

own money and I believe it would be a great step forward because they would have to trade with this portion of the State. I agree, however, that we should be careful that they do not come here to compete in an already glutted labour market. Probably some arrangement can be made with those people that if they leave the North they will have to go overseas.

The Minister for Mines: Where would they go?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: Is the Minister aware that those people have passports for a period of only 12 months?

The Minister for Mines: But where would they go?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: To the country whence they came.

The Minister for Mines: Could they do that?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: If they know that they cannot get a home elsewhere, and that it is a condition of their coming to this country that they stay in the North, I believe they will remain there.

The Minister for Mines: I believe you are right.

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I do not think we need take that point, but anyhow the Minister himself has provided an answer.

Mr. Holman: What about the migrants who went to Darwin?

Hon. C. G. LATHAM: I must confess I have not been to Darwin and I do not know anything about those migrants, though I believe there were some people settled in the southern part of the Territory. I hope the Government will give this matter serious consideration. I believe there are great possibilities in the North, and certainly those people who settle there will be able to provide most of their own food requirements. When they reach the stage of having an export surplus, their problem will be something like the one confronting us. I hope the Government will give the matter serious consideration, because I believe those migrants will make good Australians. If the first generation does not, the second generation will, and I believe such a settlement will provide the population of which this country stands in so much need.

I give the Government the assurance that members on this side of the House will expedite all legislation that is in the interests of the people of the State. We reserve to

ourselves the right to criticise any Government proposal and we reserve to ourselves the right to tell the Government where it might be wrong in introducing party legislation that is not in the interests of the State as a whole. Any assistance that we can give to encourage the development of secondary industries will be given, but success in this direction depends upon the loyalty of the people. Admittedly it is difficult to get loyalty when the matter affects one's pocket, and when one has to pay 1d. or 2d. more for a local article, though possibly of a little better quality. I hope the Minister will be successful in his campaign because it is essential in a State like Western Australia, and there are great possibilities where the population is dense enough. If the Government desires our assistance in the matter of legislation, or in any other direction that will further the interests of the State, I hope it will call upon us.

On motion by Mr. Needham, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.54 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 9th August, 1939.

	PAGE
Question: Agricultural Bank, disease in dairy cows	43
Committees for the Session	44
Bill: Supply (No. 1), £2,500,000, Standing Orders	
Suspension, 2r., etc.	44
Address-in-Reply, third day	53
Adjournment, special	59

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

QUESTION—AGRICULTURAL BANK.

Disease in Dairy Cows.

Hon. H. TUCKEY asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is the Government aware that in October last the Agricultural Bank sold by auction at Sabina Vale a number of dairy cows concerning which it refused a guarantee of freedom from the disease known as contagious abortion? 2, That as a result of

such sale the disease was introduced to a dairy farm that for the previous fifteen years had been free from contagious abortion? 3, Will the Minister for Agriculture take such steps as will definitely prevent a recurrence of such action?

The HONORARY MINISTER (for the Chief Secretary) replied: 1, The Agricultural Bank did not sell cows at Sabina Vale stock depot in October last. 2 and 3, Answered by No. 1.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Standing Orders.—The President, the Chief Secretary, Hon. J. Cornell, Hon. C. F. Baxter, and Hon. J. Nicholson.

Library.—The President, Hon. C. F. Baxter, and Hon. G. Fraser.

Printing.—The President, Hon. E. H. Gray, and Hon. W. J. Mann.

Joint House.—The President, Hon. J. Cornell, Hon. E. H. Gray, Hon. V. Hamersley, and Hon. G. W. Miles.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,500,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, resolved:—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable a Supply Bill to pass through all stages at one sitting.

Second Reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [4.35] in moving the second reading said: This is the usual Bill to provide Supply with which to finance the State's operations pending the passing of the Estimates. The Budget is now in the course of preparation, and will be presented to Parliament at an early date. The total amount sought under this Bill is £2,500,000, the same as that approved for the first three months of last year. The allocation is as follows:—

	£
Consolidated Revenue Fund ..	1,750,000
General Loan Fund	450,000
Treasurer's Advance	300,000
Total	<u>£2,500,000</u>

Compared with the corresponding figures for last year there is an increase of £50,000 in the amount requested under the heading of Consolidated Revenue Fund, and a decrease of £50,000 under the heading of General Loan Fund. The actual expenditure from Consolidated Revenue Fund for the first three months of the last financial year was £1,734,193 exclusive of expenditure under Special Acts (such as interest, sinking fund contributions, etc.). This is approximately the amount we are asking for under the same heading in this Bill. The expenditure from General Loan Fund is expected to average £150,000 a month.

The customary amount of £300,000, requested for Treasurer's Advance, is to cover expenditure which for the time being cannot be charged against either Consolidated Revenue Fund or General Loan Fund, or otherwise cleared. Last year's operations on the Consolidated Revenue Fund resulted in a deficit of £220,442, or £201,096 more than the estimated deficit of £19,346. This increase was attributable to decreased revenue and increased expenditure in respect of the Railways. Compared with the original estimate, revenue from this instrumentality declined by £213,987, mainly as a result of the failure of wheat and timber freights to realise expectation, while at the same time expenditure increased by £116,677. Excluding these figures, however, there was a net improvement in the estimates, in respect of all other items, of £129,568, revenue being £124,556 in excess of the estimates, and expenditure down £5,012. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [4.40]: I shall not oppose the second reading of the Bill but intend to take advantage of the opportunity to make one or two pointed references to action necessary in the South Province, particularly in the Norseman and Ravensthorpe districts. Ever since the revival of mining at Norseman, the district has expanded. I advise every member who has not been to Norseman recently to visit that centre. Those who adopt my suggestion will be astounded. In less than four years the population has increased from 250 or 360 to 5,000. From the inception of this rapid growth of population, the inadequate school facilities have been the bane of the local people. Notwithstanding that fact, the officials of the Educa-

tion Department are almost as far behind as ever in overtaking requirements. Recently the Minister for Railways (Hon. E. Nulsen), who is also the member for the district, and I visited Norseman and several proposals were submitted to us with the object of getting over the difficulty. One was to remove the Grasspatch school to Norseman, which would provide some additional accommodation. The position at Norseman is that there are more children under school age than there are at present attending the school, and there are 380 pupils now. Members will recognise the urgent necessity for an adequate school building being constructed. We may well ask ourselves why the Government should hesitate and why it cannot find money for a new school at Norseman, whereas on the eve of an election it could find money for technical schools and a high school in the metropolitan area.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That is the shame of it all.

Hon. J. CORNELL: To indicate the faith that the people of Norseman have in their district, the Western Mining Corporation is sinking the Ajax shaft to a depth of 2,500ft., involving the expenditure of £100,000, before opening up at the 2,200ft. level. The other institution at Norseman to which I desire to direct the attention of the Minister, who knows the position because he has been to the district, is the local gaol.

