

of sand-cement bricks; but if a building constructed with them is surrounded by a verandah—which is very necessary in our climate—I contend there is no better material that could be used and no more comfortable home could be erected. The use of sand-cement bricks, which are hollow, leads to the coolest possible home, which is a great advantage in our excessively hot summer days.

Hon. C. R. Cornish: Hear, hear!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Another point is that we do not need skilled tradesmen to make them, and a tremendous quantity can be made in a day. Moreover, they can be laid very quickly. But is the Government using that material, or does it intend to do so? We want to know these things, not for the sake of criticism but in order that we may be helpful. The scarcity of homes is shocking. A house was advertised the other day, and a friend of mine got out of bed at six o'clock and applied for it. He said there were between 140 and 150 people there already, and he was there at ten minutes past six. That shows how acute the position is. But without illustrations of that kind, we know how serious the problem is; we know how people have been herded in hovels in which insanitary conditions must prevail. What is facing us is this: Our men are coming home; that is to say, those are coming home that the Commonwealth Government is not keeping in the Army, for apparently the intention of the Government is to keep as many men and women in the Services as long as it can because it is not ready to do the things it has been promising to do for years.

For the last three years the Commonwealth Government has been promising to provide work for these people. I ask: Where is that work? Nothing is ready. Houses have been promised, but not one home was built in 1944. Where are the homes for these people who will be returning from the war? Let it not be forgotten that many of our young men were married but had no homes of their own. Their wives stayed with relatives. But the men are coming back and expect to have homes to which to take their wives. There are none; they are homeless. Only in the last few weeks has any preparation been made though there has been a lot of talk and Press articles, which have meant nothing.

It is up to every one of us to put his shoulder to the wheel and see what he can do to assist in the matter; and we can assist only if we know the position. I hope, therefore, that the House will agree to the motion so that we shall be able to look through the papers and, thus fortified, set out to assist in whatever way we can, if there is any way possible.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 11th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 8.40 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 28th August, 1945.

	PAGE
Murchison electorate, return of member after appointment as Minister	379
Greenough electorate, report of Panel of Inquiry	380
Resolution: The War, message from Minister for the Navy	380
Questions	
Pig industry—(a) as to prices payable by Britain	380
(b) as to losses during railway transport	381
Perth Hospital, as to manpower and materials for completing	381
Pardelup prison escapees, as to Mr. Barker lock-up and stricter control	381
Assent to Bill	382
Address-in-reply, twelfth day	382

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

MURCHISON ELECTORATE.

Return of Member After Appointment as Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the return of a writ for the vacancy (Ministerial by-election) in the Murchison electorate showing that William Mortimer Marshall has been duly elected. I am prepared to swear in the hon. member.

Hon. W. M. Marshall took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

GREENOUGH ELECTORATE.*Report of Panel of Inquiry.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have consulted with the panel of hon. members nominated by me to determine whether a vacancy has occurred in the seat for the electoral district of Greenough, and have to report—

1. That I obtained from the Minister for Air, under date the 22nd August, a letter which sets out (inter alia) that certain advices have been received to the effect that Flight-Lieutenant J. V. Newton was lost over German territory on the night of the 14th January, 1944, and that since then inquiries have been made through the International Red Cross, but no news concerning Flight-Lieutenant J. V. Newton has been received. Under those circumstances the provisions of the National Security (War Deaths) Regulation 6 have been resorted to, and a certificate of death issued in respect of Flight-Lieutenant J. V. Newton.

2. I accept with very great regret the finding set out in the above letter, that *prima facie* Flight Lieutenant J. V. Newton is dead, and the panel appointed by me agrees in this finding, but in view of the possibility of such death not being a fact, I recommend that nomination day be fixed not earlier than the 26th September next, so as to provide for the application of Section 38, paragraph 5 of the Constitution Act Amendment Act, 1899.

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam): I move—

That the report be received.

Question put and passed.

RESOLUTION—THE WAR.*Message from Minister for the Navy.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a message from the Minister for the Navy reading as follows:—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman, Speaker, Legislative Assembly, Perth. Desire to thank all members of Legislative Assembly of Western Australia for resolution passed conveying the deepest thanks of the people of Western Australia to the Fighting Men of Australia for the magnificent service they have given. I shall be pleased to convey this resolution to the Government and members of the Royal Australian Navy. (Sgd.) Norman Makin, Minister for Navy.

QUESTIONS.**PIG INDUSTRY.**

(a) *As to Prices Payable by Britain.*

Mr. MANN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

1, For how much longer is the payment of the present prices for pig meats to continue?

2, What is the expiry date of the existing agreement for the United Kingdom Government to take all Australia's surplus of pig meats?

3, Are the prices payable by the United Kingdom Government under such agreement subject to variation from time to time?

4, If so, are the variations specified in the agreement?

5, If not, what notice will be given to producers of the variations in price?

6, Is there any guarantee that future prices will be profitable to producers and if so for how long?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Pig meat prices are fixed by the Commonwealth in accordance with values provided for under the Commonwealth Pig Meat Acquisition Plan. The plan provides for twelve months' notice of any reduction in the prices at which pig meats are acquired. Notice of intention to reduce prices has not yet been given, and it is understood that present prices will continue until 30th September, 1946.

2, The agreement covers a four-year period ending 30th September, 1948. Regarding the first two years of the agreement the United Kingdom Government will purchase the total quantities made available. Quantities for each of the last two years are to be a matter for annual negotiation between the United Kingdom Government and the Commonwealth Government.

3, Yes, but reasonable notice of intention to vary prices must be given by either Government.

4, No, variations are a matter for negotiation between the two Governments.

5, It is understood that twelve months' notice would be given to the industry of any changes in prices under the agreement entered into with the United Kingdom Government.

6, Answered by questions Nos. 1 and 5.

(b) As to Losses during Railway Transport.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Railways:

1, What number of pigs died in course of transport over the railways to—(a) the metropolitan fat stock market; (b) bacon factories in the metropolitan area; (c) country stock sales, during the years ended 30th June, 1944 and 1945?

2, In how many cases—(a) were claims lodged against the department for the loss of such pigs? (b) were such claims paid, and what were the amounts involved?

The MINISTER replied:

1, This information is not recorded.

2, (a) One claim was lodged in respect of pigs delayed in transit to Midland Junction saleyards; (b) The department accepted partial responsibility for the delay and compensation paid accordingly

PERTH HOSPITAL.*As to Manpower and Materials for Completing.*

Mr. LESLIE asked the Minister for Health:

1, Has the Government made any effort to secure the immediate release of manpower and material required to speedily complete the construction and equipment of the new Perth Hospital?

2, When is it expected that this work will be completed and the hospital be available for occupation?

The MINISTER replied:

1, To achieve this result a higher priority than is at present available will be necessary, and this matter has been taken up by the Premier with the Prime Minister.

2, No estimate can be given until the question of priority and release has been settled.

PARDELUP PRISON ESCAPEES.*As to Mt. Barker Lock-up and Stricter Control.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister representing the Chief Secretary:

1, Does he know that while in police custody at Mt. Barker lock-up four recaptured escapees from Pardelup Prison made a further break away from the lock-up?

2, Is it correct that their means of escape from the Mt. Barker lock-up was by

the removal of a sheet of iron from the roof of the place in which they were detained?

3, Is it a fact that another prisoner who escaped from Pardelup at the same time had been taken to the Albany gaol?

4, If so, what was the reason why the four men were placed in the Mt. Barker lock-up and not in a place of safer custody?

5, In view of the statement in the 1942 report of the Comptroller-General of Prisons that "the best behaved and most responsive as well as first offenders" are imprisoned at Pardelup, is it a fact that one of the prisoners who escaped was serving a sentence of four years' imprisonment for stealing with violence, and another eighteen months for incest and if so, what justification can be advanced for allowing these prisoners to be at Pardelup in a closely settled district of farming properties where women and children are frequently left without sufficient protection?

6, If the facts are as stated above, and bearing in mind nine escapes from Pardelup for the year ended the 30th June, 1942, and two for the year ended the 30th June, 1943, will he take steps to ensure —(a) that prisoners convicted of such offences as were mentioned above are not imprisoned at Pardelup; (b) that stricter supervision is exercised over all prisoners at Pardelup? If not, why not?

7, Is it a fact that prisoners from Pardelup are allowed out on public roads unattended by an officer or warder, and if so, will he undertake that this practice will cease, and if not why not?

8, If it is intended that future escapees from Pardelup are to be lodged at the Mt. Barker lock-up after recapture, will he take steps immediately to provide premises from which escapes such as that which took place last week will be impossible in the future?

9, Is he aware that at intervals over many years there has been grave concern among residents living on the farms in the district at the number of escapes that have taken place and the lack of sufficient protection which have resulted in the stealing of motor vehicles, firearms, and other articles, and will he undertake that every possible step be taken to prevent a recurrence of these occurrences?

The MINISTER FOR THE NORTH-WEST replied:

1, Yes.

2, Yes.

3, Yes.

4, It was considered that the Mount Barker lock-up was quite suitable.

5, Every care is exercised in the selection of prisoners for Pardelup in accordance with the statement of the Comptroller General of Prisons referred to. The honour system prevails at Pardelup and it is to be regretted that all prisoners have not fulfilled expectations.

6, (a) Only under exceptional circumstances have prisoners convicted of these offences been or will be transferred to Pardelup; (b) This is constantly receiving the attention of the department.

7, No. The only occasion prisoners are permitted on public roads is when the officer-in-charge enlists the service of a prisoner to assist in driving stock.

8, The matter of providing a new police station and lock-up at Mount Barker is under consideration.

9, The recent escapade at Pardelup on V.P. night may have given rise to some concern among residents living on adjacent farms, but having regard to the number of prisoners treated at Pardelup over the years, it can be said that this was an exception rather than the rule. Everything possible is being done and will continue to be done to prevent any repetition of the occurrences referred to.

ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Lieut.-Governor received and read notifying assent to the Supply Bill (No. 1), £2,700,000.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Twelfth Day.

Debate resumed from the 23rd August.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [4.40]: I desire to associate myself with all the kind references that have been made in the congratulatory addresses to the members who have recently been promoted. I wish to sympathise with the member for Geraldton in his indisposition and I hope that it is not of a serious or permanent nature. I feel quite optimistic that, after he has imbibed the serene docility of these cross-benches and has rested in the peaceful

atmosphere that now surrounds him, he will be restored to his former good health. We have the member for Murchison in quite a new role. He has been allotted a very heavy task for an inexperienced Minister, but the hon. member has displayed courage and initiative and I believe that, with the goodwill of members during his initial efforts, he will render very valuable service as an administrator of State. I think it is reasonable to be generous and to extend goodwill to new Ministers, and then later on, if the goods are not delivered, they will come under the fire of criticism that is generally applied to those of more mature experience.

We have seen the member for Roebourne promoted to one of the administrative positions of Parliament. The hon. member—quiet, unassuming and matter-of-fact—is the very antithesis of what we in this House have grown accustomed to and, while he may not be quite as helpful as has been our experience, I am inclined to think he will prove just as exacting. Somehow or other I associate the hon. member's elevation to the Chairmanship of Committees with my earliest experience in Parliament. Many years ago I had the privilege of being elected a member when Parliament sat in the Town Hall buildings. The Legislative Assembly Chamber was then where the Commonwealth Savings Bank is now located. The Speaker was the Hon. Sir James Lee Steere, who was a very fine interpreter of constitutional law and Parliamentary procedure and had a special gift of ruling the House firmly. On one occasion the turbulent member of those days—the late Charles Moran—was making one of his speeches and directing a very vicious attack—I think I can safely use that term—from the Opposition side against the Government benches. After working himself up, the defence remaining silent, he leant over, shook his fist, and said, "I will say this." Sir James Lee Steere sat up very quickly and in a quiet voice remarked, "The hon. member had better not." That was the end of it; he did not make the utterance as intended, and things were more peaceful as a result. I feel that the member for Roebourne is going to be one of the type that will not say a great deal, and I am not going to take the risk of ignoring him, as I am afraid I have been in the habit of doing in the past because I thought I might get away with it.

I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches delivered during this debate. I have been a persistent advocate of Parliamentary reform from within Parliament itself. I find that there is a growing feeling amongst members and in other circles that we in this State cannot continue as we have been doing in the past and that the need for reform is becoming more pronounced as we grow older. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition displayed very great anxiety during his speech regarding the little control that Parliament has over the spending of money. For years I have emphasised that we are not consulted about expenditure. Neither is it possible for us to be consulted, owing to the operations of the Loan Council and the financial arrangements between the Commonwealth and the States. The hon. member wanted a public works committee to be appointed, but I suggest that he is a little late in making the proposal because I do not think that any public works committee could function, owing to the special arrangements that are necessary to fit in with the various gatherings that take place for the control of State finances, both Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings.

Concern was expressed by the member for Nedlands that we were not as closely in touch with the people as we might be, and he suggested that we should attempt to contact the people more closely and endeavour to gain their good will. The contribution by the member for Claremont was much along the same lines, though his idea of bringing the State Parliament more under the notice of the electors was that the Press should be more generous in the space allotted to the reporting of Parliament. Members will recall that he went so far as to suggest that, if this could not be arranged, we should have glass cases outside of town halls in which speeches could be pinned up for the information of those electors who have very little knowledge of what is going on inside this Chamber because of the limited Press space given to the reporting of members' speeches.

