lation to obtain additional housing accommodation. Perhaps the services of prisoners of war could be utilised with a view to assisting in providing a solution of the problem.

It has become almost traditional for the mover of the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply not to occupy too much time on the opening day and, though young in parliamentary experience, I do not intend to delay the House at much greater length. Perhaps I might appropriately conclude my remarks on this note: We have reason to be proud of the part played by the Government and citizens of this State in the prosecution of the war; the co-operation of the State Government with the Government of the Commonwealth, and the heroism displayed on sea, on land and in the air by the men of our Fighting Forces in conjunction with the men of the United Nations. The record of their deeds will be indelibly inscribed in the pages of history. I am expressing the heartfelt wish of every lover of liberty in hoping that before many more months have passed this titanic struggle will be brought to a victorious conclusion for the United Nations, and that we shall enter upon a new era of safety and liberty under a just and lasting peace.

MR. LEAHY (Hannans): I second the motion.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday, the 10th August.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.53 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 10th August, 1943.

	PAGE
Committees for the Session, points of order	9
Questions: Motor transport, control of passenger traffic	10
Emu pest, Yilgarn, as to ammunition for destruction	10
Address-in-reply, second day	10
Bill: Supply (No. 1), £2,500,000, 1R.	17
Adjournment, special	17

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

Notice of Motion.

The **CHIEF SECRETARY**: I desire to give notice that at the next sitting of the House I shall move for the appointment of members to committees for the session.

Points of Order.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I rise to a point of order. I intend to ask for a ballot in order that the Chief Secretary shall name the proposed members of the committees.

The President: Will the hon. member resume his seat? The Chief Secretary is perfectly in order. It is the parliamentary custom to propose a motion that certain members shall be members of the committees for the session. If the hon. member desires that a ballot be held, he can ask for that ballot tomorrow, or whenever the motion is moved.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I shall do so, Sir.

Hon. J. Cornell: I rise to a point of order. You, Sir, intimated to Mr. Williams that he could have a ballot in this connection.

The President: I said that Mr. Williams could ask for a ballot.

Hon. J. Cornell: I submit, Sir, that a ballot applies only to a Select Committee or the members of a conference, and that Mr. Williams, if he wants a ballot, can obtain it only by nominating some other member.

The President: The hon. member is not in order. I simply informed Mr. Williams that he could ask for a ballot tomorrow instead of today. Today the question is merely a notification.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I take it, Mr. President, that tomorrow I can ask for a ballot?

The President: The hon. member can ask for a ballot tomorrow.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is to say that any one of us could be a candidate for a position on the committees.

The President: The hon. member can ask for a ballot. The other matter will be decided tomorrow. Whether a ballot shall be held will be decided tomorrow.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I understand that that is what we agreed to.

The President: Yes. Will the hon. member resume his seat?

Hon. C. B. Williams: Yes, Sir. You have given me your word.

QUESTIONS (2).

MOTOR TRANSPORT.

Control of Passenger Traffic.

Hon. H. S. W. PARKER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, What action has the Government taken to control the ingress to and egress from motor transport of passengers at any terminus in the City of Perth? 2, If none, why?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2, Endeavours were made to queue up trolley bus passengers some months ago but the practice had to be abandoned owing to the prevailing transport conditions. The Police Department has no jurisdiction over passengers inside trams, trolley buses or buses.

EMU PEST, YILGARN.

As to Ammunition for Destruction.

Hon. J. CORNELL asked the Chief Secretary: 1, Is the Department of Agriculture aware of the potential danger to growing crops by emu devastation in the Yilgarn district? 2, If so, what arrangements, if any, have been made to alleviate the serious shortage of ammunition in this locality, so that farmers therein may secure locally a supply sufficient to deal adequately with the pest?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1, Reports have been received recently. 2, Arrangements have been made for an emergency issue of ammunition to be made available through the usual trade channels.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second Day.

Debate resumed from the 5th August.