Hon. A. Thomson: Has he been there?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think the Minister has been in the gaol, although he was a willing entrant. The Norseman gaol is a public disgrace, and has been so for a long time. It is wide open to the view of children who pass on their way to school. There is no exercise yard, nor are there any sanitary conveniences. The sergeant of police has to act as the sanitary officer. The Minister for Railways and I inspected the premises and agreed that they constitute a public disgrace. They were not fit to accommodate a dog, let alone a human being under any conditions. The local health authorities intimated that they would refuse to allow the place to be used for the purpose required and justices of the peace said they would refuse to remand men or commit individuals to the gaol. The building is 40 years old. Some members may ask: "If the gaol was good enough

in the old days, why is it not good enough now?" The reply to that is that in the earlier days men were not incarcerated in the gaol, apart from those suffering from the horrors due to the over-indulgence in drink. Those who have any knowledge of the early days on the goldfields are aware that at that period very few persons were ever committed to prison.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In those days they had too little money to indulge in the horrors.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The President can inform the hon. member that one doctor at Norseman suffered from the horrors and certified that everyone else was insane, with the result that another doctor had to be brought in to certify that the local doctor was insane, so that the others could be released from restraint. Some time ago the Minister for Railways, in his capacity as member for Kanowna, and I waited on the Chief Secretary to make representations about this matter, and he promised that he would visit Norseman before Parliament assembled. There is absolutely no excuse for a continuance of the existing arrangements, because members of Cabinet know the position. The Honorary Minister visited Norseman within the last eight months. The Minister for Mines was there less than three weeks ago, and, of course, the Minister for Railways is fully aware of the position. Thus, three Ministers at least are fully aware of the facts, and so, on behalf also of the other members for the South Province, Sir John Kirwan and Mr. Williams, I enter an emphatic protest against the delay and neglect of the Government to extend consideration to the school children at Norseman and to those persons who, from time to time, may have to suffer in durance vile.

Next, I wish to place before the Minister a request on behalf of the Phillips River district. I ask him to consider the possibility of assisting men who are working mining shows in that part of the South Province, so that they can concentrate their ores and send the concentrates periodically by steamer from Esperance to the Eastern States to be smelted. If that arrangement can be entered into, there is an immediate future ahead of the Ravensthorpe goldfields because the gold content of the ore will practically pay for its mining and concentration. I hope further assistance

will be given to Messrs. Smith and Son, who own the old Floater battery. When the Minister for Railways and I were at Ravensthorpe less than two months ago, they were operating under great difficulties and the concentrating table was more or less non est. As members know, it is impossible to concentrate unless concentrating machinery is available. I hope, therefore, that assistance will be rendered with that object in view. The Minister for Mines promised to visit the Ravensthorpe district, but something must have intervened to prevent him from doing so. Regarding the requirements for Norseman, I ask for nothing but a fair deal. No assistance for mining has been sought. I repeat that the Ravensthorpe district is not receiving the consideration it should have. Taking into consideration the price of gold, the isolation of the Phillips River district and the fall in the prices of wheat and wool, I say that if people are to be kept in those districts there is only way of doing it, and that is to render assistance to enable them to obtain satisfactory results from their mining efforts. The material is there, but the men working the shows are not blessed with the wherewithal to do the work. The machinery for proper concentration is not available at either battery operating there. The old Floater battery in use treated only 14,000 tons, and then lay idle for 20 years, but was well housed and is one of the best batteries in the State. I hope the Honorary Minister will impress on the Ministers concerned the need for taking immediate action.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.51]: The Honorary Minister in introducing the Bill stated that it was just the usual measure that had been presented for years past; that it simply provided for £2,500,000 being granted pending the passing of the Estimates. He said that it was expected that £50,000 more would be taken from revenue and £50,000 less from loan moneys than was the case last year, and that the money was to be used in employing as many men as possible in useful work. For many years I have urged the appointment of a public works committee so that we would be able to keep some check on our public expenditure. All Governments have come along at the opening of the session and asked in effect

for a blank cheque. On this occasion the amount of £2,500,000 is sought.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And it has nearly all been spent already.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The amount is the same as that of last year, and as Mr. Baxter has said it has nearly all been spent. As we are considered to be the custodians of the public purse, we should have a more detailed knowledge of how this money has been expended. I do not think any private firm would allow its manager to spend a large sum of money in this manner, and after it had been spent to come along and say he wanted £2,500,000, which represented the amount expended. I am not casting any reflection upon the Government or upon the system that has arisen, but I do think it is time that we took some steps to secure better control of the enormous expenditure of public money, particularly when it is realised that such a large portion of the money is loan expenditure. The position at the present time is that the Cabinet decides how the money shall be spent. I presume that is the method that has been in existence for some considerable time. Once the money is spent the House is asked to pass a Supply Bill to provide for the amount. I should like to know how the loan moneys are to be expended in providing work for as many men as possible. We are aware that the Government decided on the eve of the elections to make additions to the Perth Public Hospital at an estimated cost of approximately half-a-million pounds, but this House has had no plan submitted to it. We have not the faintest idea of the way that money is to be expended.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Neither has the Government.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It is quite possible, as my friend interjected, that the Government has no idea either, but the fact remains that the Government has embarked upon a project that is going to cost the State £500,000, and the work is being done under a method which I gravely doubt would be adopted by Ministers if the expenditure had to be met out of their private resources.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Were not plans prepared by someone outside?

Hon. A. THOMSON: Plans may have been submitted to the Government, but this House has no knowledge of them, and

that is what I am protesting about. If we had a public works committee there would be an opportunity to check up on these matters. For many years I have urged the appointment of such a committee. Were a public works committee in existence and a proposal to spend £500,000 in the erection of buildings in any part of the State—I do not care where—was submitted, such a committee would carefully scrutinise the plans and specifications and, if necessary, it would be in a position to call for an expert opinion to supply it with any information required. But the position is that the Government has embarked upon this scheme, and we find that the country is committed to the expenditure of a large sum of money. I speak very feelingly on this question. Mr. Cornell has just pointed out that in a country district where there is a population of over 5,000 people, the provision of decent school facilities is still being awaited, and the gaol accommodation is a disgrace to humanity. Yet when the Government wants to do so it can readily find money to expend in other directions. Those of us residing in country districts have to contribute annually to the road board or municipality in whose area we live, our share of the capital cost of hospital buildings, but as I have indicated previously—and the fact has been proved by figures supplied by the Minister last session—a great percentage of the people occupying beds in those hospitals come from districts outside the locality supposed to be served by those institutions. That applies also to the Perth Hospital. I do not say for one moment that the Perth Hospital should not be built, but I do say that if the Government when it embarked upon this enterprise had had plans and specifications prepared and had called for tenders for the carrying out of the project, it would be in a position to state exactly what the cost of the project was likely to be. As things are there is no guarantee that the building will be erected for the amount the department estimates. If a public works committee were in existence it would be possible to keep an adequate check upon expenditure such as this.

