

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 27th July, 1933.

The PRESIDENT: I have received two nominations, and as there are no others, I declare nominations closed. The two nominations I have received are those of Colonel Collett and Mr. Bourke. Members will now proceed to vote.

The ballot having been completed by members present from both Houses,

The PRESIDENT: It has been reported to me that every hon. member has received a duly certified ballot paper, and I presume that each member has voted. I therefore declare the ballot closed. Under Standing Order 18, governing the election of a Senator, I have to appoint a member of each House to act as a scrutineer with the Clerks of the two Houses. On behalf of the Legislative Council, I appoint the Hon. J. Cornell to be a scrutineer. I have consulted with my friend, the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly (Hon. A. H. Panton), and, at his suggestion, I appoint the member for Forrest (Miss Holman) to act as scrutineer on behalf of the Legislative Assembly.

The scrutineers, together with the Clerks, tallied the votes, and submitted the result of the ballot to the President.

The PRESIDENT: The result of the ballot is as follows:—

Mr. Bourke	35
Colonel Collett	40

I declare Colonel Herbert Brayley Collett, Librarian, of 75 Guildford-road, Mt. Lawley, duly elected to fill the vacancy in the Federal Senate caused by the resignation of Sir Hal Colebatch. That concludes the business of the joint sitting, and also the joint sitting of the two Houses.

The President left the Chair at 3.35 p.m.

	PAGE
Federal Senate, vacancy filled	137
Bills: Supply (No. 1), 2r.	137
Government Tramways Act Amendment, 2r.	145

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.45 p.m., and read prayers.

Sitting suspended during the joint sitting of both Houses to elect a Federal Senator (vide report ante) from 2.50 p.m. to 4 p.m.

FEDERAL SENATE—VACANCY FILLED.

The PRESIDENT: I have to report that as a result of a joint sitting of both Houses of the State Parliament, Colonel H. B. Collett was elected to fill the vacancy in the representation of Western Australia in the Federal Senate, caused by the resignation of Sir Hal Colebatch.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £1,500,000.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [44]: Since we met last year a general election has been held and we have had a change of Government. With others, I congratulate Mr. Drew and Mr. Kitson on the political change that has altered their status in this Chamber. At the same time, I wish to commiserate with Mr. Baxter, seeing that he is not now able to continue the control of the proceedings which he so ably carried out during the preceding three years. I regret that prior to the elections taking place, a redistribution of seats in the Legislative Assembly was not decided upon, for I am convinced that had such a redistribution been made, more seats would have been allocated to the goldfields. When the last redistribution was effected, I felt that an injustice had been done to the inland areas from which we derive so much of the revenue that the Government rely upon. I anticipate that the present Government will

note the appreciable increase in the number of people living on the goldfields, and that they will keep that point in mind. I was disappointed that the representation withdrawn from the goldfields areas under the latest redistribution of seats was allotted to the metropolitan area instead of to the agricultural districts. Rather than they should be handed over to the city area, I would prefer additional seats to go to the goldfields, because the people there are just as much concerned in primary production as are those engaged in agricultural or pastoral pursuits. At the present time the mining industry is doing much that is essential in the interests of the Empire.

Hon. G. Fraser: You evidently overlooked that point when you voted for the latest redistribution of seats proposal.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: On the contrary, I raised the point during the course of the debate on that legislation. People have been flocking to the goldfields areas because of the small returns obtainable for wheat and wool. On the other hand, gold is worth to-day more than I can remember since the discovery of gold in this State. I have frequently been appealed to by parents for suggestions as to how best they can secure employment for their sons. The same difficulty has been referred to by several other hon. members who have spoken since the session commenced. No doubt the Government, in asking for the Supply covered by the Bill, intend to use some of the money to provide avenues for employment. We know that some of the money is to be used to provide employment for men on the goldfields because that is the best avenue for them to-day. I have told people that it was useless to endeavour to place their sons on farms or pastoral holdings because of the low prices obtained for the products of those two industries. Whatever results may be obtained from them, the farmers and the pastoralists themselves seem to be fair game for the Commonwealth Government who make heavy demands upon their available funds by levying tariff charges on machinery, wire netting and all other requirements for the development of the industries. We can sum up the position regarding the man on the land by saying that he is toiling for the rest of the community. When I have been asked for advice as to the best means of securing employment for lads, I have suggested to parents that they should send their boys to the goldfields because I believe that part of the State