The Minister for Lands: I am glad he did not suggest pinning up our photographs as well.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think he went to that extent.

The Minister for Lands: Just as well.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The most satisfying item of all I have read or heard in recent times—and it is associated with the period during which Parliament has been in session—was a leading article in "The West Australian" of the 9th August headed, "Beggars and Profiteers." This article was very illuminating and demonstrated that "The West Australian" newspaper is fully conscious of the serious financial position of this State owing to the expansion of Commonwealth activity into spheres that were previously the responsibility of the State. The article points out that Western Australia is a mendicant State and continues—

The claimant States—

meaning Western Australia, South Australia and Tasmania—

are mendicants because yearly they have to beg from the more prosperous East a sufficient grant of funds to enable them to function on a lower standard of community well-being than the Eastern States enjoy.

It proceeds to point out that Commonwealth-wide protection has enabled New South Wales and Victoria—

to reap hugely increased wartime revenues, while Queensland has prospered, partly through Federal assistance to sugar and butter and partly through the concentration of the physical side of the war effort in that State. These large surplus revenues have not yet been spent . . . They have therefore been placed in reserve for use after the war in financing rehabilitation policies.

The position of this State is, as is pointed out in the article, dependent upon the goodwill of the Grants Commission, which is bound by the arrangements outlined in the Commonwealth legislation which created that body. The article continues—

After 12 years of Commonwealth grants as recommended by the Grants Commission, Western Australia has been brought not one pound nearer to being able to carry on without an annual Commonwealth grant.

The article then proceeds to refer to uniform taxation. I notice that the same journal has contributed during the last day or two a very helpful article on uniform taxation, but I do not propose to comment on that. In the article from which I have been quoting, after referring to uniform taxation and Dr. Evatt's hopes in that connection, the writer proceeds—

However the decision goes, Western Australia cannot regard the future with equanimity.

The article concludes—and this is the main point made, and it is a serious one—

But this mendicant State will live on the dole for ever unless something drastic is done to overcome the causes of our chronic need for Federal aid.

That is a peculiar statement, coming as it does from a journal that did its best to prevent from being implemented the policy that had been formulated to overcome the weaknesses of the mendicant States. When the Federal authorities outlined a way of overcoming that which the newspaper says will become a permanent weakness unless something is done; when something had been put into proper shape and submitted to the people whereby what the article advocates might have been done, that journal was not prepared to give such a proposal its support. I admit there is room for a difference of opinion on details in regard to policies of that kind; but, when the position is as serious as this article indicates, "The West Australian" should have been more liberal with its space in giving the case for the passing of the Referendum than it was during the period in which the people of Australia were being educated as to the arguments for and against the proposition.

Mr. McDonald: The paper gave equal space to both sides.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am glad to hear that; I am not in a position to deny it. I do not think that the case for and against was altogether out of balance; but the feeling I had was that, instead of there being a difference of opinion, a division between those of us who have studied the weak position of this State, we should have tried to make common cause and arrive at some understanding that would not place us in the position which I think, before I sit down, I will prove we are in at present. The paper goes on to say that a permanent remedy is not so easy to find. We all know that a permanent remedy is not easy to find by the maintenance of State Parliaments. If State Parliaments are going to continue, the remedy is difficult; but if we approach the problem, as it must be approached ultimately, from an Australia-wide point of view, it will be for the National Parliament, which now controls the purse and has taken that control from the States, to meet special needs—not

by a Commonwealth grant but by full responsibility for the general administration of this State and its development.

I find myself in agreement with "The West Australian" at the moment. But the point is that, while it now exposes the position, it must appreciate, with me, that the State's financial outlook is not improving. In this connection I am going to refer to figures I quoted during the discussion of the Estimates last year. I then went to some trouble to analyse the financial position, and pointed out in my Budget speech that we could not accept the situation complacently but had to realise the serious position in which we were placed. I pointed out that the Treasurer during that financial year (1943-44) had had a windfall in the shape of two large amounts of money, one being a sum of about £50,000 over and above the estimated revenue from totalisator receipts; and the other, a like sum—about £48,000—because of an increased contribution, over and above the estimate, from probate. In other words, at the time, £102,600 was received from these two items of excess revenue. That sum was beyond all anticipation. When we had that amount we finished up with a surplus, in round figures, of about £38,000. In the ordinary course of events, without that £102,000 there would have been no surplus. In actual fact—if we get down to sound economics—that amount, coming at a time when we could not spend money on special works of development, should have been put, as the Eastern States have done, into reserves so that it would be available when we have to face the enormous task of rehabilitation. That was last year.

We have not had the figures for this year, other than the statement made at the close of the financial year at the 30th June last. Apart from the Treasurer's statement made at that time we have had no information regarding the details of the items as published. Again an extraordinary thing has happened. Again two items have been buoyant in that the totalisator tax has contributed over £55,000 more than the estimate. The explanation of that is the presence of large numbers of good spenders, in the shape of our friends from America, who contributed to the buoyancy of the totalisator contributions. Probate, unfortunately, was buoyant to the extent of about

£65,000 over and above the estimate of £210,000. In addition—and this is a special item of interest—the stamp duty which was estimated to produce £220,000 gave us £30,800 above that amount. These figures are for the 30th June, 1945. The buoyancy of the stamp duty figures is an indication of a change-over from the wartime period to the post-war requirements, and evidently of people adjusting their businesses and activities so as to be ready to face the altered conditions at the close of hostilities. Whatever the cause, we have there a sum of £151,000 beyond the estimated revenue and yet we finished the year with a surplus of a little less than £5,000.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Do you not think the drought increased the expenditure?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is so. We must realise that there are always ups and downs in all economic problems.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: You are only dealing with the "ups" at the moment.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am picking out the extraordinary contributions of special items, as being contributions towards the State's position. Had the State not received these special amounts it would have finished the year with a substantial deficiency. I regard these figures as ominous. For some years now I have tried to get members to appreciate that we cannot go on as we are at present. There must come a time when we, as a Parliament, must face the position. We must try to do something to fit our Parliament in with the altered economic position of the present time as a result of the penetration of the Commonwealth Government into what were previously the affairs of the State. We must also study the troubles of this State, and overcome the difficulty outlined by "The West Australian" on the 9th August when it declared that we would be on the dole.

If we are going to be on the dole let us be on it on a proper economic basis. Do not let it be of a casual kind. Let us know exactly where we are and how best we can approach the position. But today we are on the dole and ignoring the fact because we happen to have the Grants Commission which reviews the position of the State and ladels out a certain amount of money, not based on the requirements of this State, but to give to the State its just dues compared with what is being spent in what

are called the standard States, namely, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. If they are buoyant we get a little less; if they are down we get a little more, comparatively. In other words, if they have a surplus we get enough to give us a surplus; if they have a deficiency then our position is eased to the extent that we are not looked upon as being incompetent because we have a deficiency.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: There are other factors.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know, but one cannot go into detail at the moment. Naturally more detail will be presented by the Treasurer, and by other speakers, as a result of the information given, when the Budget is delivered. I find it difficult to follow the finances of the State until I get in my possession the report on the Public Accounts, and have had time to analyse them to the standard of my ability. We have to realise, as members, that, as has been pointed out, the standard States, apart from their current revenue and their annual Estimates, have, as "The West Australian" pointed out, put into reserve large sums of money to meet the rehabilitation period. We will be in the position that we will be judged by comparison with those other States. That is going to be a very serious position. None of us is prepared to say that our people should receive less consideration than is extended to those in other States, but the fact remains that we are going to experience very grave difficulty in living up to the standard that will be set by the affluent States which have reserves put aside in special funds for the rehabilitation strain that will be felt.

I do not think this State will be able to stand up to the first shock of rehabilitating members of the Forces and others who will be released, and who will have to be transferred from their present occupations to civil employment. This question is causing me grave concern, and the knowledge I have of the previous war and of the deplorable position we got into then makes me feel that the loss of the Referendum was, to this State an economic—

Mr. Seward: Godsend!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No, it was an economic calamity. There is no way by which we can increase the income of the State. Income tax is a ready means for so

doing, but uniform taxation makes this impossible. Then again, to be fair, we must admit that under the uniform taxation provisions this State is receiving more money, or did receive more money, than was anticipated. It can be said that this State has not suffered as the result of uniform taxation.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: We are getting only the same amount that we taxed ourselves.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We were getting a little more.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: No.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I will be prepared to argue that after the Budget has been brought down. We were lucky that our taxation was high in the period selected for basing the distribution of the uniform tax. But the fact remains that, compared with other States, we have been well treated as the result of uniform taxation.

Mr. Mann: That may not be public opinion.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: We were treated only as well as we treated ourselves.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not even look to the public opinion point of view, especially on the economic side. I try to analyse the position to the best of my ability, and I desire to express my views for what they are worth, and trust they will ultimately reach the people so that they will realise that there are two sides to the question. I will deal with that phase a little more fully before I sit down. We are at the stage now when we can look only to the Loan Council to help us through. There is no other way by which we can get increased revenue. The obligation is on the new Premier to bring the special condition of this State prominently before the Loan Council so that loan funds will be buoyant if revenue is short. But of course we have to appreciate that that is a dangerous course and will help towards what "The West Australian" points out, namely, a perpetual need to be on the dole by the fact that we have to pay interest on the money that we get from the Loan Council. Interest is difficult to obtain.

During a rehabilitation period it is not likely that we should have many public works that will be revenue-producing from the outset. Therefore, the strain will be greater as a result of our dependency upon

loan funds. The member for Nedlands approached the question of the position of this State and he asserted that the State Parliaments had allowed their prestige to be lowered by submitting major questions to the Commonwealth Government for settlement; that the framers of the Commonwealth Constitution had never intended that the Central Authority should enjoy the financial power that it has today and that it had usurped extra powers. That is true. It usurped an enormous amount of power that was not anticipated originally, but the fact remains that it has that power. There is no way of our getting it back so, therefore, I do appeal to members to realise that it has gone and that we, as a Parliament, cannot expect to do our financing as we did in the past, when the Commonwealth Government has usurped, as the hon. member points out, power that was originally within our grasp. Then the hon. member went on to remark—

It was incorrect to say that the Commonwealth had comprehensive powers in legislation. Its powers were definitely limited. State laws were only invalid when they conflicted with Federal laws on subjects in which the Federal Parliament had power to legislate.

That is quite sound and quite true, but the hon. member forgot altogether that in this State we have this weakness, that in connection with legislation the Legislative Assembly is not all-powerful. It is not in legislative charge of the framing and passing of legislation. We have a second Chamber that uses its power to enact legislation and to frame it not always in the interests of the people but rather—and it is its responsibility to do it—in the interests of property. The member for Nedlands proceeded—

State Parliaments must consider how they could retain the loyalty of the people and regain their support.

Thus it is evident that the member for Nedlands appreciates that the State Parliament is gradually but surely fading out, inasmuch as the people are devoting their political thought and exercising their political activities rather in a national than in a State sense. He continued—

The State Parliament must legislate for the wants of the people in this State. There were many avenues through which the State Parliament could do that. There were diverse ways in which it could identify itself with the lives of the people and be a leader and not a follower.

Again the hon. member appreciates that we can only follow today; and we follow the Commonwealth Parliament because of its encroachment upon many of the activities that were previously administered by the State Parliament, and also because in connection with any financial arrangement the Commonwealth controls the purse.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But that applies to all States.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, to all mendicant States.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: No, it applies to all States.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Nedlands devoted some thought to what the State could do by way of legislation, but he did not touch upon the financial, or economic, side which, to my mind, is the most important and occasions us most anxiety. Let us all devote a little thought to the legislative side. As the member for Nedlands said, the State Parliament has full control respecting matters other than such as come into conflict with the Commonwealth law. The hon. member thinks the people's welfare should be catered for to a greater extent than at present. He gave every indication of that when he said, "The State Parliament must legislate for the wants of the people in this State." I submit that when he made the statement he forgot all about existing circumstances. He was addressing the members of the Legislative Assembly, and he must know perfectly well that in matters of legislation this House cannot do that which it would desire. Therefore, the member for Nedlands evidently forgot there was a second Chamber, which is a property Chamber, and is not elected as representative of the people. I do not blame the member for Nedlands for forgetting about the Legislative Council because few of us know much about it other than when it interferes with, mutilates, or defeats some of our legislation.

Hon. N. Keenan: Or improves it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is only when it deals with legislation that we know the Upper House exists. I submit to hon. members that the Legislative Council is the part of Parliament where we should try to start reforming. It is so important today with regard to our representations that we approach all our economic difficulties with sympathetic consideration. The Premier is

reported as having said recently at the Pre-riors' Conference or the Loan Council meeting that he was not prepared to declare what Western Australia could do with regard to taking over price-fixing. He pointed out that while the Government would be favourable to such a move—and I suggest it would be enthusiastically favourable—for the protection of the people against profiteering, seeing that the Commonwealth Government would experience some difficulty in doing that for us, we had, as the Premier mentioned, a Legislative Council and therefore he had to appreciate the fact that he might not be able to secure the passage of legislation that was necessary.