I may be permitted to refer to the treatment being meted out by the Government to single unemployed men. I realise the task that is before the Government in en-

deavouring to find work, particularly of a reproductive or permanent character, for those who are unfortunately unemployed. The money that has been expended on our main roads we all admit has been very wisely spent and we have had fairly good value for it. That, after all, is money provided from the petrol tax and by the motorists who use the roads. But reverting to the single unemployed men, I realise the difficulties with which the Government is faced. The Government in its wisdom has decided that single men shall work only two days a week. In my opinion those men put up a reasonable request when they asked the Government that they should be placed in exactly the same position as the married men. Why should the Government condemn the single men to go out into camps and allow them to work only two days in each week? True the Government has told those men that if they do not like to take that work they can go elsewhere. But if those men do accept employment what are they to do for the remaining four or five days of the week?

Hon. G. Fraser: They could get work elsewhere after having done two days for the Government.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I suggest to the hon. member that if the single unemployed men accept those conditions they cannot get work while they are in the camps.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is not so.

Hon. J. Cornell: Where could they get the extra work?

Hon. A. THOMSON: That is the point. Out in the bush what chance would they have of getting other than sustenance work?

Hon. G. Fraser: Around the district in which the camp might be situated.

Hon. A. THOMSON: If the hon. member were in the position of some of these unfortunate single men, probably he would feel a little more sympathetic towards them. In trying to defend the action of the Government he is not displaying that sympathy that might be expected of him.

Hon. G. Fraser: I am not defending the Government; I am stating what has actually happened.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I am aware that the hon. member is sympathetic towards the unemployed just as I am, but I am justified in criticising the methods adopted by the Government, particularly when it is dealing

with the expenditure of loan money in the direction of providing work for as many people as possible. The Government might seriously consider giving more generous treatment to the single unemployed men bearing in mind the difficulties associated with securing employment. The Government must know, as I and other members know, that there is no hope of the single men finding work in or around the camps that they are occupying during the two days employment offered them by the department.

Hon. G. Fraser: You should investigate the position.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I have done so and I am justified in expressing the views to which I have given utterance. The Honorary Minister recently returned from a visit to the Eastern States where he attended a conference having for its objective the provision of ways and means for training young men who between the ages of 18 and 24 have been denied the right to learn a trade. From the published statement in the Press I imagined that that conference rather laboured the mountain to bring forth a mouse since it did not produce anything that will assist to improve the position of the young men. It would be interesting to hear from the Honorary Minister how much money has been received from the Commonwealth Government to provide training for young men and how many have had the opportunity to learn a trade and so get away from what are termed dead-ends. It would also be interesting to know how the money that was advanced by the Commonwealth Government has been spent, a sum which I regret to say was not supplemented by the State, and how many youths have been given the opportunity to learn a trade. We have also been told that so far no arrangements have been made to assist the wheatgrowers. There are over 8,000 wheatgrowers in Western Australia and they want to know what their position is. We are asked in the Bill before us to provide a total of £2,500,000 and all that the Government can tell us is that so far no arrangements have been made for affording anything in the shape of relief to the wheatgrowers. I admit that the Premier is sympathetically disposed towards the farming community and that the Minister for Lands has a thorough grasp of the existing position. In my opinion some of that £2,500,000 should be earmarked to give assistance and en-

couragement to those who are carrying on the production of wheat in Western Australia. When introducing the measure early this afternoon, the Minister told us that the railway revenue had gone back to the extent of £213,000, and that that was largely due to the lack of the earning capacity of the railways whose wheat freights had been considerably reduced. Thus it is important in the interests of both the Government and the Railway Department that something definite should be done for the wheat industry. Last year the exportable value of wheat—I have taken these figures from the leading article in the "West Australian"—was £3,225,000, while the year before the figure was £4,834,000. This year, because of the reduction in the price of wheat, there is a drop of over £2,000,000, and, possessed of all this knowledge, the Government tells us that no arrangements have so far been made to go to the assistance of the industry. Surely the Government should have some idea of what it is proposed to do, and could intimate that a certain amount of money would be earmarked for the benefit of the farmers and in that way give them some hope. The Government declares that it is finding as much work as possible for those who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed, but it is also essential that those who are engaged in farming operations should be given something to hope for so that they might be able to secure a return of some kind. It is imperative that something be done immediately and, as the Government has not given any indication in that direction, I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill as a protest against the Government's inaction. Last year the first Supply Bill was assented to on the 28th August. That was for an amount of £2,500,000. In November, a second Supply Bill for £1,200,000 was passed, a total of £3,700,000. Surely it ought to be possible to allocate at least £250,000 so that assistance might be given to the wheat industry.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: We want more than that.

Hon. A. THOMSON: A good deal of the £2,500,000, the amount of the present Supply Bill, is to come from Loan funds, and it should not be difficult to earmark something from that total. It is regrettable that the Government has so far not done anything to give hope to those engaged in farming

operations. There has been no indication at all of the Government's intention. If a public works committee were brought into being, members of this House and of another place would be able to scrutinise the Government's expenditure programme. In my opinion, expenditure has increased to an alarming extent, and a committee such as I have so often advocated would be of valuable assistance to the Government. I admit that the Government finds itself in a difficult position by reason of its having to provide so much work for the unemployed. At the same time, we know that the Minister for Industry is out to encourage the establishment of secondary industries in the State, but every action of the Government is contrary to its own proposals in this direction. The Government's desire seems to be to control everything and do everything itself. When the Minister replies, I trust he will give some indication that the Government is seriously considering the position of the wheat industry. I suppose he will say that the Government has the matter under serious consideration, and that the Premier and the Minister for Agriculture are in the Eastern States to discuss the question at a conference of all the States. I admit that this is so, but so far, according to the statement made in another place by the Acting Premier, nothing has been done. I shall oppose the second reading of the Bill.