is the only place where avenues for employment can be found with advantage. I agree that those who are out of work have to be maintained, but I do not agree that they should be paid the standard rate of wages. If the Government were to attempt anything of that description, we would have numerous Supply Bills presented asking for funds so that the unemployed could be paid those amounts. It would not be possible for the taxpayers to find sufficient money to enable such wages to be paid if the men were engaged on work of a non-reproductive nature. Wherever possible, they should be employed on work that will return sufficient to cover the cost of wages. I often think that it would be better for us if we could say to those who are out of work and were not born in Australia: Get out! It is ridiculous to think that the State should be expected to pay the standard rate of wages to those who are out of work. During the election prior to that held recently, the present Premier pointed out at one of his meetings that any country that made such a proposal would be overwhelmed by people from other countries that did not embark upon such a scheme. People from other lands would rush to Western Australia and swamp the country, which would be ruined in the attempt to find funds to maintain the surplus population of other nations. The general election brought in its train some important changes. On this subject I should like to refer to the appointment of Sir James Mitchell as Lieut.-Governor and to say that if a local appointment had to be made I know of no man who I would rather see occupying the high office than Sir James. In respect of the principle, however, I regret that an appointment was not made from the Old Country. I am of opinion that the saving—

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is there to be a saving?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I doubt very much, but I do feel that if we are making a saving in one direction the community is suffering a loss in more ways than one. It is a very good investment indeed to have a Governor appointed from Great Britain, because we know well that we need a great deal of representation in the Homeland. We require money from England, and we expect British people to invest money in our State. The people of Great Britain are not likely to entrust any money to our care unless they have in the State a direct re-

presentative, somebody who will give them definite advice from their point of view rather than from the Australian point of view. It would be interesting to know how much of the Supply we are being asked to vote is likely to be used in connection with the appointment of the Lieut.-Governor. The upkeep of Government House would still be the same, whether the appointment was made locally or from England. Likewise the grounds would have to be cared for whether the residence was occupied by a local or a British Governor. It would have been of the utmost importance for us to have a Governor from England remembering the result of the secession vote. On this question also it would be interesting to know how much from the Supply Bill is to be devoted towards pursuing further the decision of the people. Of course I have no reason to believe other than that the Government are going to push the matter forward strongly, because we know the feeling of the community, a feeling which I think is growing. Even the Commonwealth Government themselves are acknowledging that they have not done as much by way of helping in the development of Australia as they should have done. This we gather from the fact that now the Commonwealth want to take over the northern part of Australia. Evidently they have begun to realise that something in a big way has to be done. The Commonwealth have hamstrung us at every turn by their enormous tariff. Whether it was in the north or the south, we as a State have had to incur great expense by reason of the Federal tariff. The Wyndham freezing works, for instance have been heavily handicapped by the enormous duties levied on machinery required there. The Federal Government, by means of their tariff, have absolutely blocked the States from progressing. We know that when Federation was entered upon it was the one fear that the settlers had that the Federal Government would not take a broad view, and allow to the States a sufficient amount with which to carry on the work of development. Time has proved that those fears were very well based.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan interjected.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not know of any offer that was made five years ago except it was extremely in their own favour. What has occurred was never expected. I the early framers of the Constitution. I

am satisfied that the State can better handle the development of its own territory than can the Commonwealth. It was doing so very well before we entered into Federation. Our shipping is not likely to improve under Federal control, while with regard to the freezing works I understand that the Commonwealth have turned down a good proposition which has been made, because it was interfering, probably, with some of the channels that they hoped to keep open specially for themselves. I hope that negotiations will be finalised in the direction that will further help the Wyndham freezing works and the settlers in the pastoral areas who are hoping that by chilling and exporting the chilled beef they will materially assist the north. One naturally asks what has the Commonwealth done for the Northern Territory. I do not think we can view the results there with any degree of satisfaction. The development that has taken place in the Northern Territory is certainly not an encouragement to invite the Commonwealth to do likewise in our own areas in the North. It is suggested that we want to encourage the investment of capital in our back country, but we have gone so far in the direction of destroying confidence that it is difficult to raise money. We are looking more and more to loan money to enable us to carry out works that should be done out of revenue. We are going to be asked to find loan money for railways and we know full well it is going to be expended in those directions for which big freights have been levied. One has only to travel along the railways lines to see that they have been going back. The railways have made heavy demands upon the community, and it is sad to think that we now have to find larger amounts practically to maintain the ordinary service and build up where there has been a falling back. We are aware that settlers are not in a position to carry on much development work and maintain the improvements that have been made in past years, and that the majority find it impossible to borrow money under existing conditions. At the same time we find that the Government are not taking a very strong stand in that direction, because they are borrowing and spending money almost as freely as was done in prosperous times. Amongst the producers a great many have made up their minds not to use any money