Then again there is the important question of land settlement. We know what that phase means to the prosperity of a State like Western Australia. Unless we can develop our lands and make them profitable, we shall be in a bad way. Our secondary industries are progressing, but their possibility of providing employment is so limited that a great deal of attention must be devoted to land settlement if we are to increase or even maintain our existing population. Again the question arose with regard to Commonwealth assistance in connection with that phase of development, and the Premier once more had to state that the Legislative Council might prove to be a stumbling block. I submit that we have got to realise that unless we do something in this Parliament to demonstrate that we appreciate the special circumstances and therefore endeavour to effect economies, that unless we recognise the fact that we have difficulty in regard to legislation as a result of the existence of the second Chamber and that we have difficulty in connection with finance as the result of our somewhat extravagant expenditure on Parliament and in other directions, and that unless we, who are in control, demonstrate our anxiety and determination to do something, I suggest we shall be failing in our duty.

Let us view the Legislative Council from the economic angle. Members know that, as a result of the Commonwealth encroachment that was so ably outlined by the member for Nedlands, the work of members of this Chamber has been reduced considerably. I believe that we all try to fulfil our obligations up to requirements, but I venture the opinion that there is no member of this House who, if he had not to attend to a fair

volume of work associated with Commonwealth responsibilities, would not find it difficult to fill in his time as a State member.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Not at all.

Mr. Needham: No; the hon. member should speak for himself.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I can speak only in the light of my own experience. In the Guildford-Midland electorate I have three local governing bodies and another on the fringe of it, which I regard as part and parcel of my electorate. I attend to the requirements of those local governing bodies very thoroughly, but my activities in connection with old age, invalid and widows' pensions and such like matters occupy a great deal of my time. The point I want to make is that we are situated in such a position that we are expected to render service to our constituents, and we do it in accordance with our feelings of responsibility. Some are more conscientious than others, but nevertheless we all endeavour to fulfil our obligations. But the work available is sufficient to keep us busy. We are constantly in our electorates and contacting our people. We receive communications from them. We are the media of public representations to those who are in charge of administration in Government activities.

Mr. Rodoreda: We are the liaison officers.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We are the communicating channel between the electors and Parliament as constituted.

Mr. Needham: In addition, we have our own State work.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes, but we have a considerable volume of Commonwealth work to carry out. We in this Chamber must realise that we do not constitute Parliament. While we are doing all these things, and it is our pleasure to do so seeing that we are paid for attending to such tasks, we must realise that there are others who are being paid but cannot be availed of because of the altered conditions largely operating during periods of recess. During such periods, members of the Legislative Council have little or no responsibility in the general administration of the affairs of the State. In my electorate they do not come into the picture at all, other than at social gatherings.

Mr. Doney: And you are taking that for granted in connection with other constituencies!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I speak in the light of my own experience.

Mr. Doney: And you applied your remarks to a State as a whole. That is the trouble.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I take my electorate, which is an exacting one, as a bulk sample of other electorates.

Mr. Doney: You do not know the position elsewhere.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: From my experience, I can say that I travel around the State a good deal and come into contact with Assembly members wherever I go. On the other hand, I seldom meet members of the Legislative Council at business gatherings that I attend and where members of the Legislative Assembly are found to be helpful and are looked upon as capable of assisting in the solution of difficulties that exist in various parts of the State.

Mr. Doney: Others of us have a different tale to tell.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We must face up to the fact that Western Australia cannot afford to carry two Houses of Parliament. It is economically impossible to do it, and we shall lose prestige, as the member for Nedlands said, in the eyes of every person in Australia if we allow this condition to continue in spite of the drastically altered circumstances of the moment. I said at the outset that I was a member of Parliament when Parliament sat in the old Town Hall chamber. In those days the State had just shed the responsibility of defence, customs, excise, post office and all the other big activities that went under the control of the Commonwealth Government. There were 80 members of Parliament at that time administering the affairs of the State, including loan-raising direct from London and the spending of loan funds in the general development of the State which was going ahead rapidly because of the expansion of the goldmining industry. There were 50 members in the Assembly and 30 in the Council at that time, and we still have 80 members.

Mr. McDonald: But the population of the State has since increased fourfold.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not altogether a question of population, although that is a contributing factor, but whether the responsibilities associated with Parliament justify the expenditure on administration

Mr. Doney: You mean that Cabinet has a far easier time now than it had then. Is that the idea?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. There are more Cabinet Ministers today than there were then.

Mr. Mann: How many were there in those days?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I think six, but I am not sure.

Mr. Mann: There should be 12 now, anyhow.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not want to go into that point. The member for Nedlands, and other speakers who have contributed to this debate, appreciate that the position has changed considerably as a result of the Commonwealth's assuming control of many activities formerly carried on by the State Parliament. I wish particularly to emphasise that the Legislative Council lends itself to economic reform, an immediate reform, and one simple of accomplishment. The Legislative Council costs the State £30,000 per year, if one takes into account salaries, cost of elections, cost of rolls, lighting, cleaning, stationery and all other things essential to the maintenance of the Council. The total cost, as far as I can calculate, is fully £30,000 per annum.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: That is not very much.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is not very much, but one should consider the cost in relation to the fact that during the recess the members of the Legislative Council cannot be serviceable to the State. They are only serviceable to the State while the Council takes part in legislation, and I point out that the Council last year sat for only 139 hours.

Mr. McDonald: The Legislative Council members were active in their provinces.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member now seeks to make them big guns in the general attention to affairs in the country, leaving the Legislative Assembly members out of the picture. We all know it is no use trying to cover up the position.

We know that the Legislative Assembly members are the ones who are active in all parts of the State; and, if we are honest with one another, we resent interference in matters with which we ourselves are dealing as the representatives of the people as a whole, as distinct from the representatives of a section of the people. We have to realise that the Legislative Council costs £30,000 a year and that last year it sat for only 139 hours. It therefore cost the State last year £215 an hour for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Withers: It is dearer than the war!

Mr. Abbott: It saved the State thousands of pounds!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member knows as well as does any member of this Chamber the value of the Legislative Council from the property-protection point of view. I do not profess to know as much about that as does the hon. member

Opposition members: Oh!

Mr. Mann: What about the Westralian Farmers?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I had in mind that in my electorate not one in a hundred could say who the members of the Legislative Council are at the present time.

Mr. Abbott: They must take very little interest in it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The hon. member takes a lot of interest in it, of course, and his electors would know possibly much more than do mine about it, but this is my estimate for my own district, and I venture the opinion that I have more politically-minded and politically-educated constituents in my electorate than the member for North Perth has in his. I like to be realistic in these matters.

Mr. Doney: If you want to be realistic, why say that about property?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do know that we cannot go on maintaining two Chambers at that cost for one, and there I shall leave the matter. I have given the figures and raised the matter from my own point of view. I suggest the time has arrived when we should appoint a Royal Commissioner, a man like Prof. Mauldon or some person of equal qualifications, to go into the matter and ascertain whether we can,

from the economic angle, afford to continue the Legislative Council, whether that Chamber is necessary to the welfare of the State and its people, whether its members are occupied in protecting the people to an extent commensurate with the salary which they receive, and whether the cost is out of proportion to the capacity of the State. It should not be necessary for me to go into detailed figures; someone should be appointed to undertake that task, so that the people may know exactly where the State's money goes and where it is being most wastefully expended.

Mr. Seward: Look out that they do not tackle the Assembly!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course, the hon. member, coming from the country, would say, "Look out that they do not tackle the Assembly."

Mr. Seward: Yes, it would be awkward if they did.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Surely the hon. member has lived long enough to know that property will never dominate Australia again. True, it has dominated Australia for many years, but the people are gradually and surely gaining the ascendancy.

Mr. Seward: I have been misled.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This is one of the few States which cannot afford a Legislative Council such as ours. Apart from the position in which we find ourselves today, as compared with our responsibilities of years ago, when we controlled all the activities of the State, I submit we should be influenced by the trend of the world. Surely we must see the drift of the world and appreciate what is taking place in other parts of the world. We must not stagnate. We are a people who should lead, but we have been left behind in matters of Parliamentary activity and Parliamentary control. If we turn to any country today we shall find that the people are getting greater control and greater power. The administration of concerns which previously were controlled in the interests of private enterprise are now in those countries in the hands of the people. It is true we have had a good deal of consolation for a period, but we are now getting a little anxiety. We thought the world was being organised in anticipation of peace control.

We saw a great many going over to the Left. That term means control by the people for the people's gain, as distinct from monopoly control for private gain. That is the difference between the Right and the Left.

Mr. Doney: On which side are you?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is no question but that the world is turning to the Left and trusting the people to take charge of those matters that count so much in the community. It is true that America has thrown a spanner in the works for the moment; but you, Mr. Speaker, and I quite understand what is behind all this. Britain is a little upset; there is disorganisation of all that was anticipated as the result of the Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco talks and the other gatherings that took place from time to time, so that we might be ready to meet the shock of rehabilitation and the change-over from war economy to peace economy.

Things are not panning out just exactly as was anticipated; but I have sufficient confidence in those in authority, particularly in Great Britain and her Dominions, to know that wise counsels will ultimately prevail, and that the stability of control by the people has been organised as the result of appeals to the peoples in various countries, particularly the Mother Country! This indicates that we are reaching a stabilised position, but we cannot say we are in step with all those countries which have introduced reforms so long as we try to govern this State in the way we did 45 years ago. The Leader of the Opposition pointed out that Parliament was not being consulted in matters of big expenditure. Year after year I have drawn attention to the fact that we, that is, the members of this Chamber, are not consulted on expenditure matters when the Annual Estimates are brought down. Those Estimates are really a report of what has been done rather than of what it is anticipated shall be done. I know it cannot be changed; it is the fact. It is a Cabinet responsibility. Cabinet functions regularly in this respect and, under the present methods of control, it is not possible for Cabinet to consult Parliament now on the annual basis that it did previously. But Parliament should be consulted in matters where big expenditure is involved.

I wish to refer to the very great expenditure that has taken place, or is taking place, on the survey of the proposed route for the uniform gauge railway. I was Minister for Works a good many years ago. As a result of consultations with those in authority in the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, and of conferences between engineers representing all interests concerned, it was decided that a survey should be made in Western Australia in anticipation of the building of what was then known as the trans-Australian railway from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. After a very thorough inquiry and a good deal of thought, it was decided that the line should go down on the south side of the river and avoid bridges and river crossings. After a good deal of trouble, a survey was made that provided for a grade of 1 in 80 with load. I thought, as Minister for Works, that that would be all we would require. To my mind, a 1 in 80 grade was an economical one on which to operate.

Before my time as Minister for Works, the James Government had taken into account the ultimate extension of the 4ft. 8½in. gauge from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle. In anticipation of that, a big area of land had been resumed along the south side of the river, and some of it was expensively resumed, because buildings were erected on it and people were living on that land. So far as I know, all that land is still in the hands of the State. In anticipation that I would be making some comments, I asked the Minister for Works during what period those resumptions were made, what they cost, and whether the land was still under the control of the State. The Minister has replied that the information cannot be made available until the end of the month. I realise it is difficult to get such information on the spur of the moment, but I think members should know that already a given sum of money, the details of which I hope we shall be given in due course, has already been expended in anticipation of the line being taken down on the south side of the river in order to avoid a river crossing.

We now find that, without Parliament being consulted, or our being asked whether we are still of opinion that the line should come down on the south side of the river, everything is being discarded. According to Sir Harold Clapp, the present proposal is

that the new route should leave the existing line—not a little east of Chidlow, as the line to which I am referring would have left it and then come down one of the valleys into the Swan on a 1 in 80 grade—at Northam, and, for some reason I cannot understand, run from Northam to Toodyay, and from Toodyay come back to Midland Junction. I do not see why that is being done. The line is going to cross the Swan River to get to Bassendean, and from Bassendean it will strike out through the back of Bayswater around Mt. Lawley, and come in again, I think, at Subiaco or Daglish.

Mr. Styants: At Claremont.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I visualise the State and try to understand what the mileage of the proposed line will run into. I cannot understand why this is being done and what influence is behind the change that takes the line from the original determination to the present one. Above everything else I submit that this Chamber on this important question should have been consulted. Now we have Sir Harold Clapp travelling through Australia declaring definitely where the line in Western Australia will run, while we ourselves know nothing about it.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Perhaps they will be doing the paying.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. At the Loan Council meeting the Premier gave some figures of what the States' contribution was or would be towards the survey.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: The Commonwealth is paying.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I may be wrong. I did read that the Premier at the gathering in Melbourne referred to the survey being proceeded with. I may have misread the statement, but my impression was that the State was accepting some of the liability for the survey.