HON. E. H. H. HALL (Central) [5.15]: In my opinion, Mr. Thomson is entitled to support in his frequent suggestions for the appointment of a public works committee to supervise the expenditure of these immense amounts of money on public works. Just to sit here quietly and whisper to oneself, "I agree," is not enough. When a member tackles an important subject as Mr. Thomson has consistently tackled this one over a period of years, he merits vocal support. Therefore I rise to say that I agree with the hon. member entirely in his advocacy of the appointment of a committee to exercise supervision over public moneys expended throughout the State. That is all we can do. Throughout Western Australia the question is continually being asked, "What supervision, if any, have you as a Parliament over the expenditure of public moneys?" I am indeed glad that Mr. Cornell has heartened some of us to speak on this Supply Bill at so early a stage of the session. Had not

Mr. Cornell started the discussion, an amount of £2,500,000 would have been granted with little if any debate, as on previous occasions. Now times and conditions have changed, people are apt to be critical. Money is harder to get by the individual who is called upon to pay taxation required to meet the cost of the conduct of affairs of State. The people whom we here represent have a right to ask that we members will be on our feet, ever and ever more critical, irrespective of whether the representatives of the Government in this Chamber like it or not. It is all right to be a jolly good fellow. I have no doubt every member acts according to his lights, but we have our duty to perform. Sometimes that duty may be painful, but we should keep on questioning Government representatives in this House as to how, why and where public money is expended. Mr. Thomson has repeatedly dealt with the subject, and deserves the support of every member for his comments on the treatment of single men.

I am indeed pleased to find that at long last the present Government, which the country was told had been returned with a mandate—though that is open to question if the figures are dissected—has realised, though only because of pressure from Beaufort street, that single men are deserving of some consideration. The best the Government can do for single men is to grant them two days' work per week. I say without fear of effective contradiction that so far the Government has failed to realise that it owes any responsibility to single men, especially single men in country districts.

Hon. G. Fraser: The two days' work per week has been going on for years.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I would like to get to the bottom of that. I know members representing country Provinces will support me in saying that in rural districts single men are told by the police, who act as agents for the State Employment Bureau, that there is no relief work for single men.

Several Members: Quite true!

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: One does not make deliberate mis-statements here. I know the representative of the West Province who interjected is conscientious; but I ask, does he wish to brand me as a liar when he says—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am quite sure the hon. member referred to did not mean that the hon. member would intentionally make a mis-statement.

Hon. E. H. H. HALL: I do not think so, either, Sir; but I feel bound to protest when there is a suggestion, by way of interjection, that there has not been differential treatment for single men in the metropolitan area as against single men in country districts. I am greatly afraid that it is a fact. I hope the Government will recognise, even at this late stage and when money is so tight, that something must be done for single men, even if it is only pick and shovel work.

As to the other subject frequently referred to by Mr. Thomson, I feel that the hon. member is likewise entitled to support. That subject is the young man referred to as the "Lost Legion," on whose behalf the Honorary Minister recently journeyed to the Eastern States. Some people will contend that it is a Commonwealth matter. I voted against Federation, and many years later became a member of this House and voted against the Financial Agreement. We are continually being told that this is a matter for the Federal Government and that the other is a matter for the Federal Government; and I wonder why the people of Western Australia do not rise up and say, "A plague on both your Houses; away with them, and let the Federal Government take over the whole business." Did not Mr. Baxter, who has had Ministerial experience and for many years has been a member of this Chamber, say that the question before us is one of either unification or repudiation? Have we our eyes open, or do we refuse to see whither the State is drifting? It is, in my opinion, the duty of hon. members to rise on every occasion that presents itself and do their bit towards guiding Ministers in the direction they should go. Members representing rural Provinces, who have ever before their eyes the terrible spectacle of the plight of the wheatgrowers, should not let an opportunity like this pass without supporting Mr. Thomson's remarks.

As the only member of Parliament residing in Geraldton I have perhaps come more closely in contact with these matters than other members for the Province have. The Premier for many years has had to live in the metropolitan district. Mr. Drew as a Minister of the Crown had to reside here also. Mr. Moore lives in the country. Mr. Patrick lives in Perth. I live in Geraldton. Therefore it is only natural that people in trouble should "go to Hall." They do come to me. I have done what was in my power

for men out of work. However, as Mr. Thomson said to-day, if it is necessary that the people should be taxed as they have been to provide work for unemployed men, it is equally essential that something should at long last be done by the State Government for the wheatgrowers, whose plight is terrible. This is not a question of what is to come, but of something that has happened already. How on earth can men be expected to remain tranquil, quiet, reasonable and sensible when their wheat has been thrown away for 1s. 6d. per bushel? I repeat, I am speaking about something that has happened. One hesitates to parade personal trouble, but I may add that I am speaking of something that has happened to me. Two weeks later, the price had risen to 1s. 11d. What is the present price? A facetious remark was passed here yesterday about so many bushels of wheat paying for a cup of tea. This is not a joking matter. Unless the representatives of the farmers make themselves heard in this House of Parliament, we shall be called to account. Something has happened in Western Australia during the past few months that causes the blush of shame to rise to our cheeks. Why was it made possible for such a thing to happen? I ask that in all seriousness. The answer is, nothing more nor less than that people are in such a desperate position as to be ready to clutch at any straw that promises to bring them some relief. It was not an occurrence of normal times which brought about the unfortunate episode I do not desire to particularise. It was not an episode of normality. It was an action of people who are strained to the very breaking point.

Here we have a Bill asking for a grant of £2,500,000, and still nothing has been done or is to be done for men who are in utter despair. I acknowledge that the Premier, with another Minister, has gone East to try to effect something. Still, we have been trying for a long time. We have been sympathetic for a long time. This matter has been delayed altogether too long. Is it not as true to-day as when Henry George said it, that the land is the source of all wealth? If that is true, why has not the truth been realised? Why have we not done something for those people? Every one of us has been taxed to provide work for the unemployed, and it is just as necessary that we should be taxed for

the purpose of keeping men on the land. When farmers float off the land, what does it mean? Every hon. member knows as well as I do, but it has to be voiced. There is meant to buy, milk to buy, vegetables, firewood and other necessities of life which, when a man is on the land, he has a chance of providing for himself. Men are coming off their holdings. At Marquis-street, I have been told, "The man has left his farm, and there is no relief work for him." That is dastardly. Let me say immediately that the threat has been responsible for keeping men on their farms. It has got abroad that there is no relief work for farmers. That, I repeat, has had the effect of keeping many of them on the land. Others, however, have become so desperate that they have left their holdings; and somehow or other some of them, after passing through a pretty lean time, have managed to make an appeal to the sympathies or the soul of somebody in charge, and I see them working on the roads. I am not going to follow Mr. Thomson in his expressed intention of voting against the second reading, because I cannot see that any good will result by doing so. I cannot go so far as to vote against the Bill. As Mr. Baxter said yesterday, most of this money has been spent, and we must honour our obligations. I shall therefore vote for the second reading of the Bill. I consider, however, that in saying what I have said, I have done my duty. I am not feeling well, as I have had to travel 600 miles. I do so every week whilst Parliament is in session. I could keep on talking, but I do not know that it would do much good. I know only too well that none of us can alter the state of affairs into which Responsible Government in this State has drifted. During last session I quoted the remarks of a visitor from London whose name I have forgotten. He pointed out that Parliaments were losing their grip on matters of finance, even on matters of legislation. I am not familiar with the forms of Government of countries on the other side of the world; but, speaking personally, I have five children and I desire to preserve for them the democratic government existing in Western Australia. We have that matter in our own hands and must show some backbone and spirit to the people who are paying us to legislate for the State. We are in danger of losing that