that might be available. It is available to a fair number but in view of the outlook they are not inclined to increase their liabilities. At the same time there are some who do not take the same serious view of liabilities and are prepared to borrow. Also there are those who do not mind what rate of interest they pay. It is in that direction that the Federal Government, as well as the State Governments, have for a long time been in competition with private enterprise. That is one reason why the British investor, and the investor from outside, whom we should encourage have been more inclined to lend their money to the Government, who can make the whole country responsible for it, rather than bring it over here and invest it for themselves. Those investors are taking far less risk in lending to the Governments than in lending to private persons suffering from the effects of low prices of commodities. I hope we can look forward to the time when the Government will take a very much stronger hand in reducing this constant borrowing, which is entirely opposed to the welfare of the country. It is far better to leave the money for private enterprise. In that connection I will heartily applaud the Federal Government if only they will encourage the lending of money to private individuals. We had expected much from the World Economic Conference, but it strikes me that conference has rather failed. Certainly a great deal of good may yet come from its deliberations, but as yet very little has been done that will help us along. One thing troubling our settlers more than anything else is the Federal tariff, particularly the tariff on wire netting. At present wire netting is required by a great many settlers to keep the rabbits in check, and I should like to know from the Minister what amount of this Supply we are asked to pass will be available to help the settlers in the fencing of their properties. We have seen in the Press lately a good deal respecting toxic paralysis. I have made inquiries, but I cannot hear of the same trouble occurring in the Eastern States. However we know that through poisoned carcasses of rabbits being left about, great loss of stock has been sustained by the farmers and settlers of Western Australia, and consequently many of them are turning special attention to fencing. However, the Federal tariff and the Federal taxation make them feel it is hopeless to try to

carry on, since they have to compete in the outside world with other producers who can get these necessary goods at very much lower prices. Many of the wine-makers in the Swan district purchase grapes from the settlers, and they have told me that whereas the fruit can be purchased for £5 per ton, the Commonwealth Government extracts £16 for every ton of that fruit for which the settler receives only £5. That is a severe handicap on an industry which would be very successful were it not for that imposition.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How do you arrive at that figure?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have not the particulars here, but that it is correct I am assured by a wine-maker, who tells me that through the excise duty on a ton of fruit when turned into brandy spirit for the preservation of wines, the Commonwealth Government extract a revenue of £16. Again, we have all seen recently the wonderful success achieved by Mr. Simpson of Karragullen in open competition in London. That gentleman for the third year in succession has won a special cup for the production of the best fruit sent to the London market. Last year, the second year of his winning the cup, a replica of the cup was sent to Mr. Simpson, and he had to pay 28s. duty on it. This year he has won the cup for the third time, and so it will be forwarded to him as his property. However, he is making inquiries as to what duty will be chargeable on the cup itself when it arrives. It is deplorable to think that a man who has succeeded in producing a first-class article should thus be penalised for so doing.

Hon. W. J. Mann: For putting Australia on the map!

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes, for proving to the world that Australia can produce the finest fruit in the world. It is an excellent advertisement for Australia in general and Western Australia in particular. It is farcical that the Commonwealth Government should thus stand in our way, and it is time they gave us a better opportunity to do more with the money we expend, instead of putting on embargoes against men who are disposed to try to do their best for the reputation of this State. How can we expect young men to do their best in that regard unless they get some encouragement? As it is, there is a tendency for many of them to leave the country districts

and come into the towns. I urge the Government to find more money for the various country road boards, if only because of the difficulty those bodies have in collecting their rents. I hope the Government will embark upon a scheme under which more money will be distributed to the country road boards. In many instances, large sums of money have been lavishly expended on main roads, whereas many country road boards have not sufficient funds to carry out repairs to important roads in their respective districts. One reason for that is that so many of their ratepayers have unavoidably got into arrears with their rates. It is of no use the Government saying that more money must be raised from those people, because the ratepayers are in serious difficulties, and many of them are leaving their districts and seeking sustenance in other localities. For a long time past I have heard serious complaints from country districts of the treatment meted out by the Government to the road boards, and I hope the new Government will help the local authorities in keeping their roads in order.