Mr. Rodoreda: No doubt it will, later on.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I desired to bring this illustration under the notice of members. What are we here for? What is our function? Why is it that these things can go on and we should be constantly ignored? If we are to be ignored, why does this Parliament exist? If Cabinet is going to control the Parliament of this State, let us have it controlling the State as a committee working under a central authority, and let us

have some regional council created that will provide a closer contact with the people without all the burdensome administrative organisation such as Parliament constitutes today. I desired to draw attention to the fact that we are accepting a good deal of liability in connection with the standard gauge, and yet we do not know what it all amounts to. The Premier, at the Loan Council meeting, hesitated to give the scheme his support, although he admitted that the survey was proceeding and that the State was contributing towards it. With all that in, he still hesitates as to the period when the work most requires to be done, that is to say, at the time when we can best absorb the unemployed en masse. I would never agree to our building the uniform gauge from Kalgoorlie to Fremantle in one set job, to our starting it at a given period, and continuing it until the work was completed.

Mr. Seward: That is the proposal.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is not what I would advocate. We should use the work to help our economic situation. We should speed it up when other works are short, and ease off when other works are abundant. There is no necessity for expedition in the matter.

Mr. Doney: We do not think so, either.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The work should be passed so that it can be put in hand at the right time. It is essential work. It must come ultimately. We cannot develop this country, as Sir Harold Clapp himself points out, as one country with a break of gauge such as we have at present. Australia is not united today; it is divided. We have many different gauges of railways and many breaks in our journeys from one part of Australia to another. From the commonsense point of view we know that cannot go on indefinitely, and we must face the inevitability of the work. I claim that the time to face it is now. Let us have the work approved and let us arrive at an understanding as between the State and the Commonwealth, and use the work for the purpose of easing the strain that will be put upon us in the post-war reconstruction period, as well as it will be put upon all the other States. I admit that I am out of step with many members, and possibly with quite a number of those sitting on this side of the House.

I cannot believe that the workers of this country can reach the standard of living to which they are entitled as compared with the standard in evidence in the Eastern States. I admit that we have that standard today. I will go further and say that in the past we have had a higher standard than has been seen in any other State in Australia. I am conscious of that as a result of travelling through the Eastern States in the years gone by. We are, however, gradually going down. What I am sure of is that when the pressure comes we shall not be able to stand the strain as well as the other States will. We shall be judged by what we can do and by what we are doing compared with the other States. If we fail, we shall have to plead that this State is so circumscribed that it cannot do justice to its own people, and that that is due to the encroachment of the Commonwealth Government in our revenue-earning activities.

If it is true that the Commonwealth Government has encroached to the extent of creating an impossible task for this Parliament, we should go to it and say, "You have made the position impossible. It is up to you to place the people of Western Australia on the same standard, without any differentiation, and give them the same privileges as the people in the other States enjoy." As we stand today, we are not in a position to do that. I appeal to members to approach the question from the aspect of parliamentary reform from within. I commend to the Government that as a first step towards that reform it should appoint someone as a Royal Commissioner to go into the question of the necessity for maintaining the expensive and unnecessary Legislative Council. I trust that will be done.

MR. HOLMAN (Forrest) [5.58]: I wish to associate myself with the expressions of regret that the member for Geraldton (Hon. J. C. Willcock) should have felt compelled to resign from the office of Premier. I am particularly sorry that he was caused to take this step because of his health. I have had many kindnesses at his hands and have a vivid recollection of the ability he at all times displayed as Leader of the House. I hope that now he has retired from that strenuous position he will be spared for many years to carry on his work in the Assembly as a private member. I should also like to congratulate the present Premier,

who was Minister for Lands and Agriculture until he became Leader of the House. As a Minister, he was associated with a considerable proportion of my electorate and with the agricultural pursuits conducted therein. Because of the ability he has displayed, I am convinced he will prove a worthy successor to Mr. Willecock.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should say "the member for Geraldton."

Mr. HOLMAN: In the Minister for Mines and Railways (Hon. W. M. Marshall) I am sure the Ministry will be enriched. We have heard him speak on many occasions on numbers of subjects with which he is conversant. When he takes hold of matters appertaining to transport in this State, we should soon see the sparks beginning to fly. May I add my congratulations to the new Chairman of Committees. I congratulate Cabinet on its appointment of the new President of the Arbitration Court, Mr. E. A. Dunphy, as I feel sure it is a very wise selection on the part of the Government. I have been associated with the new President of the Arbitration Court for many years, both personally and in connection with industrial activities, and I know he has the Arbitration Act and industrial laws at his fingertips, and will prove a worthy successor to ex-President Dwyer.

During the past year we have witnessed many momentous happenings, the greatest of which was the end of hostilities, not only with Germany but with Japan also. Together with other members I cannot help expressing relief that such a period has passed, and I sincerely hope that in the future such an ordeal will never again be thrust upon the human race. During the year—within the last couple of months—the Government announced that it had approved of the main recommendations in the report of the Electricity Advisory Committee in relation to the South-West Power Scheme. That is one of the most momentous decisions made by this Government for some time, especially in its effect on the constituency that I represent in the South-West, in addition to the other South-West electorates. It is hard to visualise what this will eventually mean to the development of the South-West.

It has been announced that the Government intends to introduce legislation, during this session, to implement the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, and I hope

that will be done as soon as possible. It is recommended that the works proceed in three stages, the first of which is to cost, I understand, £1,100,000. I am anxious to know whether, in addition to the towns that have been enumerated—that is the large towns such as Bridgetown, Donnybrook, Harvey and so on—this scheme will also cover the outlying districts near those towns, and in that I include the timber mills. I hope those areas are included in the Government's decision. I am glad the committee considers that the establishment of the South-West power scheme should precede, and not follow, any post-war development, because I believe the institution of that scheme will give the driving force that is necessary to post-war development in the South-West portion of this State. I do not intend to deal at length with that question, as I hope to hear further information when the necessary legislation is introduced in this Chamber.

I was particularly interested in a statement by the Minister for Education, which appeared in last Sunday's edition of the "Sunday Times," to the effect that the cessation of hostilities had renewed the hopes of those who, prior to the war, anticipated big developments in education through the use of cinemas in schools. The "Sunday Times" headed that article, "Movies in Schools to Replace Blackboards." Visual education will be a big factor in the education of our children in the future, and there is no doubt that the dry old lessons that have been the rule in schools will be brightened up and made more interesting in this way. Naturally the children will take more notice and will absorb extra knowledge owing to this development, but I am anxious to know how this will affect the country schools. Is it to be the policy of the Education Department to take this visual education into the country schools as well as those in the metropolitan area?

Last session, when speaking on the Estimates, I brought to the notice of the Minister for Education the tremendous activity that was taking place in the United Kingdom in education, not only by means of cinemas and radios, but also by the use of television. I then asked that the Minister interest himself in the subject, with a view to securing the latest information from the United Kingdom, but I have not received any intimation that that has been done. If

it has not, I sincerely hope steps will now be taken to ensure that we will not be lagging behind other countries in this particular form of education for our children. Another educational reform in England has to do with visual instruction, and daylight films have been perfected, doing away with the grouping of children in halls, and allowing the films to be shown in the classroom in daylight. Still another perfected invention which was being used in schools in Great Britain was the endless film, whereby different subjects could be filmed and shown over and over again to instil those subjects into the minds of the children.

Now that the Minister has announced that the cessation of hostilities has made certain things possible, I hope we will go in for the full ambit of this method of education. Although we do not know very much about it in this country, television, according to the Television Committee appointed in Great Britain in 1943, has come to stay. From certain articles that I have recently read I understand that television sets are to be retailed at prices as low as £15 to £20 per instrument. Surely we should be ready for any move in that direction, and the first to benefit from it should be the children, if it is used as a means of education. Another way to assist the children would be to brighten up the atmosphere of the schools. Country schools for the most part are shabby both inside and outside. The interior walls are painted in gloomy colours, giving the scholars a gloomy outlook on life. Such drab surroundings do not give the children the atmosphere to enable them to absorb the education that is being given to them. Old-fashioned desks are provided, making the time spent in school very tiring, so that the children have not the energy to complete their day's work. I realise that all these things could not be put right at once, owing to the lack of manpower and materials, but that is the usual story. It does not matter what one asks for, the answer is always a story about the lack of manpower and materials. As a post-war work I think one of the first should be that of improving the facilities for educating the children who are to carry on this country of ours.

I have been battling to get some of the schools in my electorate renovated or repaired, but have not been able to do any-

thing about it. The Government has now announced, through the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, that it has arranged to build houses under day-labour conditions. I suggest that if the Government cannot get the contractors to carry out necessary renovations and repairs to schools, it should seriously consider carrying out that work itself, by day-labour, letting the contractors go. In June last I was informed—and relayed the information to the head teacher of the Brunswick School—that the contractor would be there in three weeks' time. Yesterday I rang the Public Works Department and found that the contractor had not been to the Brunswick School at all. He, like many other contractors, had ignored the department and would not carry out the work at the school, probably because he had some better job in hand. If that is the way private contractors are to treat public works that are let on tender, the Government should take over those works itself and see that they are carried out.

Mr. Fox: And how!

Mr. HOLMAN: This should be rated as high priority work.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 till 7.30 p.m.

Mr. HOLMAN: At the risk of seeming to be parochial, there is one other school I wish to mention as a specific example of the bungling in the matter of carrying out repairs. As far back as March last, I received a note from the department telling me that repairs and renovations would be carried out at the Bengier school. As representative of the district, I communicated with the head-teacher and informed him of the decision. This teacher has been singularly unfortunate. He was teaching at Argyle and had been trying to get renovations and repairs made to the school and quarters there, and had just about succeeded when he was transferred to Dwellingup. Again he became active in asking for repairs to be done there and, just when approval has been more or less granted, he was transferred to Bengier. I advised him to get on to the job at once so that something might be done before he was moved again. As I stated previously the memo. from the department shows that approval was granted in March. As late as last week, I rang the department, but nothing has been done. I have ascertained, however, that tenders were called for the

work and closed this month and that no tender was received. Consequently the delay is no fault of the department but, as I said previously, something is lacking, and if this state of affairs is to continue, the Government must undertake the work itself instead of relying on outside contractors. Such work simply must be done. Another case I could mention is that of the Dwellingup school, but I shall not labour the matter as I have said sufficient to bring home the point about bungling regarding the work required at country schools.

Another matter is that of country children and their chance of entering the public service. I have been assured by officials that quite a number of children from the country have found their way into the service, but I have still to be convinced that they have an equal opportunity with children in the city. I should like to see a percentage of those positions set aside for country children, and country schools should be circulated to that effect. This would provide an incentive to the children in the country to acquire the education requisite for joining the public service of the State. Let me mention a case in point. A lad whose parents live in a mill centre passed the junior examination, and his parents thought they were doing right by keeping him at school until he was 16 years of age. They allowed him to complete the year's education, and he turned 16 early this year, with the result that when he applied for a position in the public service, although he had the other necessary qualifications, he was penalised because his parents had kept him at school too long. He is not now in a position to enter the State Public Service because he is over the age of 16. That is ridiculous.

In view of the statement in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that plans are well advanced to give effect to the policy of raising the school-leaving age, the Government should realise that such regulations governing the employment of boys and girls in the public service will have to be amended. The principle then would be that, even though a boy had reached the age of 16, he would still be eligible to enter the public service, and if the principle is good enough in those circumstances, it should be good enough now, provided the child has the necessary qualification. Sufficient publicity is not given to the fact that, when parents keep their

children at school until they turn 16, as we have often advised them to do, they are automatically penalising the children in the matter of obtaining employment in the public service. This being the case, we should at least tell parents the position so that they will not keep their children at school too long.

On the 15th November of last year, the Town Planning Commissioner set out for the Department of Education specific reasons why the Brunswick school should be moved, one of the reasons being the danger to the children owing to its being situated on the main Bunbury road. I do not intend to deal with the merits of the case, but I stress the fact that we have now reached almost the end of August and still nothing has been done in the matter. Seemingly it takes months and months of keeping at the departments before one can get anything done, and it is not right that the member for the district should have to be constantly reminding the department of these matters. There is no reason why such delays should occur. When the people of a district have something in view, they expect results one way or the other, and they are entitled to have them. They ought not to be kept waiting for probably 12 months before any information is made available to them. No wonder they become disgusted. I hope something will be done to prevent a repetition of such delays. I fully appreciate that the Government staff has been at a low ebb numerically, but I do not think that is a sufficient excuse for the delays that occur in reaching decisions.

Last year I had occasion to compliment the Minister for Education on the arrangement for correspondence pupils in the country to visit Perth. Everyone will agree that the visit was of immense educational value, especially as many of the children had not previously been to the city. I suggested then that the department might consider the advisability of instituting visits to the city by country children and vice versa for the sake of their educational value. I am afraid very little has been done to that end. The position appears to be that if the people in any centre wish to arrange such a visit for their children, they themselves must do it. Last week students of the Brunswick school visited Perth. That visit was arranged by the peo-

ple of Brunswick and the head teacher. The department was certainly asked for permission, which was granted, but not the slightest help or encouragement was given to the project. The department might at least have suggested certain places that could be visited for the purpose of obtaining the educational value contemplated when the visit was arranged. The people of Brunswick are to be commended on their effort, and the people of the city also deserve commendation for the welcome they gave those children. The officials of various Government institutions were only too willing to assist, and private concerns such as "The West Australian," the "Daily News," the Shell Company and others made the visit of an educational value that can hardly be assessed. Certainly it is something that those children will never forget.