HON. SIR HAL COLEBATCH (Metropolitan) [2.29]: Before touching on some of the matters contained in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, I would like to make reference to the Select Committee that was appointed by this House late last session to inquire into the matter of juvenile delinquency. When the House rose, the committee had completed taking evidence but had had no opportunity to consider its report. Two courses were open to it—either to wait until Parliament re-assembled and then present the report to the House, or to ask the Premier to convert it into an honorary Royal Commission so that its report might be handed immediately to His Excellency and by him to the Government. Feeling that some of the matters contained in the report were of urgency, the committee unanimously decided in favour of the latter course. The Premier at once conceded the committee's request; the work was completed by the committee as an honorary Royal Commission and the report handed to the Lieut.-Governor.

I think this explanation is due so that there may be no feeling in the mind of any member of this House that the committee acted in any way discourteously towards the House. I hope that in his reply the Chief Secretary will give us some information as to what action the Government has taken. I notice that steps are being taken to erect the temporary lock-up which the Commission very strongly recommended. The members of the Commission were all agreed that the conditions were disgraceful and, if I have any comment to pass on that matter, it is to express regret that the work was not previously put in hand. However, it has now been done. I am not sure whether effect has been given to the recommendation that the publication of reports of cases in the Children's Court should be greatly limited. I have noticed that there has been less publicity.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It seems to me there has been more since!

Hon Sir Hal COLEBATCH: Those were comparatively minor matters. The more important recommendations of the Commission have regard to preventive measures, and the importance of immediate consideration being given to this aspect was emphasised. The Commission was representative of all parties, and was completely unanimous in its decisions. Those decisions were based on evidence given by responsible people. It was pointed out that there was a general consensus—one might say unanimity—of opinion that the chief cause of juvenile delinquency was parental neglect and that that neglect was most noticeable—indeed one might say it amounted to perhaps 90 per cent.—in what are called "broken homes." The Commission pointed out that one of the results of the war was that there was bound to be a very great increase in the number of broken homes—broken perhaps through the father being killed in the war or, in many cases, through hasty marriages and numerous divorces, of which we see striking evidence at the present time. The Commission felt that because

there would be so many more broken homes, there would be much more danger of parental neglect and an extension of juvenile delinquency.

I hope the Chief Secretary will be able to tell us that the Government has given, and is giving, serious consideration to the recommendations of the Commission. A matter not entirely within the scope of the Commission was the transfer of prisoners from the Fremantle Gaol to Barton's Mill. We were concerned with Barton's Mill only as a place that might in certain circumstances be adapted to the confinement of juvenile delinquents. We visited Barton's Mill and spent a good deal of time there. In this case, I am not speaking for the other members of the Commission but am voicing my own opinion when I say that I felt that in the different circumstances with which it was confronted, being compelled almost at a moment's notice to transfer prisoners from Fremantle to Barton's Mill, the authorities did not do a bad job at all. I know there were defects, but personally I am inclined to think it was a good move. Much will have to be done by way of providing better accommodation. I have no doubt that the authorities are seized of the importance of sending to Barton's Mill only persons who may reasonably be considered as likely to mend their ways. If these things are done and conditions are greatly improved and the required provisions greatly extended, then I think Barton's Mill will prove to be of great benefit to the State. I trust that the idea will be persisted in.

The Lieut.-Governor's Speech struck a note of what I think was fully justifiable optimism so far as the course of the war is concerned, and it very properly dealt with the matter of post-war reconstruction. I think we are all agreed that there will be need for the closest co-operation between the Commonwealth and the States. Personally I do not think that that co-operation calls for any enlargement of Federal powers. On the contrary, I think that any attempt by the Commonwealth Government to take powers away from the States will retard rather than extend the spirit of co-operation that ought to prevail between the two authorities. Many very difficult problems are bound to arise. I think it is the general opinion that unemployment on a large scale will not be one of the vast problems to be faced, particularly during the first few years following the end of the war. Our greatest problem will be the restoration of our productive industries. When we consider that this year the yield of two of our principal industries—wheat and gold—will be down, as compared with the last year before the outbreak of war, to the extent of a value of about £25 per head for every man, woman and child in the State, we must realise how serious the position is likely to be. An immense effort will be needed to restore those industries.