Hon. G. Fraser: In other words, you want the Government to pay the wages of road board employees.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The Government, I understand, are going to find a large sum of money for the building of the proposed new Perth-Fremantle-road. It is said that the Government are not finding the money for the construction of that road, but that the funds are being provided out of metropolitan traffic fees. It seems extraordinary to spend the enormous sum per mile that I understand the construction of the road is to cost. It is wasteful extravagance, no matter what fund is drawn upon for the money. If it is to come out of traffic fees, there is a very good reason for demanding that traffic fees be reduced. A reduction of taxation of that kind would be justified because, when an unnecessarily large sum of money is extracted from motor users by way of traffic fees, there is always a danger of its being squandered. If it is spent rashly, numbers of people will be flocking into the city in order to share in the distribution of the money. I sincerely hope that the Government will not put any obstacle in the way of the bulk handling scheme being provided as speedily as possible. Last year Mr. T. Moore said his district did not require bulk handling. He may have been

speaking for farmers in the northern areas, but I can speak for the farmers in the province I represent, and I assure members that the large number of wheatgrowers in my province earnestly desire the scheme, and want the very cheapest scheme that can be provided. Those who are behind the scheme are making no demands upon the Railway Department for increased costs or upon the Government. Any probability of great expenditure being required in that direction seems to have been overcome. A large quantity of wheat was shipped in bulk last season, and every farmer who used the scheme knows that it enabled him to effect a very big saving. Other farmers are eager and anxious to see the scheme extended in order that they might participate in the cheaper costs.

Hon. T. Moore: Did not I say that the proposed scheme was not acceptable?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I understood the hon. member to say that the farmers in his district did not want bulk handling.

Hon. T. Moore: No, I said they did not want the proposed scheme.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The scheme was operated at seven sidings last season, and it is quite capable of being applied to a much greater number of sidings. I hope the work will be continued without interruption. It is of the utmost importance to all our farmers that the savings made possible by bulk handling should be effected. The Government are not being asked to spend a large sum of money, but they can help in the matter, and I appeal to them to give all possible assistance and enable the work to be proceeded with. When the Bulk Handling Bill was dropped, I was informed that the immediate effect was an extra cost to farmers of 2d. per bag because of the increase imposed by the bag trade. The loss of that Bill last session was a serious matter for the farmers, who are now looking to the Government for help in order that the scheme may be extended without delay. I repeat that the scheme involves the Government in no expense whatever, and surely the promoters of the scheme should be allowed to carry out the work as they desire at their own expense! The Government have not even been asked to give guarantees.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Were not the Government asked to provide storage at the port?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not think so. They were asked to give facilities. If the Government are desirous of taking a

hand in the scheme, their help will be welcomed. Those concerned are prepared to provide storage at the port as well as in the country. Because the late Government did not say yea or nay—mostly they said nay—in regard to storage, the people behind the bulk handling scheme have had to make their own arrangements for storage at the port. That involves extra handling costs. Those additional costs are claimed to be a mere bagatelle. The promoters of the scheme are prepared to provide storage at the port.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: The Government have not refused their storage at the port.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That is so, and the Government have not attempted to give them authority to erect storage at the port. Whatever is decided about storage at the port, it is to be hoped that the Government will afford facilities to provide it at the wharf in order to keep down costs to the farmers. There seems to be a tendency for various firms to enter into competition in the matter of providing bulk handling facilities. That may be all right; let them all embark on bulk handling schemes, if they so desire; but if too many different systems are installed at individual sidings, the probability is that the farmers will eventually be worse off and will not effect the savings they anticipated by operating their own scheme. A majority of the farmers favour the one scheme if they can get it. The Labour Party have succeeded in gaining control of the affairs of the State, and I look forward to their doing their best work. The Chief Secretary has the confidence of members of this House, and I hope he will enjoy a successful term of office, and that from time to time we shall be able to congratulate him and his colleagues on making a great success of the government of the State.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [4.57]: I should like to add my congratulations to the Hon. Mr. Drew on his again assuming the Leadership of the House. Though I deplore the necessity for it, in the circumstances we could have no better appointment than his. I also congratulate Mr. Kitson. When his appointment was announced, I told him it was not exactly what he deserved, but I do not think he quite understood what I meant. What I meant was that, in my opinion, he deserved a full portfolio and not an honorary Ministership. However, perhaps at some future date he may be granted a portfolio. I wish also to add