According to a statement in the newspaper recently, water supplies should be placed on a high priority. My electorate has probably the highest rainfall of any part of the State, and I have been endeavouring to get the Government to provide a water scheme for Dwellingup and Donnybrook. This winter we have witnessed the spectacle of floods throughout the length and breadth of those areas, and we know of the tremendous waste of water as a result. I appeal to the Government to take into consideration the contrast between what occurs in the summer and what takes place in the winter. During the summer, in those centres where the rainfall is practically the highest in the State, the people have to carry water from an old antiquated pump for a distance of half a mile or so in kerosene tins or buckets! On the other hand, in the winter, they see water running to waste. I ask the Government to give consideration to the formulation of plans to overcome this trouble. I know the Government has plans in mind for the conservation of water in certain districts, but I trust it will go further and see that the centres to which I refer are supplied with a decent scheme.

It is all very well to complain that members come into this House to discuss items during the Address-in-reply that are not of much interest to other members. Nevertheless, it makes one think when one realises that prisoners-of-war can be established in camps two or three miles away from a town-ship and receive the benefits of electric light

and a water supply and that kind of amenity, while the good Australian, who has been the pioneer of the district, still waits for these things. We have had German and Italian prisoners-of-war enjoying amenities denied to our own citizens. I will continue to stress these points whether what I say pleases or not.

Some criticism can be levelled also at our hospitals. I, probably like other members, have seen hospitals in my electorate getting more and more into debt, and it is high time that some other means of financing these institutions was adopted. I know that the Hospital Planning Committee has had this matter in hand and when its report is available we shall know what is proposed. In the meantime, however, country hospitals have to carry on. In my district there is one hospital which has a debt of over £500 and is struggling to liquidate it. In this connection, it has instituted a series of entertainments with a view to raising finance. Recently, I tried to obtain permission for an extension of the time during which dances could be held on Saturday nights with that object in view. I was told by the department that this was not possible. One reason advanced was that there would shortly be an appeal for a victory loan, and that people were not supposed to engage in this sort of activity when such a loan was in sight, but ought to drop everything and put all their money into that loan. I do not favour that point of view.

It was all very fine when we were in the throes of war to ask people to put every penny they could afford into the prosecution of the war; but the war is over. Yet people are still asked to put every penny into victory loans and let their own concerns go bankrupt as usual. I protest against that, unless the Commonwealth and State Governments are prepared to do the right thing and take over the debts of those hospitals and get them out of their morass. The law governing the closing of entertainments is antiquated. I believe that Section 9 of the Police Act Amendment Act of 1902 sets out that entertainments must close at 12 o'clock at night. I want members to visualise a centre like Dwellingup that relies on entertainments to obtain finance to conduct its hospital. To attend those entertainments, workers travel from outlying mills; but by the time they

get to a dance, they are told they must go home. The Act should be amended. I know that certain religious bodies are not in favour of that; but I believe their opinions should be elastic enough to make them realise that, provided an entertainment is held with due decorum, no harm would be likely to result from an extension of hours. We have heard a good deal about priorities, but it seems to me that the education and health of the people have a very low priority.

I would like to refer to the Donnybrook hospital in whose affairs I was particularly busy in 1939 before I enlisted. What I am about to say indicates what can happen. The people of the district raised a considerable sum of money; and as a result, the Health Department made a grant of £2,000 and the Lotteries Commission promised another £2,000. Then the war intervened and this brought about the closing down of loans. As a result, the work was held up, and the people did not receive the money from the Health Department or the Lotteries Commission. Consequently, the district was £4,000 to the bad. Now the people are waiting for a decision from the Hospital Planning Committee as to whether a new hospital is to be built in the district or not. In the meantime they have to renew the lease of the building occupied, and do not know for how long a period to renew it because they do not know when they will receive permission to build a hospital. Something will have to be done in regard to matters of this kind, because they are of vital importance to the people concerned.

Another big question to which reference has been made is the franchise for the Legislative Council. The member for Guildford-Midland gave us certain figures as to what the upkeep of the Legislative Council cost per hour or per minute. I am interested in another phase of the matter. The majority of the people I represent in the Forrest electorate are workers in the timber industry. In all, I suppose there are 3,000 odd men working in that industry in the South-West Land Division, and I presume that there would not be more than 30 entitled to vote for the Legislative Council.

I was pleased to hear the member for Nedlands say that the only legislation of any importance to which reference was

made in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech was that relating to the alteration of the franchise for the Upper House. For that reason, I bring forward the very honest complaint of the timber workers in the South-West. Why should they not have the right to vote for the election of members to the Legislative Council? Time and again, even during this session, I have heard members talking about the shortage of houses. There have been great mouthfuls of criticism in that respect. Yet the very people who are producing the wherewithal to build such houses are denied a vote for the Legislative Council. That is entirely wrong and contrary to the spirit of democracy. Of the timber workers to whom I have referred, probably 75 per cent. are married and have families of very good stock. I have heard it mentioned that the best settler of the lot is one of our own flesh and blood; yet we refuse to such people a vote for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Doney: What is the reason they have not a vote? Would you explain that?

The Minister for Works: An undemocratic constitution.

Mr. HOLMAN: Because they do not pay sufficient rent.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: How much have they to pay?

Mr. HOLMAN: The rent varies. I will give those figures later in my speech, but it does not matter a hang what rent they pay.

The Minister for Lands: Hear, hear!

Mr. HOLMAN: Why should it? They are the people who are producing the real wealth of the country. Just because a man is born with an inheritance of property, has he any more right to a vote—and sometimes more than one vote—than the person producing the real wealth of the country? Definitely not! It is a wonder to me that these men stand it. That is how I feel about the matter.

Mr. Abbott: What about the man who produces no wealth?

Mr. Fox: He has a vote!

Mr. HOLMAN: Their position as producers of the wealth of this country is becoming increasingly more apparent, especially in view of post-war schemes for housing, essential works and railway construc-

tion. Consider the proposal for the standardisation of railway gauges. We have heard how many million sleepers will be needed for that work, yet the persons who will cut those sleepers or make them available for us to use have not the right to vote for the Legislative Council. Apparently they do not deserve it! As a matter of fact, it would do us good to consider the wealth these people produce for the State. I have gone to the trouble of taking out figures in that respect.

Mr. Smith: It is worse than Bulgaria!

Mr. HOLMAN: In 1938-39, there were 3,188 men employed in the industry, the majority of whom were disfranchised, and the net value of the sawn timber they produced was £1,147,000. Surely to goodness they are entitled to some consideration.

The Minister for Works: You have quietened the member for Williams-Narrogin.

Mr. HOLMAN: Here are some other figures—

Year	Men in industry.	Net value of timber. £
39/40 . . .	2,940	1,038,000
40/41 . . .	2,946	1,322,000
41/42 . . .	2,660	1,272,000
42/43 . . .	2,615	1,423,000
43/44 . . .	2,718	1,372,000

For 1944-45 the figures are not yet available.

Mr. McDonald: Are there any vacancies in the industry?

Mr. HOLMAN: Ample! I am coming to that later.

Mr. Thorn: There will be other vacancies later on.

Mr. HOLMAN: The figures I have quoted do not include the sleeper-hewers whose work adds to the net production of this State. I would like to circularise the members of another place in respect of this matter to see whether their consciences would be affected. I sincerely hope they all procure a copy of this week's "Hansard." I think that even the one argument I have put forward should convince them that these men are entitled to a democratic vote for the Upper Chamber. I say this, too, that because these people are not concerned in the election of a representative to the Upper Chamber it is very seldom that a member of that place is seen in the vicinity of a mill centre.

Mr. Thorn: I am told they do not see much of you there, either!

Mr. HOLMAN: I have approximately 50 odd centres to attend to. I visit them, but I am not a superman. At least those people do see me, but the same cannot be said of members of another place. Of course, it is only natural. The people at the mill centres have no voice in the election of such members. I hope the situation will be mended. I go further and stress the position of the timber-workers. Not only do they not have a vote for the Upper Chamber, but they also have to put up with the most shocking living conditions of practically any worker. Their housing conditions are out of all proportion.

Mr. Mann: The same thing applies to the accommodation at the State Sawmills.

Mr. HOLMAN: Practically all mills are in a bad way. I am not booming the State Sawmills. Where that department has provided decent facilities, I will give it due credit. These conditions should be remedied because we are now entering an abnormal period. We can see by today's paper where the Minister for Munitions, Mr. Makin, stated that the supply of timber was causing him great concern, and that probably 100,000,000 cubic feet of timber would have to be imported from Russia and the same quantity from Canada. Plans have been made in this State to cope with the increased demand for timber, with the result that permits will be issued for the establishment of new mills. I understand that at present about six or seven new permits have been issued. Some two or three of them are for the purpose of increasing the supply of timber, and the others for the replacement of old mills.

Now is the time to tackle this subject. It has gone on for years, and nothing has been done. The timber workers are still living in the old shanties, and it is time that legislation was introduced for the purpose of seeing that when a permit is issued for a new mill the owners must comply with certain conditions for the housing of their employees. I do not care whether the rent is low or not. I will now offer a belated reply to the interjection of the member for Subiaco, who inquired as to the extent of the rental paid by these workers. The rental in the industry varies from 4s. to 6s., and the employer gets good value for his money! I am not saying that just for the sake of

talking, but because some of the houses are not worth 4s. The fact is that the timber-worker, by virtue of his calling, has to continue paying the rent. Some of these houses were built as far back as 1914, and probably before that, and the workers are still paying their 4s., 5s. or 6s. per week.

Mr. Fox: What did they cost to build?

Mr. HOLMAN: I do not know, but from their present appearance they would be condemned if they were within cooees of any health authority. As a matter of fact, the health authorities have had to be called in in certain instances to condemn some of these houses. The position is outrageous. It would open members' eyes to see the conditions in the industry. I hear much talk in this Chamber about lack of housing facilities in the metropolitan area, and have to sit down and take it when I know that people in my electorate are living in hovels. It is not a joke. That is why I am stressing the position this evening. In many instances the roofs are leaking and the wall-papers are torn to bits. As I have said here before, at Jarrahdale, only 33 miles from the city, some houses are being held together by the layers of wall-paper. That is one of Millars' timber mills.

Mr. Doney: It must be good wall-paper.

Mr. Thorn: That is an exaggeration.

Mr. HOLMAN: It is no exaggeration; it is even worse than that. The old-fashioned outside tin fireplaces are nearly all rusted through. Some of the mill centres have been burnt down. It is a pity that a fire, such as the Fire of London, could not clean up some of these places. If such a thing did happen, unfortunately some of the workers would lose their personal effects. In addition to what I have already stated, the ceiling linings are all torn. I have it on good authority also that the washing and bathing facilities at Jarrahdale are entirely inadequate. In addition to that, we have the spectacle of the bush camps, where civilised men are supposed to work, or live in between their periods of work. Talk about amenities for country people! The huts there are 8ft. by 6ft. 6in., and 7ft. high. Those huts have no 10ft. 6in. ceiling, about which we have heard so much.

Mr. W. Hegney: Are you speaking of the Jarrahdale mill now?

Mr. HOLMAN: No, the Nannup bush camp and other centres. We can imagine the conditions there in the winter. It is all slush and mud, and there are no lights, and when the men knock off their work it is practically dark. In the summer they have conditions just as bad. Their food gets spoilt as a result of the heat and the flies. There is no refrigeration for them. The only way to deal with the question is to abolish bush camps altogether.

Mr. Thorn: Who is looking after the interests of these timber-workers?

Mr. HOLMAN: We endeavour to, but we cannot force the employers to do these things, except by legislation.

Mr. Thorn: You would think, after the years of organisation, that things would be better than that.

Mr. HOLMAN: One would think that the employers would have a better conscience.

Mr. Thorn: Why do you not persuade them to do something?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HOLMAN: That is what I am trying to get the hon. member to do. I would suggest that the mill-owners take a leaf out of the book of the Forests Department. That department has plans by which it intends to bring its workers in from the bush and create a sort of community settlement at Dwellingup. It arranged for the Town Planning Commissioner to go there and he has made out plans for a model settlement of forestry workers. All these people will be brought in from the bush and settled at Dwellingup where they will have some of the amenities of life. They will at least have amusements and the chance of education for their kiddies, and, by virtue of motor transport, they will be taken out to the job. If the Forests Department can do that, then so can the timber industry. I go further than that and suggest that no worker should be compelled to live around the timbermill. Why should he? There could easily be a community settlement for the workers of each of the mills, so that they could get away from the mill altogether and not have to put up with the smoke of the sawdust and mill ends that are being burnt 24 hours a day. Whichever way the wind blows, the poor unfortunates living in that direction have to put up with

the smoke, the dust and the noise of the mills. In addition, the education of the children goes on in the midst of all these things.

Mr. McDonald: Would a timbermill be the centre of a permanent township?

Mr. HOLMAN: That is a very sensible interjection. It brings me to this point: That according, evidently, to the ideas of the employers in the industry, it is not a permanent settlement, and that is the excuse for not providing decent houses. They say the mill is only there for a certain period. Well, how long has Jarrahdale been here? It has been here as long as I have been on this earth, and even longer; but it cannot be called a permanent place! Because of that, the managements will not build decent houses, but say that the mills are there for only a time. For the information of the member for West Perth, "a time" is any period of from ten to one hundred years. Recently, Bunning's, at their new mill at Nyamup, provided a decent type of house for their employees, and have charged a rental of from 12s. 6d. to 13s. a week, which the men are perfectly willing to pay for the comfort they receive.

