156	77	...	...	912
North-West Ports (c) ...	595,415	19,861	4,519	2,242	†23,328	...	49,950
Swan River ...	496,395	16,558	3,573	1,870	†727	...	22,728
Dredges, Steamers and Plant ...	212,741	7,096	1,635	801	†4,797	...	14,329
Other Jetties and Works	153,088	5,106	1,174	577	†9,534	...	16,391
(c)	6,719,178	224,125	50,644	25,306	207,719	...	92,356
<i>Water Supplies.</i>							
Metropolitan ...	8,562,896	285,624	63,750	32,250	431,405	49,781	...
Goldfields Water Scheme	3,404,383	113,556	25,110	12,822	130,179	...	21,309
Country Towns ...	1,177,636	39,281	8,515	4,435	7,683	...	44,548
Country Areas ...	1,198,691	39,984	9,114	4,515	1,840	...	51,773
Goldfields Areas ...	965,313	32,199	7,359	3,636	†3,721	...	46,915
Irrigation and Drainage.	3,078,139	102,674	22,519	11,593	†21,078	...	157,864
Other Works ...	179,713	5,995	1,381	676	†4,248	...	12,300
	18,566,771	619,313	137,748	69,927	542,060	...	284,928
<i>Trading Concerns.</i>							
Wyndham Meatworks...	1,072,322	35,768	8,243	4,039	25,000	...	23,050
Quarries ...	36,142	1,206	285	136	...	...	1,627
Brickworks ...	52,197	1,741	400	197	...	...	2,338
Engineering Works ...	145,889	4,866	1,360	549	7,110	335	...
Saw Mills ...	305,168	10,179	2,369	1,149	43,030	29,333	...
Shipping Service ...	346,396	11,554	2,663	1,305	...	...	15,522
Hotels ...	70,805	2,362	559	267	13,240	10,052	...
West Australian Meat Export Works ...	287,519	9,590	2,968	1,083	13,745	104	...
	2,316,438	77,266	18,847	8,725	102,125	...	2,713
<i>Development of Agriculture.</i>							
Soldiers' Land Settlement (d) ...	2,059,005	68,680	15,829	7,755	...	...	92,264
Rural and Industries ... Bank ...	4,599,982	153,437	33,047	17,325	227,028	22,319	...
Rural and Industries Bank—Government Agency ...	3,188,646	106,360	29,045	12,009	211,245	63,831	...
Group Settlement ...	2,956,595	98,620	22,728	11,135	34,442	...	98,041
Rabbit-proof Fence ...	334,548	11,159	2,572	1,260	†8,871	...	23,862
Generally ...	3,425,873	114,271	26,229	12,903	11,356	...	142,050
	16,564,649	552,530	130,350	62,387	475,200	...	270,067

\* See footnote. † Debit. (a) on Return No 10.

[Return No. 11—continued.]

## DETAILED CLASSIFICATION OF LOAN ASSETS 1947-48—continued.

Undertaking.	Loan Liability.	Capital Charges. (a)			Net Earnings.	Surplus.	Deficiency.
		Interest.	Sinking Fund.	Exchange.			
<i>Abattoirs, Saleyards, etc.</i>	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Metropolitan Abattoirs	348,239	11,616	2,280	1,312	19,803	4,586	...
Kalgoorlie Abattoirs ...	33,354	1,112	197	125	1,040	...	394
Generally ...	69,960	2,334	498	264	†497	...	3,593
	451,553	15,062	2,984	1,701	20,346	509	...
<i>Development of Mining.</i>							
State Batteries ...	431,022	14,377	3,307	1,623	†22,627	...	41,934
Generally ...	924,237	30,829	6,855	3,481	793	...	40,372
	1,355,259	45,206	10,162	5,104	†21,834	...	82,306
<i>Public Buildings.</i>							
Education (including Narrogin School of Agriculture and Muresk College of Agriculture) ...	2,041,069	68,082	14,578	7,687	†110,250	...	200,597
Police Stations, Quarters, etc. ...	175,298	5,847	1,346	660	†13,910	...	21,763
Court Houses, Quarters, etc. ...	46,531	1,552	357	175	†5,893	...	7,977
Gaols ...	88,706	2,959	682	334	†17,194	...	21,169
Hospitals ...	1,822,243	60,783	11,439	6,864	2,797	...	76,289
Institutions ...	651,264	21,723	4,951	2,453	†12,762	...	41,889
Buildings generally ...	685,539	22,867	4,794	2,582	†13,653	...	43,896
	5,510,650	183,813	38,147	20,755	†170,805	...	413,580
<i>All Other.</i>							
Aborigines Stations ...	115,100	3,839	884	433	†32,358	...	37,514
Assistance to Industries	215,414	7,185	1,688	811	670	...	9,014
Bulk Handling, Boubury	74,331	2,479	571	280	...	...	3,330
Ferries ...	10,204	340	79	38	†3,132	...	3,589
Loans to Public Bodies	79,183	2,641	532	298	2,886	...	585
Metropolitan Markets...	147,227	4,911	1,144	555	7,294	684	...
Miscellaneous ...	669,609	22,335	3,796	2,522	1,795	...	26,858
Pine Planting and Re-forestation ...	1,020,234	34,031	7,842	3,842	...	...	45,715
Plant Suspense ...	410,739	13,701	2,581	1,547	8,849	...	8,980
Roads and Bridges ...	3,439,055	114,713	26,454	12,952	71,930	...	82,189
<i>Small Loans Scheme—</i>							
State Housing Commission ...	2,309	77	35	9	133	12	...
Stock Suspense ...	11,793	393	104	44	305	...	236
Tourist Resorts ...	75,284	2,511	579	283	†858	...	4,231
State Housing Commission ...	687,898	22,946	5,340	2,691	15,143	...	15,734
Campion Alunite Deposits ...	514,090	17,148	3,533	1,936	...	...	22,617
Welshpool Industries ...	108,605	3,623	356	409	†1,751	...	6,139
<i>Capital Adjustments and Unallocated Costs of</i>							
Raisings ...	2,165,914	72,250	25,112	8,158	...	...	105,520
Special Deficit Loans ...	5,159,406	52,209	48,034	...	...	...	100,243
Balance of General Loan Fund ...	2,027,153	67,618	6,882	7,634	...	...	82,134
	16,933,548	444,950	135,546	44,342	70,906	...	553,932
<b>TOTAL ...</b>	<b>100,274,741</b>	<b>3,224,876</b>	<b>761,014</b>	<b>358,228</b>	<b>33,980</b>	<b>...</b>	<b>4,310,228</b>
<b>Public Debt, 30th June, 1948 ...</b>	<b>100,274,741</b>						

† Debit.