Conditions on the farms have deterioriated dreadfully through the fault of nobody. I should say, generally speaking, that the condition of farming machinery was never before in so bad a state as it is now. Pests of all kinds have increased; fencing and everything else need attention. A great deal will require to be done before our agricultural lands are producing to anything like the extent they did before the war. The position on the Goldfields is similar. It is to be feared that a good many of the mines that closed down only through lack of labour, will never be opened again. Although some may say that I have expressed a sanguine view on this question I believe that, if the task of rehabilitation of the gold industry is soundly put in hand, it should be possible to employ anything up to 20,000 extra men on the mines within a reasonably short time after the end of the war. That alone should mean such an increase in the production of gold that it should go a long way towards restoring the economic position of our State.

Stress is laid in the Speech on the possibilities of secondary industries. I am entirely in sympathy with all that is said in that regard, but there is one aspect that does not seem to me to have received proper consideration. In every country throughout the world the establishment and expansion of secondary industries has depended upon fuel. Coal is the secret of the industrial greatness of Great Britain, and fuel is essential to the successful establishment and expansion of all industries. In Western Australia we have coal deposits that are not of exceptionally high value as compared with coal in other places but still are of a useful quality. This coal could be made to play a very important part in the development of our industries provided it is profitably exploited. By referring to coal being "profitably" exploited, I do not mean in the interests of those who own the coal or work

the mines, but rather in the interests of the country generally. This has not been done in the past; it is not being done now. Even today when there is talk of installing labour-saving machinery, there is always a string attached to it, namely, that it is conditional upon none of the men at present employed in the mines being displaced.

The trouble is that in the past the coal industry has been regarded as an end, the end being profit to the owners and the maintenance of good conditions of labour for the men. Whilst not disparaging either of those intentions, I say that the whole outlook respecting Collie coal is wrong; it should not be regarded as an end, but as the means to an end, that end being the expansion of many other industries. The installation of labour-saving machinery on a large scale should not mean the displacement from work of any men. It would not mean that a smaller number of men would be required to produce the present output. It would mean that the same number of men, or perhaps a greater number, would be required to produce an enormously increased quantity of coal. It is probable that with the installation of labour-saving machinery and the consequent reduction in price, the demand for coal will increase enormously. It would not mean fewer men being required for the production of the present output nor the lowering of labour conditions. The experience has always been that the installation of such machinery has improved the conditions of labour, with a general shortening of hours and a lightening of labour, and has made it possible for higher rates of remuneration to be paid.

To make the best possible use of Collie coal—and I speak in conformity with the opinion expressed by many men whom I know to be entirely competent to judge—by the introduction of labour-saving machinery and by briquetting to improve the quality of the coal, its price may be greatly reduced and the value of the product to the State will be increased almost out of bounds. This development is essential if there is to be the increase in new industries such as those referred to in the Speech. Furthermore it is essential for the preservation of our present industries. The man on the land has been prejudiced all along because of the excessive cost of coal. As for the Goldfields, the difficulty of getting wood for fuel has been increasing year by year, and it should be possible for that industry to be supplied largely with coal from Collie. There is scarcely any limit to the part Collie coal may play in the development of the industries of Western Australia.

There is another very important aspect of the case. At present there is a superabundance of Commonwealth money that disguises our true position. It must be obvious that we could not sustain a loss in wealth production of £25 per head for every man, woman and child without bringing about a condition of depression greater than this State has experienced before. And yet we have no depression; indeed we enjoy some measure of prosperity because of the enormous amount of Commonwealth money that is floating about. The money disguises our true position, but when the war is over we shall have to look facts in the face. We shall have to recognise that whatever measure of prosperity we enjoy it will have to be based on the wealth we produce. We shall have to concentrate on the production of things that the people will need, not only our own people but the people in other parts of the world. The danger of uncontrolled inflation will have to be faced, and we shall have to play our part in that matter as well as the Commonwealth. To-day we have what the economist calls "invisible inflation," inflation that is rendered invisible by price-fixing and rationing. The difference between this and the other form of inflation is simple though it may not be easy at the moment to detect.