The mere fact that these people are paying only a small rental does not enter into the question at all. I go so far as to say that that may be taken into consideration in the computation of their wages. The Arbitration Court knows that their rental has always been of a low monetary value, and for that reason it must be taken into consideration by the President when, in his wisdom, he computes the wage-scale for these workers. I venture to say that if decent housing were given to them, and their rental accordingly increased, the President, when a case next came before him, would probably see fit to increase their wages correspondingly. I should imagine so, anyhow. The circumstance that those 2,000 to 3,000 people are living under primitive conditions regardless of the fact that they are producing the wealth of the country is bad enough, but our democratic legislation says that such people cannot be allowed a vote for the Legislative Council! The whole outlook regarding the industry seems to be out of date.

In America motor power has been made use of for the haulage of logs, and, as a matter of fact, just outside Busselton there

is a timbermill the logs for which are hauled some 35 miles from the bush by motor transport. With the mill situated so close to the township, the men and their families are able to live in Busselton and enjoy the local amenities. When I read in this morning's issue of "The West Australian" that the Minister for Munitions was worried about the supply of timber for post-war reconstruction work, I was reminded that that difficulty had been stressed in this Parliament on many occasions. As I have often urged previously, something must be done to ease the manpower situation in the timber mills, and that is essential if sufficient timber is to be made available for post-war purposes.

For the past two years I have on many occasions contacted the Deputy Controller of Timber regarding that problem with a view to securing necessary releases of manpower from the Services for the purpose of supplying sufficient labour for the timber mills. Over the whole period about 500 men have been released. In 1939-40 there were 2,940 men in the industry whereas in 1944-45 there were only 2,793, which discloses a drop of approximately 150, and yet 500 men were released from the Services to be associated with the industry! As a matter of fact, those men were released from the Services to boost production but that number has been hardly sufficient to effect replacements in the industry. The position will become still more serious as the older men who have been carrying on during the war, drop out. According to one estimate, approximately another 708 men could be absorbed in the industry immediately to make up the leeway on production, to keep the existing sawmills in operation and the benches in full swing.

In order to carry out the post-war programme there will need to be more and still more timber, and that means the employment of more and more men in the industry. What will be the effect of that? In view of the fact that at present the employers cannot provide even decent housing accommodation for the men now employed, what will be the position if thousands of men return to the industry? We cannot expect men to leave the Armed Forces and accept work in the timber country, where they will have to submit with their families to conditions that are not at all satisfactory.

I can foresee quite a lot of trouble. This problem should be dealt with straight away as a matter of urgency. Then again, I urge upon the Government that a larger proportion of the houses provided should be made available to the country districts.

In my opinion the farmers should be allowed to participate in the Workers' Homes Scheme or some such scheme so that they can build homes for themselves and for their workers. If the policy of decentralisation is to be carried out successfully, essential amenities must be provided to encourage workers to remain in country districts. I would cite the position of Donnybrook, which has been one of the mainstays in the production of dehydrated foodstuffs for the Fighting Services and has forged ahead with flax production, which was so urgently required by the Commonwealth Government. During the war period, only three houses have been built for the workers at Donnybrook. From time to time statements, issued by the Deputy Director of Manpower in this State, Mr. H. T. Stitfold, have appeared in the Press urging workers to engage in the industries there—but there were no houses for those workers. I understand that the erection of six houses at Donnybrook has been promised, but I am afraid, from the standpoint of the war period, it is too late. I am hopeful that, with successful planning, the industries I have mentioned will continue to function at Donnybrook and that the necessary housing provision will be made for the workers there.

From time to time the South-West has been referred to as "The Garden of Western Australia." The actual development down there represents about ten per cent. of the area. While the South-West Power Scheme will provide for further development and other helpful contributing factors will be the land settlement scheme, the extension of the Stirling Dam and the raising of the Wellington Dam, there are other matters to be taken into consideration. One is the provision by the Railway Department of improved transport and passenger facilities. I do not desire to be hard on the newly appointed Minister for Railways who possibly knows the position better than I do, but the fact remains that the facilities on the Bunbury line leave much to be desired. That matter has been stressed so much on previous occasions that I shall not dilate

upon it now, beyond mentioning that something should be done immediately regarding the provision for the carriage of perishable goods.

Articles have appeared in the Press concerning the unsatisfactory milk supply. Until we have a much faster service for the conveyance of milk from the country to the city—possibly bulk transport will assist, together with necessary refrigeration facilities for dealing with such perishable goods as milk, butter and cheese—we cannot expect to effect much improvement in the milk position. Under the present methods, the milk has to be collected from the different farms and taken, say, to Brunswick where it has to be brine-cooled. It awaits the arrival of the train for conveyance to the city where it is again brine-cooled and then retailed to the public as pure milk. Obviously the whole position requires overhauling, and the only way to cope with the present situation is to effect the improvements I have indicated. Many other matters can be mentioned as affecting the farmers. In my estimation the re-building of country roads through farming districts, particularly in the South-West, should receive high priority in the works programme.

The opening up of new roads is also essential. Sometime ago I referred to the old Bunbury road, and I still contend that it should be properly constructed right through from Australind to Mandurah, with the object of opening up the light land area and inducing settlement along the route. There are great possibilities of development in the South-West and, in addition, the road I mention could be utilised to promote tourist traffic along the lines adopted in Victoria. It would also make the coastal sector there available as a holiday resort, especially for people in the mill towns. Roads have been sadly neglected during the war period, and it is to be hoped that the Government will put necessary reconstruction work in hand as speedily as possible. With regard to the carriage of livestock, a suggestion has been made that a special train should be made available for that purpose so as to ensure speedy transport from the agricultural centres to the city. Under existing conditions livestock is often in transit for three or four days, and as a natural consequence losses are sustained by the farmers concerned.

Another suggestion offered is that the Government should clear an additional area along both sides of country roads to provide for livestock being driven with a margin of safety for both travellers and stock. That is a valuable suggestion which should commend itself to the Government. Again, early consideration should be given to the release of tyres and an increase in the petrol allowance for farmers. I am aware that that is not a matter within the power of this House to deal with, but the Government should stress to the Commonwealth authorities the urgent necessity for steps to be taken in that direction. Western Australia is probably in a unique position, because of its vastness. It was strange to read in "The West Australian" that the petrol ration for private motorists, in other words for pleasure purposes, is to be increased by 25 per cent., while the primary producer is to receive only an increase of 15 per cent. I am still hopeful that that is a mistake; I cannot imagine it is otherwise.

Many other matters upon which I could speak I can deal with when the Estimates come before the House; for instance, employment of discharged Service personnel for employment in country areas. That is a point to which consideration has been given, but it should be given still more consideration because of the leeway that has to be made up in the country districts, especially on the dairy farms, whose owners have been unable to effect necessary repairs and renovations and keep up maintenance because the necessary labour has not been available. They should be entitled to every consideration when discharges are made from the Forces. The drains in the South-West district are in a very bad condition in most places and will have to be put in proper repair very shortly. The dairy farmers are to be commended on their production. I notice by this morning's paper that their production for this year is very little below that of last year, notwithstanding abnormal weather conditions, a very dry summer and a very wet winter. I am sorry to learn that the potato-growers will suffer on account of a great reduction in their crops, owing to the abnormal rain. I am afraid that the reduction will possibly affect the suburban people to a great extent.

When Minister for Lands, the Premier said that this session he would bring down legislation dealing with the metropolitan milk supply. I hope members representing the constituencies concerned in this matter will be given ample opportunity to consider the new legislation, because the Minister said that it would be entirely new. Many valuable suggestions have been made by various associations, but as yet they do not know exactly what the Minister intends to do in the matter. I would go so far as to suggest that it might be advisable to form a committee consisting of the representatives of the constituencies concerned to consider the legislation before the Minister puts it into complete form to bring down to the House. While dealing with the milk question, there is one point I shall not miss. I communicated with the chairman of the Metropolitan Milk Board asking him what the position was with respect to prosecutions for dirty milk. I have seen samples of such milk; they are absolutely amazing. I asked him whether the Milk Board's inspector or the Health Board's inspector was empowered to prosecute a producer for dirty milk. The chairman's reply was as follows:—

In reply to your letter of the 17th January, I advise you in reply to the questions asked by you that a Milk Board inspector has not the power to prosecute a person or producer for dirty milk.

This is a matter which certainly should be looked into by the Minister concerned. The letter continues—

Under section 36 of the Act the board is empowered to prohibit the use for human consumption in any form of milk which appears to be deleterious to health or unwholesome. This power has been exercised by the board, through its inspectors, who have rejected milk which they considered not fit for human consumption. No prosecutions have taken place by the board in respect of dirty milk.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Have there been prosecutions by the health inspector?

Mr. HOLMAN: I cannot say; his answer did not include that portion of the question. I am sorry I have not time to deal with the by-products of timber. The question is an important one. America seems to think it is of major importance, and I am afraid that Australia will allow America to capture the markets for plastics in the post-war period. I shall elaborate on this subject when next I have the opportunity. Among other matters of importance are the

standardisation of railway gauges, uniform taxation, migration and soldier settlement. I cannot deal with these very important matters in the time at my disposal. Further, I would prefer to await the return of the Premier, who I hope will give the House a full report on these matters, as they were dealt with at the Premiers' Conference.

In the course of my criticisms I have levelled certain complaints against Government departments, but I wish to take this opportunity publicly to express my thanks to the officials of those departments and the civil servants of the State. I do so in all sincerity. I very much appreciate the courtesy and thoughtfulness of the civil servants in every public department with which I have had any dealings whatsoever during the past 12 months. Never once was I turned away with the feeling that they had not done their utmost for me. I could say the same with one exception—and one exception only—in regard to the Commonwealth public servants also. I take this opportunity publicly to thank them for the way in which they received my requests for information on any matter. In conclusion I desire to express my earnest wish for the successful conclusion of the efforts that will be necessary, by Governments and individuals alike, to bring about the vital change-over from the long period of war, which entailed such a magnificent effort by the people of our nation, to an everlasting peace which I trust will bring more greatness, prosperity and happiness to our people and Australia for all time.

MRS. CARDELL-OLIVER (Subiaco) [8.39]: I am sorry it is such a late hour at which to commence. I want to congratulate our new Premier, and also our new Minister and our Chairman of Committees; I hope they will all have a very happy time in their term of office. I wish to say to the ex-Premier—I am sorry he is not here—how grateful I am to him for his kindness and courtesy since I have been in the House. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid my speech is going to be a rather involved one, and if I am difficult to follow I want to apologise in advance. I shall realise that it will be due to lack of my ability to explain rather than the want of intelligence on the part of my listeners. I wish to speak on Britain's external debt and to give an outline of the economic position which confronts her now that the

war is over, the difficulties of the cash-and-carry period which she passed through, the advantages and disadvantages of the lend-lease and reverse lend-lease policies, which have meant so much to the winning of the war, and lastly the great need for Empire unity if we are to survive as a nation. Those are my points.

May I commence by mentioning the freedoms, of which we have heard so much during the past few years? We all know that under the term "Freedom" a great deal of false propaganda has been and is being preached. Many frothy platform and radio orators, whose entire wits seem to lie in voice manipulation, moved crowds to childish indignation in talking of mythical injustices. Many of them sneered at the British Empire. They openly encouraged politics of a dictator class, encouraged distrust towards their own kith and kin and advocated class hatred. This license, which is called freedom, has been allowed during the many years in which our Empire and our country have been in deadly peril. When license is licensed, encouraged and countenanced, it means one of two things. It is either indifference on the part of the authorities, or it is that they are traitors to their duties. If this license is allowed to continue, what there is left of democracy is, in my opinion, doomed, and the greatest of all wars, for which so many have given their lives and in which so many civilians have lost their homes, will have been fought in vain.

There is another freedom, that of the Press. Press reports should be—at least, in my opinion—considered expression of thought. Throughout the war this freedom has been heavily censored. Security has been given as a reason, which is understandable, too, but are we sure that the same authorities, which have allowed unbridled license in speech in Australia, are scrupulously patriotic and jealous when it comes to censorship of the Press? It has been noteworthy that facts regarding Australian administration have been lacking, and it has been noteworthy that facts regarding world affairs have been conspicuous by their absence. Certain nations, we know, have been permitted huge headlines in the Press at the expense of other nations. There seemed at times—at least it did to me—to be almost a conspiracy to give Russia and America daily headlines. I have not begrudged either of those coun-

tries the eulogies that they have deserved, but I have resented it when British news has taken second place or has had no place at all. So, in the few minutes at my disposal, I hope to give a few facts regarding the Mother-land and, incidentally, some facts about America and Russia which seem to me to be worth recording in this House where freedom of speech and the freedom of the Press, through "Hansard," are still allowed.