(a) Actual Expenditure averaged over all assets.

(b) Includes £558,335 being part of Capital Expenditure on Harbours and Jetties controlled by Railway Dept.

(c) To this should be added £558,335 include in Railway Capital in respect of the following Harbours and Jetties Albany, £100,312; Busselton, £35,006; Geraldton, £320,650; Esperance, £83,223; Port Hedland, £24,142.

(d) Represents expenditure by P.W.D. on roads, bridges and drainage, and by Lands Department on rapurchased estates.

*In Return 11 the average cost of servicing the Public Debt has been applied to all undertakings. In Returns 12-13 the figures as shown have been prepared in accordance with the published Commercial Accounts of the Utilities.*

[Return No. 12.]

### RETURN RELATING TO RAILWAYS.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	miles. 4,381	miles. 4,381	miles. 4,381	miles. 4,348	miles. 4,348
Number of Miles Open ... ..					
	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	26,102,361	26,177,283	26,347,848	26,659,050	26,951,413
Revenue Capital ... ..	633,808	630,899	631,715	631,140	632,284
Total ... ..	26,736,169	26,808,182	26,979,563	27,290,190	27,583,697
Working Expenses ... ..	3,795,929	3,764,290	4,026,706	4,423,801	5,570,000
Interest ... ..	1,042,828	1,050,469	1,039,816	1,032,990	1,046,333
Total Annual Cost ... ..	4,838,757	4,814,759	5,066,522	5,456,791	6,616,333
Gross Revenue ... ..	4,386,523	4,276,250	4,106,718	4,045,935	4,598,896
Loss ... ..	452,234	538,509	959,804	1,410,856	2,017,437

[Return No. 13.]

### RETURN RELATING TO TRAMWAYS.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	1,227,954	1,244,437	1,247,988	1,251,124	1,304,274
Working Expenses ... ..	430,496	427,099	456,454	476,314	595,027
Interest ... ..	47,962	48,308	48,407	48,516	50,976
Total Annual Cost ... ..	478,458	475,407	504,861	524,830	646,003
Gross Revenue ... ..	515,304	507,509	521,093	481,100	509,054
Profit ... ..	36,846	32,102	16,232	...	...
Loss ... ..	...	...	...	43,730	136,949

*In Return 11 the average cost of servicing the Public Debt has been applied to all undertakings. In Returns 14-15 the figures as shown have been prepared in accordance with the published Commercial Accounts of the Utilities.*

[Return No. 14.]

RETURN RELATING TO ELECTRICITY.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	1,984,088	1,996,820	2,100,714	2,267,921	3,023,612
Working Expenses ... ..	466,424	498,053	579,825	776,207	911,172
Interest ... ..	78,002	78,336	78,281	87,251	89,719
Total Annual Cost ... ..	544,426	576,389	658,106	863,458	1,000,891
Gross Revenue ... ..	546,916	575,742	578,149	668,302	762,695
Profit ... ..	2,490	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	...	647	79,957	195,156	238,196

[Return No. 15.]

RETURN RELATING TO METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY, SEWERAGE, AND DRAINAGE.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	9,108,603	9,137,020	9,241,493	9,509,253	9,818,546
Working Expenses ... ..	114,669	112,531	130,736	157,973	169,049
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	455,996	456,798	459,100	426,904	440,578
Total Annual Cost ... ..	570,665	569,329	589,836	584,877	609,627
Gross Revenue ... ..	575,403	591,458	575,508	591,526	615,851
Profit ... ..	4,738	22,129	...	6,649	6,224
Loss ... ..	...	...	14,328	...	...

*In Return 11 the average cost of servicing the Public Debt has been applied to all undertakings. In Return 16 the figures as shown have been prepared in accordance with the published Commercial Accounts of the Utilities.*

## [Return No. 16.]

## RETURN RELATING TO GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	3,079,864	3,112,995	3,163,835	3,266,444	3,404,384
Working Expenses ... ..	148,470	180,800	182,507	193,748	247,831
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	209,798	211,537	214,426	203,216	210,848
Total Annual Cost ... ..	358,268	392,337	396,933	396,964	458,679
Gross Revenue ... ..	(a) 291,713	(a) 314,421	(b) 318,283	(c) 343,500	338,892
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	66,555	77,916	78,650	53,464	119,787

(a) Includes Commonwealth Grant, £8,074.

(b) Includes Commonwealth Grant, £6,198.

(c) Includes Commonwealth Grant, £562.

## [Return No. 17.]

## SUMMARY OF TRADING CONCERNS.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	2,314,961	2,251,449	2,253,513	2,326,156	2,404,401	2,451,826
Revenue Capital ... ..	203,640	52,242	52,242	49,713	49,713	49,713
	2,518,601	2,303,691	2,305,755	2,375,869	2,454,114	2,501,539
Gross Revenue ... ..	1,133,405	1,519,006	1,530,856	1,807,909	1,912,251	2,102,880
Increase in Stocks ... ..	14,679	7,358	...	19,522	270	16,949
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	25,241	11,516	14,833	853	5,234	5,657
	1,122,843	1,514,848	1,525,023	1,826,878	1,907,287	2,113,972
Working Expenditure (a) ... ..	1,068,114	1,410,346	1,454,390	1,751,934	1,846,802	1,951,453
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	122,645	147,152	122,018	124,767	126,758	116,330
Depreciation ... ..	20,638	39,959	48,818	47,014	50,617	55,451
Superannuation ... ..	338	411	656	683	796	859
Total Annual Cost ... ..	1,211,735	1,597,868	1,625,882	1,924,398	2,024,973	2,124,093
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	88,892	83,020	100,859	97,820	117,686	10,121

(a) Includes provision for Bad Debts and Bad Debts written off.