a few words, not only of personal opinion but echoing the opinion of people I represent regarding the appointment of Sir James Mitchell as Lieut.-Governor. I believe that it is one of the most popular appointments ever made, despite the bickerings of a few of the lesser lights in the Government party. I take some satisfaction from the fact that up to date none of the more responsible members of that party have joined in the dismal howl and undignified remarks made by some of the party regarding the appointment.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do not you think they should take some responsibility?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I have no information on that point, but I feel that they probably had some knowledge of what was done.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do not you think that someone who really has first hand information should make a statement on the matter.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Perhaps that will be done yet. I am not so much concerned about what other people are doing as to say I believe it is a very fitting reward for a very distinguished man, and I am sure he will fill the position worthily and uphold the dignity of the office. We read in this morning's paper a statement attributed to the Minister for Employment, wherein he outlined the scheme it was proposed to follow in the future. We have nothing more than that statement to go by, so it is hardly possible to analyse it fully. I notice that the proposed expenditure is at least double the amount that was spent by the previous Government. I have no objection to that provided the money is wisely spent, but I am somewhat anxious lest it be expended injudiciously. There are all sorts of ideas concerning the raising of wages quickly. I hope the time is not far distant when the economic position of the State will bring about an automatic increase of wages. We should proceed cautiously with the idea of full-time work and basic wage rates when most of the money must either come from loan, or be extorted from the pockets of the rest of the community, who are having a relatively bad time themselves. There are many people in this State who, although they are keeping smiling faces and endeavouring to appear contented, are having a very lean time. I am a little fearful lest we may

in the near future find the Government coming down with some extremely disagreeable taxation proposals, and being told that unless we pass such measures we are going to take the bread out of the mouths of unemployed. I trust that the Government in their attempt to relieve an unfortunate position will remember that there are many people whose circumstances are anything but satisfactory. I do not know how the Government view this problem of unemployment, but apparently they look upon it as a permanency. I infer that from the action which has been taken to set up quite a large-sized organisation in that part of the old town hall buildings occupied by the Tourist and other departments. I should have thought, and I think members will agree with me, that in a situation like this, which we all trust is only temporary, nothing but temporary accommodation would be necessary. I believe quite a lot of the accommodation is, however, being set aside, that the large room occupied by the Electoral Department is to be turned into a board room, and that we are to see quite a fair-sized departmental organisation set up. All this may be justified, but I was hopeful that the question would be dealt with in a manner that would not necessitate the expenditure of a great deal of money. I may be misinformed, but I have been told that the alterations to the buildings will cost about £600. That is a fairly big sum to spend in this direction. If the expenditure was to cover space for the accommodation of a permanent department, one would not have so much to say, but to spend the money for this purpose seems to be unwarranted. I notice that the Government are providing for the relief of about 14,000 men. I understood a few months ago that the Labour Party undertook, when assuming office, materially to reduce the number of unemployed within a few weeks, and that instead of the figures going up they would come down. This has not yet occurred. It seems, as a result of the estimate put forward by the Government and the arrangements they are making to cope with the situation, that they anticipate an even greater number of unemployed. Amongst the 14,000 persons affected are included about 4,000 single men. I commend the Government for their attention to the latter. In the past many single men

have had to suffer considerable hardships. I know quite a number of decent young men who are anxious to work but have been unable to obtain employment. In many cases their parents have also been unemployed, and yet they have been unable to get even the meagre sum of 7s. a week which was granted in exceptional cases. I am speaking of the country districts, because I am not so familiar with the situation in the city. Even to-day many young men are unable to get any measure of assistance. This is having a very serious effect on their minds. I was in the unfortunate position during the week end of hearing several young men discussing the trend of world events. I gathered from their modernistic ideas that there was a feeling in their minds that was not good. They had reached the stage when they believed that the temporary phase through which we are passing was a permanent one. I was sorry to think that as a result of the unfortunate circumstances through which these young fellows were passing there was being forced upon them an undesirable complex. I hope the Government will go carefully into the matter and see that the men get reasonable relief, particularly in cases which can be substantiated as deserving of help. The Government scheme is handed to us, in the words attributed to the Minister for Employment, as one for the solution of the problem of the restoration of the purchasing power of the workers of the world. I do not know whether the word "worker" was used by design or accident. Rather than that one section should have been singled out, I should have preferred to see the word "people" used. "Worker" seems to savour of a class idea, which I hope is not in the minds of the Government.

The Honorary Minister: Are we not all workers?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Not when one wants to get work done in certain directions. We are told that unless a man has a union ticket he cannot be called a worker.