which we already have through our wretched apathy. Only by showing the people that we can stand up to any taunts that might be hurled at us shall we be able to retain our present political system. I support the second reading.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West—in reply) [5.32]: It is not customary to reply to the debate on the Supply Bill, as the various matters brought up are usually dealt with when the Address-in-reply debate is continued. I desire, however, to say a word or two in reply to Mr. Cornell. Norseman has advanced rapidly and we have there some of the most progressive people in the State. At Norseman we find both the mining companies and the men working together for the good of the township. The questions raised by Mr. Cornell will be investigated, and I hope a satisfactory reply will be given before the Address-in-reply debate is concluded.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is a pity that what is being done at Norseman is not being done in the West Province.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Thomson is consistent in his advocacy of a public works committee. I disagree entirely with his remarks about the Perth Public Hospital. I know complete inquiries were made in that regard. Our Principal Architect investigated many modern hospital buildings, and his opinion has been confirmed by experts in the Eastern States. I am convinced that the inquiries and investigations which were made before the hospital was commenced were of a searching character. My experience has taught me that men in charge of the public purse make special inquiries before expending money on hospitals, schools and other public buildings.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Is the medical profession satisfied with the proposed hospital building?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I think so. The trouble is whether the Government can afford the heavy expense of constructing a hospital equal to some of the very modern hospitals in the Eastern States. That, however, will probably be done.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The best is not too good for Western Australia.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is my opinion, too. I disagree also with Mr. Thomson's ideas regarding departmental construction of buildings. As a matter of fact, while in Melbourne recently I had the opportunity and pleasure of inspecting a modern bakery built on two acres of ground. I believe it to be the most modern bakery in the world, and it was built entirely by day labour.

Hon. A. Thomson: That does not get away from the principle. There must be some check.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I take exception to the remarks made by Mr. Thomson and Mr. E. H. H. Hall regarding the treatment meted out to single unemployed men. As the Minister in control of the Employment Department, I say that the plight of single unemployed men should not be made a political football.

Member: Hear, hear!

The HONORARY MINISTER: Everything possible should be done for both single and married unemployed men.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is what I say.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Mr. Thomson contends that single unemployed men should be given the opportunity to work for stated periods. That course has been tried and proved to be a bad failure. All the men in camps are not young single men; there are also single middle-aged and elderly men. The system which Mr. Thomson advocates has been tried by the present and previous Governments. It was tried by the National Government, of which the late Mr. Seaddan was a member, and it then proved to be a failure. The men who were allowed to work for four or five weeks and were then stood down, very quickly got into trouble. In special cases young men have been allowed to work for a stated period in order to give them a chance to break away from the camp and obtain employment elsewhere. As a general principle, however, the system was a failure, and the Government does not intend to alter the existing system. Bad as are the facilities in Western Australia for young men, the position in the Eastern States is far more serious. If the proposals suggested by experts and endorsed by the Commonwealth Government are adopted, a decided step forward in solving the great unemployment problem will be made throughout the Commonwealth so far as our young unemployed are concerned. The last

question I have to deal with is the criticism levelled at the Government's treatment of the wheat farmers. The present Government has always been considerate in its treatment of the farmer, and has expended huge sums in his behalf. Surely we can now wait until the conference sitting in the Eastern States has concluded its deliberations. Every man, woman and child in the State is assisting the farmer by consuming bread. I think the Government has done remarkably good work in assisting the wheat-growing industry. Everyone admits the present serious plight of the farmer, and hopes that proposals will be brought forward enabling him to retain his holding and get a decent return for his labour. Mr. E. H. H. Hall mentioned that relief work had been refused to farmers who had abandoned their farms. If the Government provided relief for everybody, then the present scheme would be far more attractive to the farmer than is the growing of wheat. There are two sides to the question, and the Government has to be careful how far it goes with its policy. Mr. Hall has been in communication with me, and I can say that no acute case of distress caused by unemployment has been turned down by the department, to my knowledge.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: I say this, the control is different since you have been in charge of the department.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I thank the hon. member for the compliment. The Government recognises the position. Regarding the question of extending the period of work for single men in the country, if we made the work too attractive, farmers would be unable to get any labour at all.

Hon. G. Fraser: I remember a party having raised that question a couple of years ago.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: That is so.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The question is a very difficult one to deal with. I feel sure members will vote for the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.*Third Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.45]: I feel that I am in a rather unenviable position. It was my intention to make my contribution to this debate next week or the week after, but knowing last night that some of my friends who are absent desired to contribute to the debate, I moved the adjournment and so in a way was landed with the responsibility of carrying on the discussion to-day. My original intention was to devote a considerable amount of time to the wheat position and the question of the marginal wheat areas. Unfortunately, in the short space of time at my disposal, I have not been able to obtain the desired data. However, another opportunity may occur at a later stage of the session.

Touching on the wheat position, I wish to recall that last session I was the first to suggest to this House the adoption of the wheat scheme, which was not my own but was one of which I had heard in the Eastern States. It was really a scheme to provide a home consumption price for wheat. Amongst the many schemes then propounded, this is the one that was adopted. At the time that the home consumption price measure was enacted by all the Governments of Australia, the price of wheat was 2s. 11d. or 3s. a bushel export parity. The flour tax was designed to give the wheat farmers another 6d. a bushel. I wish to commend this House and the Parliament of Western Australia and the other Parliaments for having come to the assistance of the wheatgrowers when wheat was even bringing 3s. a bushel. If members considered it necessary to pass that legislation so expeditiously at a time when wheat was 3s. a bushel, I ask them to consider what must be the position of the wheatgrowers to-day when the price is down to 1s. 3½d. a bushel.

Hon. J. Cornell: Nine months ago Mr. Bath said that would be the price.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: But the fact of Mr. Bath's prophecy coming true does not ease the position for the wheatgrowers. A month ago Mr. Teasdale made a statement to me that bears out Mr. Cornell's remark. He said he could not understand why the price of wheat was then 2s. 6d., because at the time it should have been down to about 1s.

3d. "In fact," he added, "it is not a matter of price; it is a matter of whether buyers want to take the wheat or not."