*Note.*—Wyndham Meat Works—Financial years ended 31st January, 1944, 1945, 1946, 31st October 1942. State Shipping Service—Financial year ends 31st December.



[Return No. 18.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE BRICKWORKS.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	52,231	52,231	52,097	52,097	52,097	52,007
Revenue Capital ... ..	1,774	1,774	1,774	1,774	1,774	1,774
	54,005	54,005	53,871	53,871	53,871	53,871
Gross Revenue ... ..	47,377	22,069	30,144	39,997	49,898	55,921
Increase in Stocks ... ..	...	903	...	90	270	...
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	766	...	1,343	...	...	250
	46,611	23,032	28,801	40,087	50,168	55,671
Working Expenditure ... ..	42,411	24,245	29,132	38,723	45,933	50,041
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	2,820	2,820	2,820	2,813	2,813	2,682
Depreciation ... ..	1,384	1,369	1,330	1,619	2,074	1,884
Superannuation ... ..	338	411	656	683	796	859
Total Annual Cost ... ..	46,953	28,845	33,938	43,838	51,616	55,466
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	205
Loss ... ..	342	5,783	5,137	3,751	1,448	...

[Return No. 19.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE ENGINEERING WORKS.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	168,548	175,980	182,460	180,348	178,107	176,968
Revenue Capital ... ..	123,461	...	...	...	...	...
	292,009	175,980	182,460	180,348	178,107	176,968
Gross Revenue ... ..	210,026	379,442	392,511	379,914	281,436	266,077
Increase in Stocks ... ..	14,679	6,365	...	...	...	1,716
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	...	...	9,739	853	1,006	...
	224,705	385,807	382,772	307,061	280,430	267,793
Working Expenditure ... ..	203,044	353,845	364,763	379,789	261,023	241,742
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	(b) 13,886	(b) 10,274	(b) 10,519	(b) 9,413	(b) 9,486	(b) 9,012
Depreciation ... ..	3,870	8,524	7,096	7,544	9,517	14,313
Total Annual Cost ... ..	220,800	372,643	382,378	396,746	280,026	265,067
Profit ... ..	3,905	13,164	394	315	404	2,726
Loss ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...

(b) Includes Sinking Fund charged, in the accounts of the Concern as follows :—

£366	£431	£444	£456	£531	£1,002
------	------	------	------	------	--------

[Return No. 20.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE QUARRIES.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	39,931	38,601	38,601	37,634	37,324	37,086
Revenue Capital ... ..	872	872	872	872	872	872
	40,803	39,473	39,473	38,506	38,196	37,958
Gross Revenue ... ..	8,381	76	272	81	79	94
Increase in Stocks ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	1,160	446	200	...	...	...
	7,221	Dr. 370	72	81	79	94
Working Expenditure ... ..	8,320	601	70	82	24	100
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	2,131	2,132	2,106	2,061	2,011	1,896
Depreciation ... ..	1,249	47	...	...	...	...
Total Annual Cost ... ..	11,700	2,780	2,176	2,143	2,035	1,996
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	4,479	3,150	2,104	2,062	1,956	1,902

[Return No. 21.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

—	1942.	1943.	1944.	1945.	1946.	1947.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	631,751	346,396	346,396	346,396	346,396	346,396
Revenue Capital ... ..	75,000	...	...	...	...	...
Gross Revenue ... ..	128,733	277,594	264,625	281,719	195,266	270,164
Working Expenditure ... ..	166,479	291,985	300,438	328,971	280,055	276,727
Interest and Sinking Fund (a)	39,925	30,115	18,331	18,940	18,714	16,333
Depreciation ... ..	13,813	12,010	11,906	12,075	12,320	12,114
Total Annual Cost ... ..	220,217	334,110	330,675	359,986	311,089	305,174
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	91,484	56,516	66,050	78,267	115,823	35,020

(a) Includes Sinking Fund not charged in the accounts of the Concern as follows:—

£1,579	£1,579	£866	£866	£866	£1,732
--------	--------	------	------	------	--------

[Return No. 22.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE HOTELS.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	82,068	80,257	78,358	76,482	74,609	72,735
Revenue Capital ... ..	2,533	2,529	2,529	...	...	...
	84,601	82,786	80,887	76,482	74,609	72,735
Gross Revenue ... ..	58,725	70,447	69,305	70,771	89,097	105,644
Working Expenditure ... ..	52,320	59,539	58,714	61,976	73,524	90,130
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	5,941	6,099	6,278	6,288	5,696	5,229
Depreciation ... ..	298	1,307	1,372	328	1,568	318
Total Annual Cost ... ..	58,559	66,945	66,364	68,592	80,788	95,677
Profit ... ..	166	3,502	2,941	2,179	8,309	9,967
Loss ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...

[Return No. 23.]

## RETURN RELATING TO STATE SAW MILLS.

—	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	268,110	266,469	264,658	262,867	260,996	308,219
	268,110	266,469	264,658	262,867	260,996	308,219
Gross Revenue ... ..	665,817	607,288	573,223	548,263	612,882	689,096
Increase in Stocks ... ..	...	...	...	13,069	...	15,233
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	20,176	10,961	3,551	...	3,301	...
	645,641	596,327	569,672	561,332	609,581	704,329
Working Expenditure ... ..	(a) 572,016	557,135	540,659	538,647	573,741	645,359
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	15,047	15,045	15,035	15,024	15,645	16,166
Depreciation ... ..	(b) 24	2,559	3,300	5,086	10,751	13,446
Total Annual Cost ... ..	587,087	574,739	558,994	558,757	600,137	675,171
Profit ... ..	58,554	21,588	10,678	2,575	9,444	29,168
Loss ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...

(a) Includes £5,000 paid to Mill Construction Reserve Account.

(b) On new assets only. Temporarily suspended on existing asset.