Hon. E. H. Gray: A man cannot work in your business without a ticket.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Many people are doing so. There should be no bar of that kind to a man getting work. It is purely and simply class.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Lawyers and doctors will not tell you that.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Mr. Gray may be an authority on lawyers and doctors. The only ticket the lawyer and doctor gets is the ticket from the University showing his standard of ability. I am sure that in many cases a union ticket does not show the standard of ability of the holder. So long as a man can put up his 25s., he gets a ticket whether he can do any work or not. I do not think the hon. member's analogy holds good. I want to see all sections dealt with fairly. If the Government will work to that end they will have no better supporter than I shall be. It is fair to point out these things at the beginning and object to any question of class. Arrangements are being made to house the Tourist Department in Hay-street. I hoped the Government would take advantage of that site and do a little more in the way of advertising our tourist resources. We seem to have no real conception of what the tourist business means to any country. I have quoted figures on many occasions showing the colossal amount that has been spent in the past in this form of travel. In this State we have quite a number of excellent tourist resorts, to which people should be encouraged to go instead of spending their holiday money elsewhere. I hope the Government will do something in the direction of rebuilding Cave House at Yallingup. I condemned the previous Government for neglecting this work. Cave House was burnt down and a portion of the insurance money expended upon it. I said last year that £1,000 had been spent, and was told that it had gone in refurbishing. I have been unable to see where that money was spent.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Was not the insurance money paid and taken into revenue?

Hon. W. J. MANN: I believe it was put into a trust fund, less the amount expended for the replacement of cutlery and crockery.

Hon. J. Cornell: Perhaps it was credited to the trust fund but spent in other directions.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Possibly that is so. I think every member who has visited the Cave House will appreciate the fact that it is a beautiful place. In its present condition, however, one would hesitate to ask visitors, especially those from overseas, to go there. I hope the Government will do something in this matter. It is well war-

ranted; the place is well conducted, and given ordinary facilities would certainly become a revenue producer. True, I am not keen on enterprises conducted by the State; but I believe that Cave House, as regards its conduct, furnishes an exception, the managers having been most careful. There have been no excesses, and no grounds for complaint, as has been the case in other quarters. If the Government cannot see their way clear to expend the amount of money necessary to bring the place into reasonable, habitable repair, their best course would be to lease it. Something needs to be done. Next I wish to make an appeal on behalf of many country people, including some in the group settlements, regarding veterinary advice and assistance. The Agricultural Bank, so far as I know, has only one veterinary officer, who is stationed at Margaret River—Colonel Le Souef. That gentleman is supposed to furnish veterinary assistance throughout the entire system. Though not provided with any means of transport except the train service, he is expected to travel 150 miles to Pemberton, and to make other journeys all over the South-West of the kind which are impossible for any man to accomplish. There is a dearth of qualified veterinary surgeons in Western Australia, and until quite recently I had the impression that this shortage was due to an all-round scarcity of veterinary surgeons. I am informed, however, by the highest veterinary circles that that view is not correct, and that the reason for the sparsity of qualified men in this State lies in the fact that no encouragement is given them to come here. I suggest to the Minister controlling the Agricultural Department that he inquire what is done in the Eastern States. There, I believe, veterinary clubs exist, the farmers paying annual subscriptions and the Government subsidising those receipts so that the farmers may get a fully qualified veterinary surgeon to reside in their midst and render the assistance which is so highly necessary. It would be difficult to compute the loss which has been incurred by our Agricultural Bank through the want of provision in this direction. Hundreds of valuable animals have perished simply owing to the fact of no veterinary assistance being obtainable. I desire to congratulate the Minister for Railways on his proposal to expend money on the upkeep of the State

railway system. It is quite true that through what may be termed enforced neglect, much of the railway equipment is in a bad way. Without labouring the question, let me express the hope that the Government will set aside such funds as are needed to allow the Minister to do the work. I am glad to know the Government have at last realised that the Bunbury harbour is worthy of much more attention than it has received in the past. I believe the Government intend to put in hand some highly necessary works there. At the same time they should go into the question of cold storage at Bunbury, and see whether something cannot be done to improve local shipping facilities by the erection of a cold storage depot at the port. In one part of the South-Western Province there is an agitation for a short line of railway to connect Collie with Dardanup, using the old Millars line for the purpose. It is claimed that if that were done the heavy expense necessitated by haulage over the present railway would be obviated. I commend the investigation of the project to the Government. I am told that if it were put into effect, it would materially improve the position in regard to transporting the coal output of Collie.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Macfarlane, debate adjourned.