The ordinary form of inflation means that the whole of the nation's money is depreciated in value. Our present condition of invisible inflation means that portion of the money retains not quite the whole but nearly the whole of its purchasing power, while the balance loses its value altogether because there is nothing that can be bought with it. When the war is over there will be an abundance of money. We know the extent to which deposits in the savings banks and other banks have increased. There will be the soldiers' deferred pay, and the war savings certificates whose owners may desire to cash them. Probably price-fixing may have to be continued for some time, but it cannot continue indefinitely. I fear there will only be one way to check uncontrolled inflation and avoid destruction of the value of the people's savings and that will be by such enormously increased production that

the goods available may within a short time be brought into something like accord with the volume of money in circulation. That means the cutting out of waste in all directions. It means the employment of everyone and the use of labour-saving machinery. Dr. Evatt who has recently returned from his second trip round the world said, "There will be more room for private enterprise and business initiative after the war than ever before." That statement is not altogether in accord with Labour policy, but it is a wise statement. The function of government should be to encourage private enterprise and initiative. In this State I do not know of any other direction in which the Government can encourage private enterprise and initiative than by seeing to it that our fuel resources are turned to the best advantage. Royal Commissions do not always achieve the desired results, but I am inclined to think that a commission comprised of competent experts—the best men available drawn if necessary from outside Australia, from anywhere so long as we get the best men—could submit a report on the possibilities of Collie coal that would be worth not thousands but millions of pounds to Western Australia.

I do not intend to steal the thunder of the representatives of the country districts or of the North-West, but I should like to refer to one matter in connection with industries in those parts. It seems to me that far more should be done towards providing amenities for those who live in the country, and more particularly for those who live in the North. We read the other day the decision of the Commonwealth Government to erect a luxury club for the use of the soldiers somewhere in the far north. That is commendable in every way. This, however, suggests to my mind that it is necessary in peace-time that those engaged in the development of our industries in the country and in the North should enjoy the same amenities as are enjoyed by the people in the city. There are many directions in which an endeavour should be made to render conditions in the country more attractive. A deputation recently waited on a member of the Government asking that there should be uniformity in water charges. That is a good idea. The quantity of water consumed in the metropolitan area is so much greater than that which is consumed elsewhere from the same sources that a small increase imposed upon the water rate in the metropolitan area would enable a considerable reduction to be made in the price of water supplied to the country. As a representative of the Metropolitan Province, and believing as I do that the prosperity of the province depends on the well-being of the country, I would have no hesitation in urging my constituents cheerfully to agree to an increase in the water rate in the interests of the people outside.

One piece of legislation referred to in the Speech is a Bill to amend the University Act. I do not know how far that measure will follow the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner, nor do I propose to discuss those recommendations until the Bill comes before us. It is possible the Bill will contemplate some alteration in the method of electing the Senate but I do not intend to debate that point now. Recently I have been wondering what are the responsibilities of the Senate in certain directions. I favour the opportunity for the spread of all kinds of knowledge at the University and the airing of all sorts of opinions, but I think some steps might be taken to see that when propaganda is spread it is spread in accordance with facts. Members are aware that at the last University summer school an entire section was organised and conducted by a prominent communist who is not in any other way, I believe, associated with the University. I have no objection to the spread of communist propaganda at the University, provided that is done in accordance with truth.

Two or three months ago I was told that a communist, speaking frequently to luncheon gatherings at the University, had made a statement that I can only say is deliberately false. He said that everyone who is not a communist must necessarily be a fascist. I made an offer to address the same body of students and the offer was accepted. I was received most courteously and listened to with flattering attention. After my address two things happened. The chairman, in thanking me, said that probably many of my auditors would not agree with me, and he reminded them of the opportunity they had had to hear the other side. Before I left the building several students came to me asking to be supplied with the material from which I quoted. They certainly gave me the impression that what I had told them, based on documentary evidence, was

contrary to what other speakers had led them to believe. Members will have noticed that more recently the Archbishops of the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches in Sydney issued a statement in which they joined communism and fascism in one comprehensive denunciation. Their action has been objected to in the Press by certain other ministers of religion. These things have forced me to the conviction that communism has been advocated on false premises, and that people are being misled into giving their support to this doctrine. In the world of post-war reconstruction in our country and in every other country a great deal will depend upon internal unity amongst our people, and I am sure that the spread of communism will not contribute to that state of affairs. For that reason I feel justified in setting out those features of communist propaganda that I regard as being contrary to fact.