[Return No. 24]

## RETURN RELATING TO WYNDHAM MEAT WORKS.

	1-2-42 to 31-10-42.	1-11-42 to 31-1-44.	1-2-44 to 31-1-45.	1-2-45 to 31-1-46.	1-2-46 to 31-1-47.	1-2-47 to 31-1-48.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	1,072,322	1,072,322	1,072,322	1,072,322	1,072,322	1,072,322
Gross Revenue ... ..	14,346	21,455	2,155	278,776	405,810	451,339
Increase in Stocks ... ..	...	...	...	6,363	...	...
Decrease in Stocks ... ..	3,139	109	...	...	927	5,407
	11,207	21,346	2,155	285,139	404,833	445,932
Working Expenditure ... ..	22,829	21,564	8,227	251,464	372,335	413,153
Interest and Sinking Fund (a) ...	42,895	67,019	53,616	56,300	50,488	48,254
Depreciation (b) ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Total Annual Cost ... ..	65,724	88,583	61,843	307,764	422,823	461,407
Profit ... ..	...	...	...	...	...	...
Loss ... ..	54,517	67,237	59,688	22,625	17,940	15,475

(a) Includes Sinking Fund not charged in the accounts of the Concern, as follows:—

£2,681	£2,681	£2,681	£2,681	£2,681	£2,681
--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

(b) Depreciation on Stores.

[Return No. 25.]

## WEST AUSTRALIAN MEAT EXPORT WORKS.

	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.
	£	£	£	£
Loan Capital ... ..	218,621	298,010	382,550	386,003
Revenue Capital ... ..	47,067	47,067	47,067	47,067
	265,688	345,077	429,617	433,070
Gross Revenue ... ..	207,621	190,388	277,783	264,355
Working Expenditure ... ..	152,387	152,282	240,167	234,201
Interest and Sinking Fund ... ..	13,313	13,928	21,905	16,758
Depreciation, etc. ... ..	23,814	20,362	14,387	13,176
Total Annual Cost ... ..	189,514	186,572	276,459	264,135
Profit ... ..	18,107	3,816	1,324	220
Loss ... ..	...	...	...	...

{Return No. 28.]

## THE AGRICULTURAL LANDS PURCHASE ACT, 1909, and AMENDMENTS.

Position of Estates under the above Act, at 30th June, 1948.

[Amount Authorised £1,500,000]

Estates.	Receipts.				Payments				Balances.		
	Proceeds of De-ventures.	Sale of Lots, Rents, etc.	In-terest.	Total.	Purchase Money.	Survey Expenses, Interest, etc.	De-ventures Re-deemed.	Total.	Amount Over-drawn.	In Hand.	In-vested
Anniebrook .....	£ 4,002	£ 1,382	£ .....	£ 6,374	£ 4,002	£ 4,416	£ .....	£ 4,408	£ 3,034	£ .....	£ .....
Avondale .....	40,849	114,541	3,417	167,007	49,949	61,021	49,949	160,919	100,919	6,088	.....
Baacton .....	32,875	36,005	.....	69,840	32,875	33,300	32,875	99,140	20,300	.....	.....
Bowes .....	54,352	97,809	17,588	169,809	54,352	60,915	54,352	169,619	.....	190	.....
Brunswick .....	5,050	9,805	1,005	17,120	5,050	5,024	5,050	17,224	104	.....	.....
Bucklands .....	30,162	47,193	.....	77,355	30,162	16,054	30,162	75,978	.....	1,377	.....
Henty .....	4,526	9,001	34	14,461	4,526	4,008	4,527	13,661	.....	800	.....
Homebush .....	1,250	1,079	742	3,071	1,250	1,471	1,250	3,971	.....	.....	.....
Jelcobine .....	8,320	20,041	391	28,722	8,320	10,296	8,320	26,936	.....	1,786	.....
Jingalup .....	2,734	2,790	15	5,548	2,734	2,859	2,734	8,327	2,770	.....	.....
(Kojonup) .....	16,170	13,416	.....	29,586	16,170	13,430	.....	29,600	14	.....	.....
Kockatea .....	4,452	7,010	1,749	14,117	4,452	5,216	4,452	14,120	3	.....	.....
Marjidin .....	16,586	14,709	224	31,519	16,586	14,821	.....	31,407	.....	112	.....
Mendel .....	24,119	41,378	3,881	69,378	24,119	21,412	24,119	69,650	272	.....	.....
Narra Tarra .....	7,000	11,444	4,303	22,747	7,000	8,747	7,000	22,747	.....	.....	.....
Norman .....	22,000	41,438	12,018	76,456	22,000	26,366	22,000	70,366	.....	6,090	.....
Oakabella .....	4,295	2,303	106	6,604	4,295	4,022	.....	8,317	1,713	.....	.....
Pickering .....	.....	984	39	2,787	1,784	1,507	.....	3,271	484	.....	.....
Porongorup .....	3,350	5,820	1,348	10,524	3,350	3,225	.....	6,575	.....	.....	3,94
(Plantagenet) .....	700	.....	.....	700	700	597	.....	1,297	597	.....	.....
Ullingulup .....	42,260	20,891	.....	63,151	42,260	34,697	.....	76,957	13,806	.....	.....
Wongondy .....	140,000	318,000	10,161	474,761	140,000	165,792	140,000	445,792	.....	28,909	.....
Yandanooka .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Estates under S.S. Scheme	.....	307,219	.....	307,219	.....	237,252	.....	237,252	.....	60,967	.....
	477,600	1,129,550	63,591	1,670,656	447,506	737,638	387,390	1,602,534	52,106	116,279	3,04
										120,228	
										Credit Balance £68,122	

{Return No. 27.]

## DISSECTION OF CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND EXPENDITURE, 1940-41 TO 1947-48.

Item.	1940-41.	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Interest .....	3,540,608	3,546,625	3,497,501	3,486,511	3,413,705	3,354,082	3,247,497	3,224,376
Sinking Fund .....	510,635	555,296	594,154	606,060	711,023	729,732	758,381	819,303
Exchange .....	503,482	408,242	497,167	503,219	506,164	471,997	494,251	528,755
Unemployment Relief .....	26,215	4,124	3,818	645	591	271	381	744
Salaries and Wages .....	4,328,006	4,506, 07	4,587,714	5,031,048	5,224,607	5,685,002	6,070,002	7,582,260
Materials .....	905,293	1,068,918	1,259,319	1,472,251	1,622,746	1,876,115	1,844,285	2,850,637
Grants .....	160,092	151, 38	151,259	172,449	215,849	625,538	950,948	1,177,453
Pensions .....	198,017	232,300	252,904	272,206	323,331	318,812	360,009	417,896
All other .....	1,147,809	1,285,441	2,283,406	2,006,765	1,928,004	1,945,978	1,295,983	1,960,172
Total .....	11,420,957	11,938,381	13,127,242	13,551,154	13,949,340	14,407,557	15,028,427	18,062,332

[Return No. 28.]