BILL—GOVERNMENT TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.23] in moving the second reading said: As far back as 1912 it was recognised that the time might come when the Commissioner for Railways would require, in the interest of his department, adjuncts to the tramway system; and, in an amendment of the Tramways Act passed that year, power was taken to meet, as far as could then be foreseen, the position which was likely to arise. The amendment to which I have referred has never been availed of, but the progress of science has led to a new development in methods of traffic which the Commissioner desires to utilise in the interests of economy and without impairment of efficiency. I refer to the electric trolley bus, which has proved so successful in other parts of the world, and which the previous Government decided to introduce here.

The purpose of the Bill is to amend Section 21 of the Government Tramways Act, 1912, in order to enable the Commissioner of Railways to run motor buses in conjunction with the Government tramway system. It was recently decided to institute an electric trolley bus service between East Perth and West Leederville; and as an electric trolley omnibus is not a similar vehicle to a motor omnibus, it is necessary to amend the Tramways Act in order to give statutory authority to the Commissioner of Railways to operate such a system in conjunction with the existing tramway service and to make and enforce suitable by-laws to control such a system. East Perth was formerly served by a branch of the existing tramway system, but the track became worn out, and it was considered that the cost of relaying it, together with road maintenance, would not be justified in view of the small amount of traffic offering. It was then decided to institute the trolley bus system.

It was considered that this system would be more advantageous to the State than a motor omnibus system inasmuch as it would be run by electric power produced at the Government power station at East Perth. As Collie coal is used for the production of this power, we will thus be able to provide a certain measure of additional employment and at the same time keep the money in the State, whereas with motor buses the fuel used has to be imported.

Hon. members will no doubt be interested to learn what has been the experience elsewhere in regard to trolley buses. In England they have grown in popularity since they were first used, about 12 years ago. I will give some figures in reference to the matter, taken from the returns of the Statistical Department of the Minister for Transport, covering the ten years 1921-22 to 1931-32—

TROLLEY BUS ROUTE MILES.

Year.	Route Miles Operated.	Car Miles Run.	Passengers Carried.
1921-22	47	1,374,444	9,879,730
1931-32	256	19,739,000	184,373,000

In the United States of America trolley buses have found favour, and there are, in operation to-day, 135 miles of route opened

for traffic. From Mr. C. J. Spencer's paper "Electric Trolley Omnibuses," read in London on the 30th April, 1933, I quote the following—

About a year ago a questionnaire was sent to all the trolley bus undertakings in the States, inviting information regarding costs and revenue and the attitude of the public towards the services. With one exception the returns showed either that there had been an actual increase in revenue on the trolley bus services compared with the previous year, or that the decrease in revenue was far less than on sections operated by motor buses or trancars. Every operator was emphatic in stating that the trolley bus was by far the most popular type of vehicle.

The London United Tramways are operating trolley buses over one of their routes which was previously a street tramway. This is a subsidiary company of the London Underground and London General Omnibus Company under the chairmanship of Lord Ashfield, who is also chairman of the London Passenger Transport Board. These are the latest figures available for one year—

Route miles 17; trolley bus mile run, 2,449, 017; passengers carried, 26,887,817.

Birmingham operates a large trolley bus service, and has recently placed a further order for 50 Leyland trolley buses. The Wolverhampton Corporation has entirely abandoned tramways and have turned to trolley buses. The same applies to Ipswich. Hastings and Nottingham propose to do the same. The trolley bus has been adopted in most instances in place of relaying worn out tracks and to permit of the use of a vehicle that can pick up passengers from the foot-path and set them down similarly. The silent running of trolley buses in place of tram cars, has caused their general demand in large cities. Another point to be taken into consideration is that they are able to negotiate in and out of traffic. They do not require the same amount of roadway exclusively for their use. The trolley bus is silent in operation and causes no smell or danger from fire. Highly inflammable fuel, which is always a source for danger in an accident, is not carried. With the trolley bus system in Perth, local coal will be used and employment given to miners whereas with petrol or crude oil, the fuel has to be imported. This in itself is an important economic factor in countries not possessing oil as their local fuel. It has been stated that each trolley bus in service

means employment for one coal miner. This in the aggregate, is no doubt true when we consider the number of hands a ton of coal passes through from the coal face to the power station boilers. The relative cost of operating trolley and petrol buses respectively is—

Trolley bus, 12.21d. per bus mile; petrol bus, 12.83d. per bus mile.