First let it be remembered that the type of communism now being advocated in these addresses at the University and in frequent wireless talks is the type that is practised in Soviet Russia today. All of us have the greatest admiration for the splendid fight Russia is putting up against Germany. I do not think anyone can doubt not only that the Russians have created a magnificent military machine, but that any totalitarian dictatorship is more competent to create quickly a military machine than is possible under a democratic system of government. The Nazis lost no time in building up a tremendous military machine. In his second year Hitler defied the nations by introducing conscription. In the third year he embarked upon the military occupation of the Rhine. In the fifth year he annexed Austria, staged the tragedy at Munich and destroyed Czecho-Slovakia. In the sixth year he felt strong enough to embark upon another world war.

That is an illustration of the efficiency of a totalitarian dictatorial power in the building up of a war machine. In this war the German machine will be destroyed and the Russian system will prevail. But do not let us forget that an important element in the destruction of the one and the triumph of the other will be that the entire weight of the great democratic powers has been thrown into the scale against Germany and in support of Russia. Russia will be at liberty to continue her communistic form of government as long as it is suitable for the requirements of her people and I do not think any other nation is likely to interfere in the matter; but we are entitled to protest against an attempt to force communism down the throats of our own people by misrepresentation. Let me set out the directions in which this misrepresentation takes place. Many high-minded people lean to the communistic idea because it destroys the profit motive and they think the profit motive is something we ought to get rid of. The old communistic slogan "From each according to his capacity; to each according to his needs" appeals to them. I am one of those who do not think that the profit motive is the highest motive or that it is the motive which always directs human nature.

I well remember listening to that grand man, Dr. Grenfell of Labrador. I heard him say that whenever he wanted a man for a really big job he always got someone who did not want to be paid. But, on the other hand, I do not believe that in the present state of human nature the profit motive can be done away with. The elimination of the profit motive has been tried in Russia and has failed, just as it failed in the New Australia settlement in Paraguay, where it was said that there was only one genuine communist in the party and he could not get a spade to suit him. It has been abandoned in Russia. Why? First, we had the liquidation of the Kulaks—a euphemistic term, liquidation, meaning something very much more unpleasant. Russia is a totalitarian State. No contrary opinion is allowed. It is founded on force. We hear of the local communists' boast that there has never been any fear of Quislings in Russia, because all the opponents of the policy had been liquidated. But after the liquidation of the Kulaks it was found that the livestock did not receive the attention that was necessary and therefore private ownership in stock had to be re-established. Then it was found that in the factories a maximum production was not achieved when the system was that everybody should be paid exactly the same whether they worked hard or little. So the profit motive had to be re-established in both instances and now it is recognised in the Constitution, as amended. I shall quote from the "Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, adopted at the Extraordinary Eighth Congress of

Soviets of the U.S.S.R., December 5, 1936." Article 12 reads—

In the U.S.S.R. work is the obligation and a matter of honour of every able-bodied citizen, in accordance with the principle: "He who does not work, neither shall he eat." In the U.S.S.R. the principle of socialism is realised: "From each according to his ability, to each according to——

not his need, but—

—the work performed."

Article 8 provides—

The land occupied by collective farms is secured to them for their free use for an unlimited time, that is, forever.

Article 9 provides—

Alongside the socialist system of economy, which is the predominant form of economy in the U.S.S.R., the law permits small private economy of individual peasants and handicraftsmen based on their personal labour and precluding the exploitation of the labour of others.

Article 118 provides—

Citizens of the U.S.S.R. have the right to work, i.e., the right to guaranteed employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality.

Article 10 provides—

The right of citizens to personal property in their income from work and in their savings, in their dwelling houses and auxiliary household economy, their domestic furniture and utensils and objects of personal use and comfort, as well as the right of inheritance of personal property of citizens, are protected by law.

Therefore, not only is the profit motive recognised but also the right of inheritance. I am not quoting these things as being bad in principle. I dare say that the idea of payment according to results is far more in accordance with my desires than with the desires of certain sections of the Labour Party, but I want to make it clear that those people supporting the communistic principle in the belief that it eliminates the profit motive are being led entirely astray. Now, what does it mean? Already the rate of payment varies from 200 roubles a month to upwards of 2,000. That must mean almost at once better houses, motor cars, and all the amenities of life enjoyed by a certain section that are not enjoyed by the mass.