**LOAN REPAYMENTS.**  
**RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.**

Year ended 30th June.					Receipts.	Expenditure.	Balance in Hand.
					£	£	£
1928	...	...	...	...	154,108	...	154,108
1929	...	...	...	...	235,404	33,297	358,215
1930	...	...	...	...	153,583	216,647	293,151
1931	...	...	...	...	84,248	...	377,399
1932	...	...	...	...	112,361	171,800	317,960
1933	...	...	...	...	91,751	249,275	180,438
1934	...	...	...	...	100,935	215,740	45,831
1935	...	...	...	...	160,507	97,064	99,074
1936	...	...	...	...	107,906	74,781	132,189
1937	...	...	...	...	122,975	78,376	176,788
1938	...	...	...	...	134,462	154,825	156,425
1939	...	...	...	...	147,040	153,105	150,360
1940	...	...	...	...	127,470	101,086	176,744
1941	...	...	...	...	127,889	140,202	164,431
1942	...	...	...	...	171,232	89,867	245,796
1943	...	...	...	...	281,355	184,707	342,444
1944	...	...	...	...	256,153	198,896	399,701
1945	...	...	...	...	207,075	222,493	384,283
1946	...	...	...	...	287,043	210,595	460,731
1947	...	...	...	...	190,503	192,818	458,416
1948	...	...	...	...	498,087	282,155	674,348

[Return No. 29.]

**SUMMARY OF TRANSACTIONS OF FUNDS, THE EXPENDITURE OF WHICH IS NOT SUBJECT TO  
PARLIAMENTARY APPROPRIATION. FOR YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1948.**

Fund.	Balance, 1st July, 1947.	Receipts during Year.	Payments during Year.	Balance, 30th June, 1948.
	£	£	£	£
Hospital Fund (see Return No. 30)...	46,549	592,193	638,742	...
Forest Improvement and Reforestation Fund (see Return No. 31) ...	57,703	166,988	185,317	39,374
Road Funds (see Return No. 32) ...	1,421,420	1,603,398	1,460,566	1,564,252
Metropolitan Markets Trust ...	10,138	22,207	(a) 21,364	10,981
Fremantle Harbour Trust ...	...	831,989	(b) 831,989	...
Bunbury Harbour Board ...	2,802	25,250	24,747	3,305
	1,538,612	3,242,025	3,162,725	1,617,912

(a) Includes payments on account of—Interest, £6,698 Sinking Fund, £1,620 and Profits, £596

(b) Includes payments on account of—Interest, £128,843 Sinking Fund £29,300 Replacement Fund, £2,000 and Surplus Cash, £105,169

[Return No. 30.]

## HOSPITAL FUND.—TRANSACTIONS DURING THE YEARS 1943-44 TO 1947-48.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
<i>Receipts.</i>	£	£	£	£	£
Balance from previous year ...	51,070	44,519	46,222	28,174	46,549
Hospital Tax Collections ...	275,750	275,750	275,750	325,750	325,750
Treasury Grants ...	...	20,000	20,000	143,000	259,007
Miscellaneous Receipts ...	3,381	5,685	5,825	2,678	7,436
	330,201	345,954	347,797	499,602	638,742
<i>Payments.</i>					
Administration Expenditure ...	2,263	3,458	4,171	7,392	9,721
Hospitals Expenditure—					
Departmental ...	104,273	122,164	130,748	175,121	260,005
Non-Departmental Subsidies, etc.	175,615	169,583	169,720	262,321	353,187
Miscellaneous ...	3,531	4,527	8,984	8,219	15,829
Balance at end of year ...	44,519	46,222	28,174	46,549	...
	330,201	345,954	347,797	499,602	638,742

[Return No. 31.]

## FORESTS IMPROVEMENT AND RE-FORESTATION FUND—TRANSACTIONS DURING THE YEARS 1943-44 TO 1947-48.

—	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47.	1947-48.
<i>Receipts.</i>	£	£	£	£	£
Balance from previous year ...	78,722	68,592	8,643	1,402	57,703
Appropriation from Revenue Fund	(a) 71,735	(b) 43,051	(c) 93,375	(d) 161,393	129,765
Sundry Receipts ...	26,832	22,052	26,103	29,799	37,233
	177,289	133,695	128,121	192,594	224,691
<i>Payments.</i>					
Expenditure on Forest Improvements and Re-forestation during the year ...	108,697	125,052	126,719	134,891	185,317
Balance at end of year ...	68,592	8,643	1,402	57,703	39,374
	177,289	133,695	128,121	192,594	224,691

(a) Includes Special Grant, £45,000.

(b) Includes Special Grant, £15,000.

(c) Includes Special Grant, £45,000.

(d) Includes Special Grant, £30,000.

[Return No. 32.]

## ROAD FUNDS.—TRANSACTIONS DURING THE YEAR 1947-48.

	Main Roads Trust Accounts.	Federal Aid Roads Agreement Account.	Common- wealth Aid Roads Accounts.	Metropoli- tan Traffic Trust Account.	Total.
	£	£	£	£	£
Balances from Year 1946-47 ....	331,808	1,087,079	....	1,933	1,421,420
Receipts during year—					
License Fees and Permits ....	9,067	....	....	345,797	354,864
Recoups by Local Authorities ....	16,163	....	....	....	16,163
Commonwealth Government Recoups	51,816	....	....	....	51,816
Commonwealth Grant ....	....	78,274	1,020,484	....	1,098,758
Miscellaneous Receipts ....	....	....	....	....	....
Other Receipts in Suspense ....	....	....	....	....	....
	408,854	1,165,053	1,020,484	347,730	2,943,021
Transfer to Other Funds ....	....	2,864	66,438	....	69,302
Transfers from Other Funds ....	81,797	....	....	....	81,797
Totals ....	490,651	1,163,089	954,046	347,730	2,955,516
Payments during year—					
Administration, Plant, Office Equipment, etc. ....	4,345	38,588	10,205	35,348	88,486
Transferred to Consolidated Revenue Fund	....	....	....	67,003	67,003
Treasury—Interest and Sinking Fund	....	....	....	7,396	7,396
Road Construction, Maintenance, Surveys, etc. ....	86,519	743,741	251,019	5,100	1,086,379
Distributions to Local and Statutory Authorities ....	....	....	....	142,000	142,000
Other Payments in Suspense ....	....	....	....	....	....
Totals ....	90,864	782,329	261,224	256,847	1,391,264
Balances in hand at 30th June, 1948 ....	309,787	380,760	682,822	60,983	1,564,252

[Return No. 33.]