I am informed by the General Manager of the Electricity Supply Department that the favour with which this new form of transport is viewed in London is such that on the routes of the London General Omnibus Company over which trolley and petrol buses operate, people allow the petrol buses to pass in order to ride in the trolley buses. Another recommendation the trolley bus has is that by virtue of its being electrically driven, it has all the advantages of silent and clear running and none of the disadvantages of the bus driven by internal combustion engines. The cost for a trolley bus system compared with tramways, assuming two vehicles to be run, is estimated to be £15,250 for the tramways and £5,650 for the trolley buses. The following table indicates how this result is arrived at:—

Tramways—Permanent way per mile, £9,500; two tram cars, £5,000; overhead line, £750; total, £15,250.

Trolley Buses—Permanent way per mile, nil; two buses, £4,400; overhead line, £1,250; total, £5,650.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Does that estimate for the trolley buses include the body?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: These particulars are given to me as covering the whole cost.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Can you tell me how much the local body will cost as against the imported cost? I understand that one bus has been imported complete and the other had to have a body provided locally.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have given the House the total cost of the trams and the two buses and I understand they cover the whole cost.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: Is any reference made in the estimate to the cost of maintenance and repairing the roads?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No. The Perth City Council will probably do that work. I think I have said enough to show

the Mitchell Government acted very wisely in introducing the trolley bus system. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. M. MACFARLANE (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.40]: I support the second reading of the Bill, but I am not altogether impressed by the story the Minister has told regarding the trolley buses. I realise that, compared with the tramway service we have to-day, the trolley buses have many advantages. They are mobile and sure to be much more silent in operation than the trams. They are also of advantage because they are not so costly to instal. I look at the matter from another standpoint, which has not been mentioned by the Minister. I wish something could have been done some years ago so that a very fine body of men could have been freed from the harassing they have experienced for some time. They helped to open up the outer portions of the metropolitan area, and it is a pity that they should have been so handicapped by restrictive regulations, which became not only a source of embarrassment to the proprietors of charabancs but to the public as well. I trust that if the trolley bus system proves successful, the present regulations will be removed and there will be a "free-go" for everyone who can secure a license for the transport of passengers. The traffic fees are sufficiently heavy with regard to the charabancs, but they at least give the proprietors of those conveyances an opportunity to build up their businesses, maintain excellent services, and provide work for a large number of people. The charabanc service between Perth and Fremantle has grown to a wonderful degree during the past few years, in competition with Government-run concerns, and that indicates that the business men concerned have the brains and ability to make a success of the undertaking. I would sooner support a body of men with initiative behind them in the running of such concerns than I would a monopoly such as the tramway service undoubtedly is. The charabancs have provided a much more frequent service than was otherwise available to the public by means of Government-run concerns, and surely we must recognise that the tramway system, as we know it, is obsolete. Should new districts

be opened up and transport services be required, then I trust that, if the trolley system between Leederville and East Perth proves successful, it will be extended to such centres. I hope that in future, when the business people have made a success of such services, the Government will not tell them to clear out and hand over their business to the State. I hold no brief for the charabanc people and I have not discussed this matter with them. I have been associated with various deputations regarding the traffic regulations, and I know the injustice that has been experienced by people who have been rendering a service to the public without any financial assistance from the Government. The trolley bus service should be suitable for the requirements of the people in the metropolitan area. While the Leader of the House has quoted figures, he has not told us exactly how the buses compare with the tramway system as we know it. For that reason I was not very much impressed by the figures the Minister submitted. I believe that the two trolley buses that will be in commission are luxurious vehicles and will be appreciated by the people who will use them. Perhaps Mr. Franklin, in his capacity as Lord Mayor of Perth, will remember that 14 or 15 years ago the City Council discussed the question of installing trolley buses and I should have imagined that, had they proved the success the Minister has indicated, even greater results would have been shown by this time. If the system has been so successful elsewhere, why has it not been adopted by the Government before? I take it the Superintendent of Tramways would have some knowledge of this method of transportation. It seems to me to indicate a lack of interest in the people's welfare, if the trolley bus system is so successful elsewhere, that it has not been introduced before. I hope it will not be long before the buses are in operation, and that if we have to import the chassis for the extension of the scheme, private enterprise will have an opportunity to compete for the construction of the bodies.

On motion by Hon. J. T. Franklin, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.