I believe, on reading what I have been able to read, that even at the present time the differences between the most fortunate and the least fortunate are as marked in Russia as they are in certain of the democracies, probably more marked than in countries like Sweden and the Scandinavian States. In two or three generations, with this right of inheritance preserved, what will happen? Will there be another liquidation and a fresh distribution, or shall we see Russia embark upon some sort of capitalistic system just as the people of France did after the Revolution? Article 125 is of special interest. It sets out the four freedoms, not quite the same as the four freedoms we are accustomed to hear of. The article reads—

In conformity with the interests of the toilers, and in order to strengthen the socialist system, the citizens of the U.S.S.R. are guaranteed by law:

(a) Freedom of speech;

(b) Freedom of the Press;

(c) Freedom of assembly and of holding mass meetings;

(d) Freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

But to whom are those four freedoms reserved? The article continues—

These rights of citizens are ensured by placing at the disposal of the toilers and their organisations printing presses, stocks of paper, public buildings, the streets, means of communication and other material requisites for the exercise of these rights.

These rights are for only one section of the community. They are not open to anyone outside the ring-fence of the rose-water preferences of the communists. Quite a lot of people are misled into believing that there is political freedom in Russia. Political freedom in Russia is exactly the same —no more and no less—as it is in Germany. Everybody has the right to vote, but just as in Germany no-one can stand for election except those selected by the Nazi Party, so no-one can stand for election in Russia except those selected by the communists. In Russia, under Article 141, the right to nominate candidates is secured to public organisations and societies of toilers, Communist Party organisations, trade unions, co-operatives, youth organisations and cultural societies. In another paragraph it is clearly set out what organisations have the right to nominate.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is something similar in this State. A candidate here must be nominated by the National Party or by the Labour or some other party.

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: What I have said is made clear by Article 126—

In conformity with the interests of the toilers, and in order to develop the organisational initiative and political activity of the masses of the people, citizens of the U.S.S.R. are ensured the right to unite in public organisations—trade unions, co-operative associations, youth organisations, sport and defence organisations, cultural, technical and scientific societies . . .

and so on, all under the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Other people, including those ministers of religion to whom I have referred, think there is religious freedom in Russia. There is—exactly the same measure of religious freedom that there is in Germany. A parson may preach. People may go to church. But the parson is not permitted to say one word against the regime. Article 124 reads—

In order to ensure to citizens freedom of conscience, the church in the U.S.S.R. is separated from the state, and the school from the church. Freedom of religious worship and freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognised for all citizens.

There the Russian Constitution goes a little further than the German in practice. It recognises in the Constitution an anti-God movement, but the most important feature of that article is the separation of the school from the church. That means that in Russia there can be no religious instruction of children in state schools and that no religious body is permitted to have any schools. We know very well that it is in the early days of a child's life that his character in matters of this kind is formed. If a child can be prevented from obtaining religious instruction it will not be very long before religion is destroyed altogether.

Russia's written Constitution contains no reference to marriage and divorce. Why? I shall quote from a pamphlet entitled "Soviet Quiz"; it is written by a communist on direct communist lines, advocating communism in all directions. It is in the very convenient form of question and answer. Dealing with marriage, the first question is—

In Soviet Russia is marriage regarded as a holy and permanent union?

The answer—

It is regarded as a personal matter concerning no-one but the man and woman involved. Marriage is simply a civil contract and is, therefore, no business of the State. There are, naturally, certain laws on marriage, but these laws are regarded as directives rather than hidebound laws. It is considered that a man and a woman who live together, share the same rooms and the same bed, work together to build a home and have children, are married. The fact of marriage is what is important, not the solemnisation of marriage.

Later follows this question—

On what grounds can one sue for divorce?

The answer—

You have evidently forgotten that divorce, like marriage, concerns a man and a woman and perhaps children. For that reason it is not necessary to sue anyone to get a divorce. Such terms "adultery," "in flagrante," "illicit relations," are quite unknown in the U.S.S.R. It is not the State's function to divorce parties. The parties divorce themselves and the State merely recognises the decisions arrived at by the individuals. The State simply sets its seal on the matter. A marriage may be dissolved any time either party want it. The party requiring the divorce is under no obligation to state any reasons to the courts. The principle of guilt is absolutely alien to Soviet law. In fact, the Supreme Court laid down that the court, "to concern itself with the conduct of either party in a divorce case would imply an utterly false interpretation of the principles of Soviet law." The divorce is merely registered. If a certificate is wanted, a stamp duty fee is charged.