TOTAL NET COLLECTIONS OF STATE TAXATION TAKEN TO THE CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND,  
TRUST ACCOUNTS, AND SPECIAL ACCOUNTS, FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30TH JUNE, 1948.

Particulars.	Paid to C.R. Fund.	Paid to Trust or Special Accounts.	Total.	Taxation per Head. (c)
	£	£	£	£ s. d.
Probate and Succession Duties ...	307,511	...	307,511	0 12 1
Other Stamp Duties ...	432,797	...	432,797	0 17 0
Land Tax ...	110,657	...	110,657	0 4 4
Income Tax—Commonwealth Reimbursement (a)	3,807,000	...	3,807,000	7 9 9
Liquor Licenses ...	118,149	...	118,149	0 4 8
Racing—				
Stamp Duty on Betting Tickets ...	27,429	...	27,429	0 1 1
Totalisator Duty ...	168,787	...	168,787	0 6 7
Totalisator Licenses ...	2,387	...	2,387	0 0 1
Stamp Duty on Tote Dividends ...	1,812	...	1,812	0 0 1
Motor Taxation ...	26,964	660,869	687,833	1 7 1
Other Vehicles ...	...	6,238	6,238	0 0 3
Entertainments—Commonwealth Reimbursement	(b)	...	(b)	...
Vermine Tax ...	...	30,859	30,859	0 1 3
Fruit Fly Eradication ...	...	4,956	4,956	0 0 2
Licenses, not elsewhere included ...	15,878	...	15,878	0 0 7
	5,019,371	702,922	5,722,293	11 5 0

(a) This amount includes arrears of State Income Tax, £2,470; Goldmining Profits Tax, £ ...; Financial Emergency Tax, £64; and Hospital Tax, £35: Total, £2,569  
From this Commonwealth Reimbursement Grant an amount of £584,757 was paid to  
Hospital Trust Fund.

(b) Now part of Income Tax—Commonwealth Reimbursement.

(c) Based on estimated mean population for year 1947-48, viz., 508,600



[Return No. 34.]

## STATEMENT SHOWING RECEIPTS FROM COMMONWEALTH, 1901-02 TO 1946-47.

Year.	Contri- bution to Sinking Fund.	Contri- bution towards Interest.	Surplus Revenue Re- turned.	Payment per Head, 25/-.	Special Payment to W.A.	Interest on Trans- ferred Prop- erties.	Grant Under Sec. 96.	Total.
PERIOD COVERED BY BRADDON CLAUSE.								
*1901-02 to 1910-11	£ ...	£ ...	£ †8,872,722	£ ...	£ ...	£ ...	£ ...	£ 8,872,722
PERIOD COVERED BY PER CAPITA PAYMENTS AND SPECIAL PAYMENT TO W.A.								
1911-12 to 1926-27	...	...	...	10,632,264	2,556,248	462,010	565,905	10,216,427
PERIOD COVERED BY FINANCIAL AGREEMENT ACT.								
1927-28 ...	77,908	£483,286	...	...	...	25,775	300,000	886,964
1928-29 ...	91,598	£463,578	...	...	...	47,868	300,000	903,045
1929-30 ...	97,863	473,432	...	...	...	...	300,000	871,298
1930-31 ...	106,166	473,432	...	...	...	...	300,000	879,598
1931-32 ...	118,946	473,432	...	...	...	...	300,000	892,373
1932-33 ...	126,781	473,432	...	...	...	...	600,000	1,100,218
1933-34 ...	136,826	473,432	...	...	...	...	600,000	1,210,253
1934-35 ...	143,871	473,432	\$133,000	...	...	...	600,000	1,350,309
1935-36 ...	151,247	473,432	\$35,000	...	...	...	800,000	1,459,678
1936-37 ...	157,016	473,432	\$33,000	...	...	...	500,000	1,163,446
1937-38 ...	162,524	473,432	...	...	...	...	575,000	1,210,955
1938-39 ...	167,013	473,432	...	...	...	...	570,000	1,210,447
1939-40 ...	174,765	473,432	...	...	...	...	595,000	1,243,195
1940-41 ...	177,423	473,432	...	...	...	...	650,000	1,300,854
1941-42 ...	181,808	473,432	...	...	...	...	630,000	1,285,249
1942-43 ...	183,295	473,432	...	...	...	...	800,000	1,456,727
1943-44 ...	183,922	473,432	...	...	...	...	850,000	1,507,359
1944-45 ...	192,447	473,432	...	...	...	...	904,000	1,569,807
1945-46 ...	185,900	473,432	...	...	912,559	...	950,000	2,521,819
1946-47 ...	188,838	473,432	...	...	628,000	...	1,245,000	2,535,270
1947-48 ...	197,132	473,432	...	...	1,000,000	...	1,977,000	3,647,564
Total, 21 years ...	3,203,289	9,942,072	201,000	...	2,540,559	73,643	14,246,000	30,206,563

\* First complete year under Federation. † Including £868,963 from Special Tariff provided under the Constitution of the Commonwealth for 5 years after the imposition of uniform Customs duties.  
‡ Special payment under States Grant Act, pending passing of the Financial Agreement Act.  
Proportion of Commonwealth Surplus distributed to States.

## GRANTS FOR ROADS, UNEMPLOYMENT, AND ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES FOR YEAR 1947-48—PAID TO TRUST FUNDS.