I wish to point out how vitally dependent is the State of Western Australia on the wheat industry. New South Wales, with its variety of exportable products, is dependent on the wheat industry to the extent of only 5 per cent., whereas in Western Australia 35 per cent of the exportable primary products comes from the wheat industry. I make that comparison in order to bring home to members the vast difference between the two States—5 per cent. in New South Wales and 35 per cent. in Western Australia. The farmers were supposed to receive 6d. a bushel from the proceeds of the flour tax, but even some of that money was filched from them; a sum of so many hundred thousand pounds was taken for drought relief. I contend that that money should not have been taken from the flour tax fund.

The Primary Producers' Association of Western Australia and similar organisations in the Eastern States had been fighting for a home consumption price for many years in order to compensate for the disabilities the wheat industry suffered under the tariff. I am sorry that the State Government did not utilise some of the loan funds to assist the drought-stricken farmers, but took the money out of the home consumption fund, which was provided for an entirely different purpose. I cannot agree with some of my colleagues who hold that the State Government should bear a share of the cost of wheat stabilisation. In my opinion, this is a Federal matter, and I consider that all the money required for the purpose of wheat stabilisation should be provided by the Commonwealth Government. I do not say that the State Government should not utilise some of its money for the alleviation of the wheat industry, but as regards actual wheat stabilisation, I am firmly of the opinion that the Federal Government should not shelter behind the State Governments, but should provide all the money.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Do you think that any of your colleagues differ from you on that point?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have heard it said that this is a matter for both Federal and State Governments. The State Government has a very big task on hand. There are many directions in which it can expend its money, such as by removing the surcharge

imposed on bulk wheat or by relieving the farmer of the payment of interest charges. The State Government could also make provision for transferring some of our farmers to other avenues of primary production. For farmers located in the marginal areas, provision should be made to enable them to engage in sheep raising and pig raising. There is ample scope for utilising the £250,000 mentioned by Mr. Thomson in order to assist the wheat industry, without devoting any of the money to the fund for wheat stabilisation.

I do not agree with Mr. Thomson's statement that the State Government is not doing anything. We are all aware that the Premier and the Minister for Lands have gone to Melbourne to attend a wheat conference, and it does not behove us to condemn the Government when that conference is about to begin. To indulge in such condemnation at this stage would not be fair. I have no desire to embarrass the Government by suggesting what amount should be paid to the farmers. During the recent election campaign irresponsible persons and some members of the Federal Parliament, I regret to say, went about the country cheating the farmers into believing that they would receive 4s. a bushel at their sidings. I should like to see every farmer getting 4s. a bushel at his siding, but I am honestly of opinion that to provide such a price is impossible. Many of the farmers, however, believed that it was possible, and the statement certainly had a big effect on the voting in one or more of the electorates. I regret that members of the Commonwealth Senate went out of their way to embarrass the Government by saying what they would do if they got into power—give the farmers 4s. a bushel for their wheat.

All sorts of prices have been suggested to ensure a reasonable return to the farmers. My considered opinion is that the farmers should receive not a penny less than 3s. 4d. a bushel at sidings if it is at all possible to pay that price. Every effort should be made to pay it. If the international agreement falls to the ground the farmers should receive at least 3s. 4d. a bushel at country sidings. From the international agreement we have great hopes that something useful will eventuate. At the same time we have to face up to many things upon which we are not keen, such as quotas. If the four great wheat-exporting countries of the world determine that only so much wheat

should be produced, Australia will be obliged to face up to a quota of 85,000,000 or 90,000,000 bushels. Once such a quota is imposed upon Australia, the fun will begin. Every State naturally will strive to get more than its share of the quota and when the States have overcome that difficulty, the fun will start amongst the farmers to determine how much wheat each is to grow. Of course one farmer will want to grow more than another. Hence many difficulties are likely to arise under an international agreement, and I confess I feel rather pessimistic. The difficulty confronting us at the moment relates not so much to the future as to what is to be done with the coming crop. I hope to have an opportunity to deal more fully with the question when the legislation is brought before us later in the session. Unquestionably the Parliaments of Australia will be asked to pass legislation such as has never before been even contemplated, but I have faith that this Parliament will pass the measure as expeditiously as it dealt with the Bill last session to provide a home consumption price for wheat.

The position of the woolgrowers is almost as unsatisfactory as that of the wheatgrowers. The wool industry has suffered from drought and, for a number of years, from the effect of low prices. Only with diffidence have the pastoralists of Australia at long last asked for Government assistance. I believe this is the first time in the history of the industry that the growers have had to ask for a bounty. I am not one of those who think that the provision of bounties will overcome the difficulty. I believe that a better price for wool could be obtained from the market if reasonable marketing legislation were enacted. At present the price of wool is down to 9d. or 10d. a lb., and surely it would not be too much to request Governments, Federal and State, to pass legislation prohibiting the export of wool at less than a certain price.

Apart from the difficulties attending the wheat and wool industries, one of the biggest problems confronting the State is that of the marginal wheat areas, particularly the north-eastern section of the wheatbelt. This, of course, is purely and simply a domestic matter. Schemes were evolved as far back as three years ago, when we were told of proposals for grouping certain hold-

ings and enabling the settlers to engage in stock-raising. However, very little has been done. I hope that the new Minister for Lands and Agriculture will face the position more seriously than it has been faced in the past. There is no reason at all why a general exodus of the settlers from those areas should be countenanced. There is no reason why they should leave that part of the State. There is every reason why they should be enabled to remain, which could be brought about by grouping the holdings and assisting the farmers to grow fodder crops and engage in the raising of sheep and pigs. Many of those areas should not have been settled, but as farmers have been placed upon that land, as railways have been built, towns established and essential services provided here, there and everywhere, in view of all this development, some effort should be made by the Government to keep those farmers on their holdings. What is the alternative if those men leave their blocks? They will drift to the city and, as a member stated earlier this afternoon, will be found at Marquis-street looking for jobs. Rather than have them drift into the city, it would be better to keep those farmers on their blocks and pay them sustenance, even if they did not produce any wheat.

I wish now to allude to the rush of business that occurred at the end of last session. It seems to have become the usual thing to finish each session with a sitting extending over 24 hours. For some unknown reason we were asked to deal with a score of Bills during the late hours of the night or the early hours of the morning of the last sitting day.

Hon. G. Fraser: We contribute to that by the slow manner in which we start the session.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Three weeks before the close of last session I learnt, in conversation with you, Mr. President, and with other members, that we were in a very good position to get the business cleared up without any undue rush. I happened to be interested in a Bill which I commend this House for having passed almost intact. The measure was sent to another place, and remained there until the last day of the session. Then it was amended to such an extent that I scarcely recognised it, and when the Bill was returned to us, I was not game to contest those amendments at 3 o'clock

in the morning lest the whole measure should be lost. That is not the proper way in which to do business. Mr. Cornell had on the Notice Paper a Bill that did not come forward at all.