It seems to me important that these ministers of religion in our community, who are lending their support to the doctrine of communism, should know these things and understand just what they are doing. That brings me back to the question: Is it within the province of the Senate, or of any other authority connected with the University, to inquire as to whether or not the spread of communistic doctrines so freely permitted, if not actually encouraged amongst University students, is in accordance with fact? I am one of those who believe it is not sufficient merely to oppose any particular doctrines. A negative attitude will never get us anywhere. Why is it that these "isms" are spreading with such amazing rapidity to different parts of the world? I remember that in the summer of 1937 I made a tour of that truly amazing series of structures created by Hitler for the purpose of the Olympic games. I went in a fast lift to the top of the bell tower in which was hung the Olympic bell weighing ten tons. The person showing me round pointed to the inscription on the bell, and said, "Therein lies the secret of Hitler's greatness." The inscription, translated into English, is in these words, "I call the Youth of the World." It is the appeal to youth

that has enabled many of these "isms" to spread with such alarming speed, and in each case the promise of equality of opportunity to youth is made. The Nazis have not kept that promise; whether the communists will keep it or not I do not know, but I have little faith in any doctrine based on force. But this demand for equality of opportunity for youth will arise in every generation and the democracies, if they would survive, cannot close their ears to it.

To my mind, the first step to be taken in order to secure something like equality of opportunity for youth is through our schools, and it is for that reason that I find but little satisfaction in the paragraph of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech referring to education. It is recognised that education is one of the greatest instruments of reconstruction, and it is proposed to initiate legislation to enable the school leaving age to be raised to 15 years "at a convenient time." Over and over again we have seen that any time is convenient to do certain things, no matter to what extent they embarrass the public finances, but even this poor, half-hearted attempt to make amends is to be introduced—when it is convenient! The entire paragraph suggests an absolute lack of conception of what we are up against and what we have to do. A complete scheme of post-primary education is what is needed, and that should not be impossible to carry out. Our teachers will be coming back from the war, and builders will be available to build schools if necessary. It all depends what position is given to education in the scale of priorities of public expenditure. In England educational reform on a large scale has been determined upon although no country's economic burden is likely to be greater than the burden that England will carry when this war is over. The warmest possible reception was given to these proposals in that stronghold of Conservatism, the House of Lords! This is one statement made there—

> When this great conception has been realised, this country will possess a system of education superior to that of any other country in the world at present, and beyond the wildest dreams of the pioneers of education.

The only doubts expressed were as to lack of force in putting the proposals into operation. One speaker said—

> There is no breach in the fellowship of our national life so deep as that which has come about by differences in educational opportunities.

Another speaker remarked—

> The proposals if put into effect would do more than anything to intensify the national unity which was already far closer in this country than in any other country in the world, and that all should receive the special training for life now enjoyed by the few.

Here in Australia, where our system of education has drifted 30 or 40 years behind that of most progressive countries and where, I regret to say, although I believe it is a fact, there is evidence of internal discord to a greater extent than ever before in our experience, all that we get is the suggestion that the school age will be raised to 15 years when convenient. The attitude of the British public to these proposals is indicated by the fact that in a single fortnight 40,000 copies of the Government White Paper on Education were sold. It became the third best seller amongst all White Papers!

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: And not given away, either!

Hon. Sir HAL COLEBATCH: I am sorry to have detained the House so long, but I do think, so far as post-war reconstruction is concerned, that we should have before us three very definite aims—

> 1. To educate our people; to give at least that measure of equality of opportunity to youth that education can ensure.
>
> 2. To increase production and take all steps that are necessary to secure a just distribution of the wealth produced.
>
> 3. To endeavour to restore a spirit of unity amongst our own people.

On motion by Hon. J. A. Dimmitt, debate adjourned.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,500,000.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I move—

> That the House at its rising adjourn till 2.15 p.m. tomorrow.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.38 p.m.