<i>Federal Road Agreement Act—</i>		£	£
Contributions from Petrol Tax:			
For Roads	...	78,274	
For Sinking Fund	...	8,812	
			87,086
<i>Commonwealth Aid Road Act—</i>			
Contributions from Petrol Tax:			
For Roads	...		1,020,484
			£1,107,570

Service.	Loan Li- ability.	Expenditure :					Receipts.	Net Ex- penditure.	Cost per Head.  (*)
		Indirect.		Direct.		Total.			
		Interest and Ex- change.	Sinking Fund.	Con- solidated Revenue Fund.	Trust and Special Accounts.				
<b>1.—Education—</b>	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£ s. d.
(a) Education Department and Schools ...	1,667,338	61,897	11,999	1,472,719	...	1,546,615	75,212	1,471,403	2 17 11
(b) University ... ..	40,216	1,492	262	93,779	...	95,533	...	95,533	0 3 9
(c) Technical Education ... ..	199,700	7,413	1,309	207,522	...	216,244	30,007	186,237	0 7 4
(d) Agricultural Education ... ..	133,815	4,967	1,008	51,175	...	57,150	21,023	36,127	0 1 5
(e) Library, Museum, Observatory ...	35,956	1,334	277	15,095	...	16,706	465	16,241	0 0 8
(f) Deaf, Dumb and Blind ... ..	884	32	7	3,300	...	3,339	...	3,339	0 0 1
Total 1 ... ..	2,077,909	77,135	14,862	1,843,590	...	1,935,587	126,707	1,808,880	3 11 2
<b>2.—Health, Hospitals, and Charities—</b>									
(a) Public Health ... ..	7,919	294	...	92,773	...	93,067	19,286	73,781	0 2 11
(b) Care of Sick and Mentally Afflicted, Health of Mothers and Children ...	2,307,359	85,665	15,167	244,215	770,470	1,115,507	176,780	938,727	1 16 11
(c) Recreation Facilities ... ..	...	...	...	12,850	...	12,850	...	12,850	0 0 6
(d) Relief of Aged, Indigent and Infirm, Child Welfare ... ..	109,057	3,540	702	149,023	...	153,265	50,370	102,895	0 4 0
(e) Miner's Phthisis ... ..	...	...	...	47,707	...	47,707	25,000	22,707	0 0 11
(f) Natives... ..	115,100	4,272	884	97,769	...	102,925	19,419	83,506	0 3 3
(g) Unemployment Relief ... ..	...	...	...	1,871	...	1,871	214	1,657	0 0 1
Total 2 ... ..	2,539,435	93,761	16,753	646,208	770,470	1,527,192	291,069	1,236,123	2 8 7
<b>3.—Law, Order and Public Safety—</b>									
(a) Administration of Justice ... ..	46,531	1,727	357	139,254	...	141,338	148,328	Cr. 6,990	Cr. 0 3
(b) Police ... ..	195,909	7,272	1,504	415,502	...	424,278	79,108	345,170	0 13 7
(c) Gaols and Reformatories ... ..	88,706	3,293	682	70,567	...	74,542	6,184	68,358	0 2 8
(d) Public Safety ... ..	...	...	...	41,333	...	41,333	13,996	27,337	0 1 1
Total 3 ... ..	331,146	12,292	2,543	666,656	...	681,491	247,616	433,875	0 17 1
GRAND TOTAL ... ..	4,948,490	183,188	34,158	3,156,454	770,470	4,144,270	665,392	3,478,878	6 16 10

(\*) Based on estimated mean population for year 1947-48, viz., 508,600. (†) Includes £131,728, Patients' Fees paid to Hospital Fund.

## RAILWAYS.—STATEMENT SHOWING TONNAGE AND EARNINGS ON GOODS CARRIED.

Class of Goods.	1943-44.		1944-45.		1945-46.		1946-47.		1947-48.	
	Tonnage.	Percentage of Total.	Tonnage.	Percentage of Total.	Tonnage.	Percentage of Total.	Tonnage.	Percentage of Total.	Tonnage.	Percentage of Total.
Coal, Coke, and Charcoal	257,127	10.04	267,675	9.21	307,896	11.27	342,188	13.28	361,507	12.85
Ores and other Minerals	145,151	5.67	214,289	7.38	278,096	10.20	249,522	9.68	196,206	6.87
Wool	42,423	1.66	34,525	1.19	38,433	1.36	32,655	1.28	36,148	1.26
Hay, Straw, and Chaff	37,603	1.47	55,939	1.93	38,235	1.40	31,519	1.22	30,074	1.05
Wheat	539,066	21.06	801,887	27.61	571,272	20.94	449,093	17.43	583,011	20.43
Other Grain and Flour	170,118	6.84	201,375	6.93	178,818	6.56	170,777	6.62	215,842	7.54
Firewood	117,092	4.57	102,380	3.52	93,423	3.42	84,521	3.28	105,219	3.68
Local Timber	243,190	9.50	223,267	7.60	251,778	9.23	254,273	9.87	272,234	9.53
Imported Timber	181	.01	172	.01	349	.01	405	.02	443	.02
Fruit and Garden Produce	80,870	3.15	68,770	3.40	107,727	3.95	107,052	4.15	99,864	3.49
Fertilisers	190,540	5.10	203,060	6.99	260,513	9.55	220,873	8.57	269,482	9.43
All other goods	796,976	31.13	701,040	24.14	603,162	22.12	634,058	24.60	687,143	24.05
Total	2,560,137	100.00	2,904,481	100.00	2,727,702	100.00	2,576,936	100.00	2,857,573	100.00

Class of Goods.	1943-44.		1944-45.		1945-46.		1946-47.		1947-48.	
	Earnings.	Percentage of Total.	Earnings.	Percentage of Total.	Earnings.	Percentage of Total.	Earnings.	Percentage of Total.	Earnings.	Percentage of Total.
Coal, Coke, and Charcoal	£ 145,459	5.41	£ 159,715	6.02	£ 174,454	6.75	218,797	8.08	230,162	7.50
Ores and other Minerals	83,400	2.36	88,109	3.32	109,610	4.24	119,336	4.38	137,823	4.50
Wool	112,127	4.18	92,496	3.49	97,104	3.75	93,620	3.44	104,890	3.42
Hay, Straw, and Chaff	30,081	1.12	42,930	1.62	30,599	1.18	25,607	.94	23,845	.78
Wheat	300,093	11.18	400,822	15.09	374,192	14.46	291,072	10.68	361,257	11.79
Other Grain and Flour	88,830	3.31	108,229	4.07	101,455	3.92	100,404	3.68	130,502	4.26
Firewood	32,968	1.22	30,945	1.17	29,133	1.13	30,675	1.13	40,738	1.38
Local Timber	217,885	8.12	211,219	7.95	219,426	8.48	233,000	8.55	245,965	8.02
Imported Timber	192	.01	94	.01	173	.01	565	.02	585	.02
Fruit and Garden Produce	102,336	3.81	119,340	4.49	126,413	4.88	127,143	4.67	114,460	3.74
Fertilisers	39,190	1.46	62,154	2.34	78,818	3.05	68,366	2.51	82,827	2.70
All other goods	1,552,351	57.82	1,339,885	50.45	1,245,557	48.15	1,416,482	51.97	1,591,955	51.94
Total	2,684,846	100.00	2,655,938	100.00	2,586,939	100.00	2,725,067	100.00	3,065,009	100.00

[Return No. 37.]