Hon. J. Cornell: I had three Bills that were shot out.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The people who were dependent upon an adequate marketing Bill have thus lost a whole year.

Hon. J. Cornell: One of my Bills was for many weeks on the Notice Paper.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: For fear I should lose the whole measure I did not contest the amendments. I deemed it better that the Bill should find its way upon the statute-book, as I intended to bring down amendments this year covering the points at issue. I am not blaming the Minister in charge of this House, for all the Ministers collectively are to blame for business being conducted in this way. I hope some effort will be made to rectify the position.

We have heard something about educational facilities to-night. The Speech itself contained a mild boast about certain new schools that had been built. For instance, there is a new High School at Geraldton, and before the elections the member for Canning (Mr. Cross) was given to understand that a new school, to cost £15,000, would be erected in his electorate. Extensive improvements have been made to the Perth Technical College, and at Fremantle more training in industrial occupations is to be given. Metal working has been established at Collie, a new school of mines has been erected at Wiluna, and improvements have been made to the School of Mines in Kalgoorlie. Despite these things, we still have the same old battle to secure a few improvements to our country schools.

The other day I was in a town, at the school in which a new room had been erected. The people desired that two new rooms should be provided. They were prepared to do without other improvements if they could get the extra accommodation, but were met with a statement that no money was available. The cost involved was only £200. I refer to Narembeen. It is not right that country children should be deprived of primary education facilities when money can be spent in other directions. Thousands of pounds have been spent on secondary education, a high school here and another there,

whilst the country children are permitted to suffer.

The other day I was at a school to which a little girl had to travel 15 miles daily in a cart. She began her journey at 7.30 a.m., which in the winter time cannot be very pleasant for her, and did not get home until about 5 p.m. I do not blame the department for that. The case is an isolated one, and probably one of the worst of its kind in the country districts. It is a terrible thing that children should have to travel such long distances to school. I could mention many other instances almost as bad as that one. I visited another school where the residents were dissatisfied because their children were being educated with the offspring of natives. That is not a desirable state of affairs. White children should not have to mix at the desks and in the schools with natives. It is all very well to say that the natives are clean. I know of many families of aborigines, the parents and children of whom, together with some relations, all camp in the same small hut. Even if the native children are clean, they are morally different from what we would desire our own children to be. This sort of thing is happening all over the country. The Director of Education told me that if the native children were clean they could not be kept away from school. It appears to me that the department in charge of native administration is sponging on the Education Department.

I do not say the native children should not be educated. It is quite right they should receive some training of this kind. When I was in the North-West I was opposed to natives being educated, but the position there is very different from what it is in this part of the State. In the agricultural districts we find native children, half-castes, who are nearly white. The time has come when the Government should handle this matter in a serious way, and do something for the education of those children without their being obliged to go to the same schools that are attended by white children. At the Brookton hospital the other day I was told that natives were put into the same ward as were white people, because of the absence of an isolation ward. It is a sorry state of affairs that aborigines should be treated in the same way as whites expect to be treated; they are not the same as we are.

The Honorary Minister: They are kept in a separate ward in the Fremantle hospital.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: More accommodation may be available there. I have no objection to natives being treated in the same hospital as are whites, but they should be separated from them. Hundreds of natives are living near Brookton and Pingelly, and the local hospitals probably receive many more cases than are dealt with at Fremantle. I hope an isolation ward will be erected at Brookton; no doubt Mr. Piesse will take the matter up himself.

The Merredin school must again be referred to. The playground of that institution, during the wet weather, is nothing better than a lake.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It is a duck pond.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: In some places it is deeper than a duck pond would be. I trust the Minister will have this matter looked into. A great deal has been said about secondary industries. The Minister in charge of that department recently visited the Eastern States with a view to furthering the interests of secondary industries in Western Australia. I hope he will not set out to bring industries here that are similar to those we already have.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Unfortunately I do not think he was successful in bringing many industries back with him.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: He is very enthusiastic about the project.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: Oh, yes!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I hope he will endeavour to see there is no overlapping.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: He did not meet with much enthusiasm in the other States.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am of opinion that most manufacturers in the other States would rather make radiators and batteries over there and export them to Western Australia than embark upon the foundation of smaller factories here. In the endeavour to establish more secondary activities in Western Australia, I trust that the Minister and his colleagues will not overlook the claims of our primary industries. It is of no use to set up secondary industries with a view to building up the city and suburbs if no primary producers are available to buy the goods produced. I warn the Government it can go too far in this direction to the detriment of our primary industries.

The other day Mr. Fraser shed crocodile tears concerning the condition in which market gardeners found themselves. He

declared that if there was one section of the community deserving of encouragement, it was that particular section. He said that the men, their wives and families were growing the best vegetables found in the State. I agree with that remark. In another place the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Triat) informed members that vegetables were being imported by the goldfields from the Eastern States. That indicates an amazing lack of co-operation. The eastern goldfields are represented almost entirely by Labour members. What have they done to rectify such an anomalous position? Mr. Fraser almost sobbed when he related the circumstances in which his electors found themselves. What has the Government, of which he is a follower, done to rectify the position?

Hon. G. Fraser: I am asking the Government to rectify it by introducing marketing legislation.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: We put through the Bill for the marketing of onions.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: That has no connection with Mr. Fraser's remarks.

Hon. J. Cornell: It produced the tears.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: These market gardeners are producing some of the best vegetables we see. There is no reason why the people of the goldfields should import their requirements from Adelaide.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: They also import eggs.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes, but not to the same extent as was the case. I suggest to Mr. Fraser he should endeavour to find out why the people of the goldfields are importing vegetables. Are freights cheaper from Adelaide than they are from Perth, or are the facilities afforded by our railways not good enough? There must be some reason for what is going on. Over-production is evident in this State, and I am appalled to think that the residents of the goldfields should be looking to Adelaide for their requirements, as evidently they are. I suggest they should be told to look to Adelaide for their water supply, if they are not prepared to show a little more loyalty to Western Australia and the people we are endeavouring to keep on the land. I know that Mr. Fraser is very conscientious in his attitude towards these particular electors.

Something has been said about the Municipal Corporations Act that was passed

last session, and how pleased everyone is with it. That is not the story I have heard, particularly in its relation to hawking. Whether I had anything to do with it or other members had, it appears that we have now given the hawkers an "open go" by this particular measure. Fully 95 per cent. of the hawkers can do as much hawking in the country as they like without having to take out a license. I hope amendments will be brought down this session to rectify that situation.