It was when I saw a small Press notice a few weeks ago, from Washington, to the effect that after the Import and Export Bank of America had arranged for further trade credits, to the extent of 700,000,000 dollars to 1,000,000,000 dollars, to Russia, there would be little if any credit available to aid Great Britain, that I decided that I would, upon every possible occasion, stress the need to help Britain, and to point out that if an obligation for help lay upon any nation it was upon a nation within the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the British Empire. Just before the last British general elections the financial circles of Britain were very perturbed about the external indebtedness of Britain. That debt is approximately the huge sum of £3,000,000,000, or more. How she is going to pay that debt we have yet to find out, but it is certain that it must be through exports. Russia has estimated that Britain must export one and a half times more than she did before the war if she is to feed and clothe her people, and meet her commitments. Lord Keynes puts it down at 50 per cent. above the 1938 exports. Whatever the amount is, huge markets will have to be found, and the question is: Where is Britain going to find them?

The markets of the Baltic and of the Balkan States, which once did a certain trade with Britain, will now come under the domination of Russia. Russia is also demanding further interests in the East at the expense of Britain. Manchuria, China and Japan will all come under the guidance and influence of Russia. America will be almost a closed country. We can remember that after the last war when Britain cancelled her debts to her Allies she found herself in the position of not being able to pay her debts to America which country had raised its tariffs to such heights as to make payment with goods impossible. The same thing will happen now because of the termination

of the lease-lend policy. Britain, on the other hand, as was remarked by the member for Mt. Marshall the other night, accepted from her enemies goods, in payment of their debts, much to the detriment of her own people.

If I am to make myself clear I must go back to 1938. It was in that year that the Import and Export Bank of America came into prominence. In the Press today we see that Mr. Crowley is chairman of that bank. It came into prominence in 1938 because China then sought assistance from America, but, owing to certain American laws at that time concerning countries at war, the 25,000,000 dollar loan that China received could not be spent on guns and ammunition, which China wanted. As a result China had to buy the next best thing, namely, aircraft, and a condition of the purchase was that the loan was to be repaid in five years by cargoes of tung oil which America needed. At that time huge orders were being placed with America. The war was looming and many countries hoped to get their orders through before its outbreak.

As we know, when war did break out Britain was still very unprepared. She was then placed in the same position as China, but, by special interpretation of the Act, America did allow Britain to purchase a number of old guns that had been greased and laid aside after the last war, and which were considered obsolete. However, America was sympathetic and knew that the downfall of Britain would adversely affect her. She saw Britain's difficulties and, in 1939, devised the cash-and-carry plan which suited her. When this plan became law it allowed nations to buy weapons of war, but cash had to be paid and the purchaser had to carry away the goods. It was during this period that Britain spent most of her external assets. She paid and paid until she could pay no more. While Britain spent almost all her external assets America was depending upon Britain to save the world, including herself!

If there is any justice left in the world today surely all the latecomers in the war who share in the glory of conquest should share in the material costs. They cannot share in the lives that have been lost, but they can share in the material costs. It was in the meantime that American trade was bounding ahead, and thousands of mil-

lions of dollars were being invested. Factories were being enlarged everywhere and American defence was being assured and paid for by outside nations. It was only when Britain was trapped in Flanders and much of her equipment gone; when Belgium surrendered and France was falling that America began to think that she might be left to fight alone the battle for democracy. Her fleet was in the Pacific. She had been depending more or less upon the British Fleet in the Atlantic which, at that time suffered. In 1941 America said—

Our two-way fleet is still in the building.

“Such a situation,” said Mr. Stimson, “can easily become critical if British sea power in the Atlantic is lost.” It was then that America began to seek a way out. The barnacle-encrusted destroyers were thought of at that time. They were over-age and worn out but Britain to whom the sea is life, wanted them. America suggested an exchange involving some long coveted bases in Newfoundland and Bermuda. Although wanting ships so badly Britain refused to trade any of these particular bases which she thought might, at some time in the dim and distant future, be wanted by Canada. So she gave certain rights in them as a free-will gift. She then traded bases, in exchange for these destroyers in the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua and British Guiana. At the conclusion of the bargain Mr. Churchill was asked by Mr. Hull if he would re-affirm the remarks he had made in his Dunkirk speech, when he said that the British fleet would never surrender, and would never be scuttled, but would fight on from overseas bases if the British waters became untenable. To that humiliating request Mr. Churchill replied characteristically. He said, “These hypothetical contingencies seem more likely to concern the German Fleet, or what is left of it, than the British.”

Members will have seen, in a recent Press statement, that America now wants more bases in the Pacific, on islands now controlled by the Allies, declaring that she has won the war alone and almost single-handed. I am sure she did her best, and I am just as sure that she will expect full payment. If we, in Australia, had never made a line of division for our Fighting Forces; if we had allowed them to go into all battle areas, as we did during the Great

War, I am quite sure that America today could never have said that she won the war alone and single-handed, and this grab for bases would not have occurred. It was in 1940 that America became a realist, but it was not until nearly two years later that she entered the war. When Britain declared war on Germany her external assets were one billion and sixty-five thousand million pounds. This huge asset has long since gone, mainly in smoke, in exporting guns and munitions to the Continent, gone in expelling Rommel from Africa.

The success of that campaign, of which Britain bore the brunt, and in which many of our own boys participated, is now almost forgotten, but it was one of the finest achievements of the war. Over half a million British men and hundreds of thousands of tons of ammunition and equipment were carried 12,000 miles, round the Cape to North Africa, by British or mainly British ships. It was a great achievement, when fighting 12,000 miles from the base. It was the freeing of North Africa that made it possible to free the Mediterranean, to land on Italian soil and to cut off supplies from Germany, to capture Sicily and re-capture Greece and Crete, and to maintain Malta.

It was in 1941 that America, after discussion and intense propaganda throughout her 48 States, conceived the simple method of exchange known as lend-lease. I think the example of the exchange of destroyers against bases might have had some bearing on her decision. In defending the Bill for lend-lease, the Secretary for the Navy, Stimson, said—“We are not seeking to make a loan to Great Britain. We are really seeking to purchase her aid in our defence,” and the day after the Bill was passed Congress was asked to appropriate 7,000,000 dollars to produce tanks, guns, and “all things for nations whose defence we have decided is vital to our own.” It was the passing of the Lend-Lease Bill that made victory sure, as we know, and for this our eternal thanks are due to America. It was in March, 1943, that the extension of that Act came before the Parliament of America, an Act which had been regarded with such suspicion when it first came before that Parliament prior to America entering the war, and it passed the House of Representatives by 407 votes to six, and the Senate by 80 votes to nil.

Lend-lease has helped all Allied nations during the war, but in peace it is the author of lend-lease that will reap the benefit. Lend-lease has made it possible for America to become the greatest producing country in the world. Shipyards and factories, representing millions of dollars, are now permanent structures in 34 out of 48 States. Whilst most of the supplies sent to the Allies have gone up in smoke, lend-lease money from the Allies has helped to build these establishments in America, places such as the great bomber plant at Willow Run, the great Chrysler tank arsenal in Detroit, Kaiser's permanent shipyard at Richmond, California, the Douglas aircraft plants, the Boeing, Consolidated Bell, Curtiss-Wright, Verga, Grumman, and United Aircraft plants. We cannot imagine America wasting such wartime production in peacetime. Rather will she demand her full share of the world's trade, in the air, on the roads and on the sea. I have mentioned some of her aircraft production plants, and the same applies to the shipyards. Lend-lease funds helped to enlarge the Charleston Navy Yard at Boston, to build new shipyards at Bethlehem and Baltimore, the Sun Shipbuilding yards at Chester, and others. Lend-lease funds have built new factories for Ford, General Motors and Nash.

The expense of building Packards was split between America and Britain. Britain paid 25,000,000 dollars for her part of the erection of that factory, and also gave free for good measure, the designs of engines, without royalty charges. Rolls Royce and other priceless engine designs have been given to America without charge. In food, though America was self-contained before the war, since 1941 food plants have so increased that America has had more food than ever before in her history. Though I read in yesterday's papers that this was not so, I am taking America's own words when I say it is so. America has also exported millions of tons of dehydrated meats, milk and eggs. I do not think America will close those factories. It is true that Australia and New Zealand have supplied 90 per cent. of the food consumed by the military forces in the Pacific zone, and have built small ships for carrying food, troop-carrying barges and so on, and have established a few canning and processing plants which will be useful in peacetime. It is true that by reverse lend-lease Australia has obtained

airfields at Port Moresby and Darwin, but much of the equipment came from America and cannot be credited to reverse lend-lease. It is true that Australia has supplied base hospitals, barracks and repair depots, which can be credited to reverse lend-lease.

Though these items decrease our indebtedness to America, they do not increase Australia's post-war facilities for trade, except to a minor extent. I believe that Australia's reverse lend-lease is about half her lend-lease debt to America. It will be observed that lend-lease money spent in America mainly built up private industry, while in Australia it did not build up private industry to any great extent, and did not even build up new Government concerns. It merely used the existing buildings, and in Great Britain it did more or less the same thing. My point is that America did not disturb her existing commercial or social conditions. She insisted on new factories, and extensions for which outside countries paid, and from this America will reap colossal benefits.

Mr. Fox: You do not seem to like America.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I like every country. According to a leading article in "The West Australian"—

Britain does not only emerge from the Allied victory as the world's biggest debtor; she virtually threw her vital export trade into the pool. As a result of supplies of munitions, food and raw materials, shipping services, etc., under lend-lease and Canadian mutual aid, Britain was able to use manpower in the Armed Forces and for other direct war purposes in a record mobilisation. She did not attempt to maintain sufficient exports to finance the acquisition of materials and services, and to obtain these for civil production, she is now without reserves.

What does America think about Britain's chance of recovery in the post-war period? A United States Senator from Utah in his book entitled "The Four Fears," writes—

England has made heroic efforts to place all possible facilities at our disposal and reports seem to indicate that they do not begrudge their best.

None of this has been done for love of us. It has been done because we have needed each other. We need her resources and she needs ours. We need her strength, her staying power as a people, her skill, materials, her trade. Above economics I place the moral force that she can bring to bear on this crisis.

How much she needs us now she knows. How much she will need us later, she may not know until after the war. Her situation is less favourable than after the last war. Her in-

dustrial machinery on which she depends will be run down when she needs it most. Politically, she will not stand out as a great power. Her problem of domestic reconstruction will be far more acute than ours, more acute than Russia's. She cannot hope to feed herself. Foreign trade is her life. For us it has never been more than 10 per cent. of all we produce, but Great Britain and Canada have taken that 10 per cent.

That is the opinion of a leading man and writer, and it is also the opinion of many Americans. If this economic degradation is to come true, it can only come true if we, the children of the Motherland, allow it to come true. I should like to comment upon one point made by the writer, "that nothing has been done for the love of us; it has been done because we have needed each other." Why did Britain fight for Poland and freedom? Poland had no assets to speak of and Britain wanted nothing from Poland, but Britain gave and gave freely of all she had so that democracy might be saved for the world. That is my answer to that American Senator. I have called Britain great. Let me quote another American. The following is an extract from President Roosevelt's 17th Report to Congress on Lend-Lease:—

The total monetary value to the United Kingdom of its reverse lend-lease aid to the United States from the 1st June, 1942, to the 30th June, 1944, was 2,437,062,000 dollars—almost 2½ billion dollars. Thirty-one per cent. of all supplies and equipment required by the U.S. Army in the European theatre of war between 1st June, 1942, and the 30th June, 1944, were supplied by British reverse lend-lease aid without payment by the United States.

It would have taken 1,000 ships to send the requisite supplies from the United States to Britain, and the cost of such transport has not been allowed for as it does not come into reverse lend-lease; it is a gift. Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease made it possible to begin the invasion of Europe months earlier than would have been the case. In addition to the supplies mentioned, an immense amount of construction has been done to accommodate the troops of the United States—air bases, camps, and repair depots throughout England, in Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland. About one-third of Great Britain's total labour force was employed on the United States programme on production, which work will be valueless to Britain in peacetime. The monetary totals are incomplete, but they

can never show the true values of costs between the United States and Britain because the cost of labour in those countries is very different. Dollar figures are arrived at by translating pounds into dollars at official rates of exchange, and therefore understate the real financial value. For example, a parachute which is purchased in the United States for the Forces or for lease-lend countries costs 165 dollars, whereas in the United Kingdom it costs 135 dollars. An army jacket costing 6 dollars 10 cents in America costs 5 dollars 60 cents in Britain. Members will notice the saving to the United States, which is seldom mentioned. The report continues—

Although Great Britain has supplied so much material for the Allies, the United Kingdom forces have been supplied with approximately 70 per cent. of their equipment from their own factories.

Great Britain's part in this combined production and supply, through the miracles of production and the steadfastness of her people, have been achieved in the five years during which they have been living literally on the front lines. From the days of the great blitz in 1940-41, through the equally terrible flying bomb attacks of last year—when 700,000 houses were partially or wholly destroyed within a few months—the people submitted to five years of smashing bomb attacks which destroyed 4½ million homes. They were five years in which countless families were torn apart, five years in which mothers were called to factories and fathers to the Forces, five years of scanty rations in food and clothing. Out of a population of approximately 45,000,000 people, no fewer than 23,000,000 were removed from their homes, either for war work or at Government direction.