## TRADE, PRODUCTION, POPULATION, ETC.

	1938-39.	1939-40.	1940-41.	1941-42.	1942-43.	1943-44.	1944-45.	1945-46.	1946-47	1947-48.
Railway and Tramway Revenue	£3,883,367	£3,802,385	£3,908,540	£4,301,502	£4,016,122	£1,034,929	£4,780,818	£4,605,321	£4,459,926	£5,054,077
Railway Mileage (Route) ....	4,378	4,381	4,381	4,381	4,381	4,381	4,381	4,381	4,348	4,348
Wool exported ....	£3,270,680	£4,131,875	£1,559,585	£5,433,041	£2,378,527	£5,879,587	£4,553,439	£9,957,030	£10,260,373	£16,621,984
Wool produced (c)— (quantity—lbs.)	72,475,000	75,400,000	69,427,000	77,627,000	95,718,000	102,750,000	84,141,000	82,067,200	80,000,000	†89,000,000
(value)	£2,962,860	£4,054,720	£3,853,984	£4,164,150	£5,967,440	£6,370,720	£5,255,927	£5,211,793	£7,990,000	†£14,000,000
Wheat produced (bushels)	36,843,600	40,861,000	21,606,000	37,500,000	20,600,000	16,550,000	15,929,000	20,920,000	23,800,000	34,500,000
Wheat produced (value) ....	£4,492,003	£7,269,316	£4,182,255	£7,344,967	£4,754,380	£4,523,479	£3,963,936	£6,525,456	£9,205,000	(e)
Hay produced (tons) ....	437,809	475,677	375,143	414,115	277,957	314,359	338,912	†287,476	280,252	267,901
Gold produced (b) (value) ....	£10,784,852	£12,957,448	£12,000,027	£10,770,977	£7,167,716	£5,058,480	£5,018,160	£5,353,214	£7,419,077	£7,322,302
Coal produced (value) ....	£371,713	£361,152	£367,403	£431,005	£475,078	£523,724	£598,694	£632,180	£771,351	£847,082
Other Minerals produced (c) ....	£187,592	£129,636	£238,733	£157,621	£160,868	£201,999	£250,231	£327,082	£323,778	£446,454
Timber exported ....	£721,941	£628,352	£790,876	£699,661	£605,940	£613,994	£570,028	£722,090	863,140	£1,099,073
Timber produced ....	£1,437,203	£1,313,598	£1,301,777	£1,333,967	£1,269,932	£1,343,973	£1,339,132	£1,412,677	£1,714,149	(e)
†Number of Sheep ....	9,177,531	9,574,433	9,516,272	9,722,780	10,424,385	11,102,936	10,049,587	9,765,973	9,787,002	10,443,798
†Number of Cattle ....	767,680	799,175	788,928	839,731	831,231	870,930	852,563	833,567	811,949	815,010
†Number of Horses ....	143,679	130,207	130,057	124,402	112,782	100,743	96,528	88,180	80,746	74,537
Area of land selected (acres)....	627,443	305,213	346,365	172,120	123,944	197,373	231,400	220,022	558,676	703,160
Area of land leased (acres) ....	3,201,701	2,705,988	2,509,275	2,244,369	1,655,497	1,902,737	1,960,825	1,168,045	5,128,710	3,233,085
Area of land under cultivation	15,852,929	16,112,071	15,931,281	16,085,051	(e)	(e)	(e)	13,860,553	16,139,472	15,525,292
(d)										
Area of land under crop (acres)	4,683,333	4,286,935	3,988,308	3,816,522	2,784,000	2,744,000	2,756,000	2,875,048	3,532,445	3,936,118
Tonnage Shipping, Inwards ....	4,251,368	3,719,116	3,040,611	2,545,823	1,435,241	1,585,935	1,690,820	2,378,206	2,532,750	(e)
Tonnage Shipping, Outwards ....	4,326,529	3,751,135	3,087,389	2,507,742	1,467,495	1,579,056	1,528,336	2,472,948	2,046,285	(e)
Exports, including Gold ....	£23,006,410	£24,576,754	£24,839,479	£25,351,484	£16,392,003	£19,532,146	£19,403,033	£26,544,880	£29,720,015	£55,571,373
Exports, excluding Gold ....	£12,206,535	£12,473,441	£12,191,568	£14,964,896	£8,435,851	£15,833,325	£19,390,608	£26,515,024	£20,039,279	£31,692,728
Imports (Australian Currency)	£19,394,166	£20,015,054	£19,083,21	£18,751,869	£16,449,292	£17,574,227	£18,483,952	£22,150,734	£31,504,328	£42,819,781
Savings Bank Deposits ....	£10,802,936	£10,039,271	£10,193,000	£12,153,422	£17,468,535	£20,346,999	£21,262,769	£32,917,664	£26,140,983	£26,773,839
Savings Bank Withdrawals ....	£10,285,055	£10,641,171	£9,657,739	£11,000,730	£11,626,377	£13,786,931	£15,826,571	£26,074,891	£28,426,316	£27,810,784
Population end of Financial Year	465,420	470,738	474,396	478,604	479,055	484,567	489,983	494,080	502,731	514,000

‡ As at 31st December of year first mentioned.  
(e) Calendar year first mentioned.

† Preliminary figures, liable to revision.  
(d) Area cropped, cleared, fallowed, ringbarked, etc.

(b) Australian Currency Value.  
(e) Not available.