Another mistake has been made with regard to superannuation. I have been informed that the matrons of hospitals and persons who are paid under the Hospitals Act do not come under the superannuation scheme. It appears that pensions are paid by the Government only to employees whose salaries come out of money appropriated by Parliament. I trust that something will be done for the other people to whom I have referred.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have now something to say about the so-called mandate that we have been told the people gave to the Government in respect of the introduction of legislation. I have here a copy of the Premier's policy speech delivered at Geraldton. A perusal of the report shows that at least 30 matters were referred to. Surely it cannot be contended that the people gave the Government a mandate to give effect to all that the Premier mentioned in the course of his remarks! Had he stressed any matters in particular and made a feature of them during the election, then I would have said that the Government had received a mandate in respect of those particular questions. In moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply, Mr. Fraser said he hoped, in view of the liberal endorsement the Labour Government had experienced, this House would at least behave itself and pass more of the Government's legislative proposals than previously. On the other hand, if 350 people had voted differently, the whole result of the election would have been reversed. I refer to the voters in the Pilbara, Canning and Perth electorates. In those three constituencies, an aggregate of 350 votes would have resulted in the issue being quite different. In those circumstances, I do not see where the liberal endorsement comes in

that Mr. Fraser referred to as calculated to induce us to agree to what we would not sanction previously. We heard a lot about this House being democratic a few years ago, but crawling back into its burrow of conservatism last year. I have not had much time for the preparation of my speech, but to-day I went through "Hansard" and discovered that Parliament, which includes this Chamber, passed 50 Acts last session, including 12 measures that I consider industrial, whereas we rejected four in that category. That is not a bad record.

Hon. G. Fraser: How did we pass them? As they were introduced?

Hon. W. J. Mann: We improved them.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have eliminated those that I do not regard as industrial, which totalled 36 measures. The 12 industrial Bills that we passed were the Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment Bill, the Bread Act Amendment Bill, the Companies Act Amendment Bill, the Financial Emergency Act Amendment Bill, the Friendly Societies Act Amendment Bill, the Local Courts Act Amendment Bill, the Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill, the Pensioners (Rates Exemption) Act Amendment Bill, the State Government Insurance Office Bill, the Superannuation and Family Benefits Bill, the Workers' Compensation Act Amendment Bill, and the Workers' Homes Act Amendment Bill. The last-mentioned measure provided the Workers' Homes Board with power to borrow money. Surely to goodness that list of legislative enactments represented an advance in Labour legislation not previously endorsed by Parliament. I do not stress that point to absolve this House from any charge that has been made against it, but I think it may be advanced with justification in refuting any such allegation. Certainly the Council did not pass the Fair Rents Bill, but the Government could not have been very serious about that measure, because it was not mentioned by the Premier in his policy speech. Apparently he forgot all about it, and I do not think the Government wished that measure to be passed.

Hon. G. Fraser: You were not game to try the Government on that point.

Hon. W. J. Mann: But the Premier did not mention it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: As a matter of fact, the only four industrial Bills that the Council did not agree to were the Fair Rents Bill,

the Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, the Profiteering Prevention Bill, and the Qualification of Electors (Legislative Council) Bill. I do not think the Labour Government has much to growl about concerning the attitude of this House respecting its legislation. Measures were placed on the statute-book that were not agreed to before, and that applies particularly to the State Government Insurance Office Bill and the Workers' Homes Act Amendment Bill.

Hon. W. J. Mann: They were passed in an improved form.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Dealing now with the railways, we were told when the State Transport Co-ordination Act was under consideration that it had been introduced because the railways were not paying. It was suggested that once the proposed restrictions were imposed upon motor transport, the position would become satisfactory and that the railways would pay in future. I assert that the railways will never pay because the more revenue the railways earn, the more do hours go down and the more do wages rise. That has been the experience right through the piece. I hope experience will teach the Government a lesson and that Ministers will not endeavour to import any more drastic provisions into the State Transport Co-ordination Act, which has proved so detrimental to many primary producers. I was speaking recently to a man engaged upon honey production, and he told me that whenever he desires to transport refined honey—it is really strained honey, not refined honey—he has to secure a license and a permit every time he comes to Perth. Such a procedure harasses primary producers altogether too much. They are permitted to carry their bees and crude honey from place to place, but when they desire to transport strained honey, they have to engage a licensed carrier and go to Perth in empty trucks, which is not right.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It is absurd.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: It is about time this hampering treatment was ended. I have mentioned the matter before, and I do so again. Such a state of affairs is a rank injustice to producers. Certainly we were able to secure a few amendments to the Schedule last year, and that has assisted in some measure. Farmers are permitted to cart their oats, but the Government would not permit barley to be transported. I can-

not see where the difference comes in. I hope the Government will give the primary producers a fair deal. They are not making so much money that they should not be granted a few privileges.

Much has been said about the establishment of a Jewish community settlement in the Kimberley district. In Western Australia we had experience with regard to group settlements in the past, which scheme has cost this State many millions of pounds. I do not say that eventually great benefit will not accrue to Western Australia as a result.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Already great benefit has accrued.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am beginning to admit that fact, despite the huge expenditure. I trust that no mistakes will be made regarding the establishment of a Jewish settlement in the Kimberley district. I would not like the State to be involved in the expenditure of millions of pounds, if these proposed migrants could bring capital with them. I hope the most searching inquiry will be made by experts into the proposed scheme. I do not wish it to be understood that I am throwing cold water on the scheme; my desire is that every inquiry should be made to ascertain whether or not it will prove to be successful. Whether the migrants bring their own capital with them or not, if the scheme is unsuccessful the failure will react on the State. If it proves successful, then tens of thousands of Jews may migrate here and make use of land which hitherto has been lying idle. I again urge that everything possible should be done to convince these people that they can make a success of settling the Kimberleys.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Whose opinions do you suggest getting?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The hon. member ought to know better than I. I have an open mind on the subject. Experts are available who can give a considered opinion on the proposal. There may be people in Palestine who have had experience of a similar class of land and who can judge of the capabilities of proposed migrants. There must be experts in the Kimberley district who know something about the possibilities of it.

Hon. E. H. Angelo: Have you read any of their opinions?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have. I am not running the scheme down, but I do not want the State to be faced with mistakes similar to those made in the past.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I quite agree with you.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Among the Jews possessed of capital and ready to migrate to any haven of refuge, there may be some undesirable people who would never make a success here. The matter of experts I leave to the Government; that is not my job. The experts could have the assistance of the North-West members. There is nothing more I wish to say at present. I was rather caught napping on this debate, but I shall take an opportunity later to deal more extensively with some of the very important matters that have been raised. I conclude my remarks by supporting the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

On motion by Hon. W. J. Mann, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (Hon. E. H. Gray—West) [7.43]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 15th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 7.43 p.m.