After the glorious defeat at Dunkirk, and it was a glorious defeat, when every little ship, tug, yacht and paddle-boat went to the rescue of those 300,000 men, did the people of England feel down-hearted? No! They were more determined than ever to build again. They had that unconquerable spirit which has made it possible for 78,000,000 British people to build an Empire. Britain conceived and carried out the bridging of the Channel, fathom deep, by a steel pipeline which would enable her to pump hundreds of thousands of gallons of petrol a day to France when V-Day came. So sure was she that that day would come that she built

little rafts to bridge the surface of the water. But of what use are they to her now? I cannot see that they will be one iota of advantage to her now that peace has come. But they did help America and they did help the Allies, and they helped Britain, too, to conquer Germany. Now, I do not want members to think for one moment—as my friend has said—that I do not like America. I do not want members to think that.

I salute the Americans for what they have done, but the senator who said that America could live alone economically, and that Britain could not, hit the nail on the head. America is a rich country with a 130,000,000 population to exploit her wealth and consume her goods. Now what of Russia? She depicted Britain's downfall to less than a third-rate power. "The prospect of mass unemployment," she said, "lies upon Britain like an evil shadow." That was well circulated in Britain just before the last election, and I cannot help thinking that such propaganda had an influence on the political landslide. Neither can I help remembering what that small, but great, power Britain has done for Russia. When Russia came into the war Britain had been waging war alone for a long time. As Churchill said, "We fight alone, but not for ourselves alone." Russia, like all other great powers, waited until she was first attacked to attack.

Although British armies were everywhere short of supplies, Britain decided to send certain vital necessary supplies to Russia to encourage and support her new ally. It was British engineers who opened up the overland supply route from the Persian Gulf to the Caspian Sea to transport British, and later on United States, supplies to Russia. More than 4,000,000 tons of tanks and munitions poured across that route for three years before Germany was defeated. It was the Trans-Iranian supply system which was largely responsible for enabling Russia to save Stalingrad. Although by April, 1943, the Americans were able to take over much of the road and rail haulage on that particular route, the fact remains that it was British skill, British enterprise and British courage that provided that route. The difficulties were enormous, crossing mountain ranges 7,000 ft. high, with 52 deg. of frost and trains breaking in half and running away. But the British, with inimitable tenacity, worked on until they had pro-

vided that particular route to Russia. Over the icy Arctic, too, with untold dangers in every knot, millions of tons of war materials found their way to Russia, all conveyed by the British Navy, and on British ships and with British volunteer seamen.

It would take hours to enumerate the millions of pounds worth of articles from needles to power plants that were sent to Russia at great cost to Britain and risk to British lives. But, like America, Russia is a unit country. She owned one-sixth of the world before the war; and in the early days of the war publicity was given, both through our Press and through our radio, to the fact that she wanted no territorial gain whatsoever. We almost believed her. Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia fell into her lap like ripe cherries, without protest from the Allies, as well as part of Finland and half of Poland. She has now complete domination over the Baltic Sea and the Baltic States. Russia has made sure of her interests, being protected by deporting inhabitants of acquired lands who were antagonistic to her, and installing Soviet citizens. Over 1,500,000 Poles are still missing, and it will be remembered that they were driven out in the early days when Russia first went into Poland. They were driven to Russia and Soviet citizens were put in their particular country.

Russia now seeks freedom of the waters which have for ages been closed to her in Turkey. She seeks to enlarge her interests in the East at the expense of Britain. Why? Is it not for world trade and domination? She did not enter the world war until she saw which way the United States were going, and she did not enter the Pacific war until she saw that victory by the western Allies was sure. She will now reap great benefits from, although she says she will not take, new ports in Manchuria. She will nevertheless get ports in that particular part of the world where before Japan rode roughshod. Manchuria always belonged to China; it was always a Chinese possession. Professor Copland has said that Russia will become a great economic power, and I am sure we all believe it. She will enlarge her interests through China, Japan and the Islands until she is linked up with this country. I salute her. The Russians have been heroic in their fight, but they have not fought for democ-

raey. They have fought heroically for communism under the belief that they were fighting for democracy.

Mr. Withers: You ought to give this script back to "The Archer" when you have finished:

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I would like to, but he does not know of its existence yet.

In my view geographically, economically, and politically, Russia can look after herself, or perhaps the hon. member might help her. What has all this got to do with my subject? Just this: That both the countries which I have mentioned are self-contained. They need none of our particular aid. But our Motherland is composed of a small island, and both America and Russia are alike when they say that she cannot hope to feed herself, clothe herself and retain her former greatness, and I add, alone. But they are wrong if they think she stands alone. The outflung posts of the Empire have always come to her help when she has been in need of it. She needs it now. How can we give it? The answer is—it is quite easy—it is "Buy British," demand British goods, make contracts with Britain. The Governments of both Britain and Australia are now Labour Governments, and it is for Labour now to show her worth. It will be an eternal disgrace to Labour politics if our country cannot clasp hands with Britain across the sea and help the Motherland to bear her burden.

Mr. Needham: Australia has not been idle.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I am very worried now that she should do her duty when the time has come for her to do it. We see that, owing to the termination of lend-lease, housing, decent food and clothing must be delayed or cut in a country that has suffered so much and that I, at any rate, love. I am not speaking of Labour in England. I know the members of the party there will do their best. I am speaking of Labour Governments here, and I trust that they will make contact with Britain and help her out of the difficulties in which she now finds herself.

Mr. Needham: Have they not been doing so?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: I cannot understand what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Subiaco will address the Chair.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: We sometimes hear unthinking people say that America has saved Australia; I heard the hon. member say it. It is said that our debt is to her rather than to Britain; though the hon. member did not say that. But let us think back for a moment. When Pearl Harbour lay stricken, the Japs had a chance to invade Australia. They certainly gave us a few nuisance bombs, but why did they not come down in hordes to invade this country before America could mobilise her Army or get her Navy into action? It was because of the distance from her base. I am one of those few people who believe that Japan never seriously contemplated the invasion of Australia. The rich islands north of Australia which held all the raw materials she desired, with their teeming millions of coloured population who would be subservient to her—these were her real objectives. Japan knew that she could never keep and develop a continent of this size with 7,000,000 whites who were individualistic and undisciplined, a continent with 11,000 miles of coastline always open to the might of the British and American navies. Japan is not a foolish nation. Many members may have been there and must know them. The Japanese knew of our waterless tracts and sandy deserts. They knew Australia better than the majority of Australians know it. Japan was content to keep what she had gained. Her concern was this: that Australia was the jumping-off ground for America, and therefore she tried to prevent America from using Australia. But America did use Australia.

Mr. Smith: She had all the scrap-iron she wanted.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: It helped America for Australia to be used. What would have happened to Australia, especially Western Australia, if Japan had been successful in her Pearl Harbour stunt on Ceylon? America had little interest in this side of the continent. It was the British who shot down the 100 Japanese planes over Ceylon and sent the Japanese out of those waters and kept the sea lanes from India and Ceylon to Australia free. What would have happened to South Africa and the Cape route both to Australia and North

Africa if Britain had not taken prompt action in Madagascar? Let it be remembered that North Africa meant a great deal to our war programme and America's war programme. What would have happened if the British had not been holding up a million Japs in Burma and elsewhere?

The British got no headlines—and are not getting many in this Chamber tonight—when her Royal Navy attacked Sabang, the enemy's naval base and oil centre on Sumatra and Surabaya. They had no headlines when the Royal Navy sank 62 Japanese vessels when they were on their way to Rangoon in 1944. There were no headlines to say that Britain had formed a new army and that thousands of troops were on their way when peace was declared. Before the Pacific war ended, there were a million of our British forces in the Far East. Information received on the 13th July stated that before the end of August the number would be increased and that nearly 2,000,000 men would be in the East. No atomic bomb was necessary for Japan's defeat, and neither was Russia's last minute entry. Japan was already defeated. It might have taken longer to end the war, but Japan was already defeated. The British people are modest. We do not see Britain's men here in the same way as we have seen the Americans. They are not as obvious as are our American friends. They do not put their arms around people in the daylight!

The Minister for Works: Do they do so at night?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: Britain hates publicity. She is the world's worst propagandist. In 1934, I wrote a little book called "Empire Unity or 'Red' Asiatic Domination." In that book I dealt with Australia's trade with Japan. These words occur in the book—

Will Australia accept the shadow and let the substance go?

Japan was our second largest buyer of wool. During 1931-32, Australia exported to Japan produce worth £11,000,000, of which the wool exported was valued at £7,000,000 odd. She imported from Japan goods to the value of £2,396,734. In 1932-33, Australia increased her imports from Japan to £3,564,000. This increase occurred largely at the expense of British goods. Mills in

Yorkshire and Lancashire were idle whilst we in Australia were buying Japanese goods. Japan flooded the world with cheap goods. She achieved that not only by cheap labour but by aid from internal currency such as Germany employed and Russia employs now, and which has been employed by many countries which subsidise their goods so that they can be sold on the world's markets at cheaper than cost. I will illustrate that by showing members a little doyley. I bought it in a most exclusive shop in the most exclusive street in London. It is linen and hand-made, and it sold for 1d. There were thousands there waiting to be sold. I have had this doyley washed over 1,000 times, so it is of good quality. Other articles were sold at that time in Britain and elsewhere equally cheaply.

The Minister for Lands: Was it made in Britain for 1d.?

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER: No, in Japan. I am sorry if I did not make myself clear. It is money acquired through the means I have mentioned that allows warlike nations to build equipment for war. America, with her large supplies of gold and her huge supplies of raw materials may not adopt these methods, but she has might behind her and a world in debt to her before her; therefore markets must be open to her. Russia and her satellites will adopt these means. She has been acquiring her war equipment by these methods since the revolution. It is plain wishful thinking to imagine that democracy has won this war. It is might that has won it, and in some countries the freedom for which we fought will never be known.

Surely our lesson has been hard enough! We want no more wars; but as surely as night follows day, peace will not come to the British nation unless we stand together in this post-war period. It is true that there are only 78,000,000 white people scattered throughout one-third of the globe; but the real population of the Empire is approximately 500,000,000. We have raw materials; we have the character to protect ourselves and our industries; and our dominions and British colonies are potentially rich. We can win through with unity, and only with unity. Rudyard Kipling some years ago wrote a poem in which he appealed from

England to the Empire for unity. He ended his poem with these words—

Also we will make promise
So long as blood endures
I shall know that your good is mine,
Ye shall feel that my strength is yours,
In the day of Armageddon,
At the last great fight of all,
That our House shall stand together
And the pillars do not fall.

On motion by Mr. Mann, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.36 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 29th August, 1945.

Questions:	PAGE
Water supplies—(a) as to progress at Pingrup	411
(b) As to Cranbrook and Mt. Barker	411
(c) As to Kalamunda and Maida Vale	411
Pardelup prison escapees, as to compensation for damage done	412
State Shipping Service, as to vessels for North-West trade	412
Coal, as to prices and storage bins	412
Timber, as to manpower for local production	412
Electricity supply, as to approved extensions in Swan district	413
Sterling and Australian exchange, as to reasons for continuance	413
Address-in-reply, thirteenth day (amendment)	413
(Amendment on amendment, defeated)	435
(Amendment defeated)	451
Point of order	435

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

QUESTIONS.

WATER SUPPLIES.

(a) *As to Progress at Pingrup.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

1, What progress has been made with the excavation of water tank on No. 1 site at Pingrup?

2, When is the work expected to be complete?

3, Will completion include roofing and bitumenising of catchment area, and if so, what area of catchment will be treated?

4, Is a pipe to be laid to the adjacent road, and what size pipe will be used?

The MINISTER replied:

1, 50 per cent. of excavation for dam and drains.

2, End of October, providing roofing iron is available.

3, Includes roofing, but no bitumen catchment at present.

4, Yes, to adjacent road, but not to main Pingrup-Lake Grace road. Two-inch pipe will be used.

(b) *As to Cranbrook and Mt. Barker.*

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

1, When is it expected that a start can be made in regard to the approved survey for a water supply at Cranbrook?

2, What progress has been made regarding the proposed water supply for Mount Barker?

The MINISTER replied:

1, In a month's time, when surveyor finishes work in hand.

2, Sufficient information has been obtained to submit a preliminary report to the Director of Works (Mr. Dumas). This will be considered after his return from the Eastern States on the 31st August.

(c) *As to Kalamunda and Maida Vale.*

Mr. OWEN asked the Minister for Water Supplies:

1, What source of supply was decided on as the result of the survey made in regard to the water supply for Kalamunda and Maida Vale?

2, Was there any alternative source discovered?

3, Does he consider that these places should be left any longer without a water supply?

4, If not, what is it proposed to do to make a supply available in the near future?

5, Can a water supply be guaranteed for next year, and if not, what will be the possible cause for delay?

The MINISTER replied:

1, Mundaring Weir.

2, Every natural local source of supply had been examined without result.

3, Until Mundaring Weir is raised it is impossible to provide a satisfactory supply.

4, Raising of Mundaring Weir has been listed as one of the urgent post-war works.

5, No. See 3 and 4.