

made the world a very small place. A nation which at one time could consider itself fairly safe from invasion is of course now only a few hours travel from the invader.

Then we have the question of war debts and reparations. Even under the necessity of making another quotation, I shall read a leading American authority's opinion. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of the Columbia University, said—

Put bluntly, the specific cause of the plight in which our farmers, our manufacturers, our merchants, our railways, and our bankers find themselves is the attempt not only to pay war reparations and so-called war debts, but to pay these across frontiers that are guarded by high and thick tariff walls which do not permit international payments to be made in goods. A quick result has been an unwarranted and unnatural distribution of gold, which lies useless and sterilised at one or two centres. We are calling aloud for a return to prosperity, while supporting Governments in precisely those policies which make a return to prosperity impossible.

He goes on to deal with the argument that the American taxpayer will have to carry the burden if war debts are written off. It was urged that Britain was a wealthy country and that she should be made to pay. Dr. Butler continued—

We have lost many times over the sum we hoped to receive from this source. We present the unenviable picture of cutting off our national nose to spite our national face.

In spite of all this, I am optimistic as to the future. I agree with the Premier of Queensland, Mr. Forgan Smith, who recently returned from England, that the intense nationalism prevailing will not continue very long.

The Premier: It could not, for the world would crash under it.

Mr. PATRICK: The people of European countries will not continue to pay 10s. or 12s. a bushel for wheat, which is evidently the cost of growing it there, when wheat can be obtained from other countries so cheaply. The people will rise against it. That is the Queensland Premier's opinion, and I agree with him. When that time comes, there is no doubt that the prosperity of Western Australia will rest on a very solid basis. When wheat and wool return to their aforetime prosperity—the price of wheat has improved and I think wool prices will appreciate, because no doubt the world requires wool—and in view of the fact that we have a third string to our bow, namely the revival

of goldmining, I consider that a return to prosperity in Western Australia is inevitable.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 9.5 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 16th August, 1934.*

	PAGE
Questions: Financial Emergency deductions ...	145
Federal Meat Export Advisory Committee ...	146
Wheat—1, Bulk handling machines; 2, Royal Commission's report ...	146
Address-in-Reply, seventh day ...	146

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

### QUESTION—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY DEDUCTIONS.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Treasurer: 1, What amount has been deducted from the salaries or wages of—(a) railway officers, (b) State school teachers, (c) officers under the Public Service Act, (d) members of Parliament, and (e) other Government employees not mentioned above, under the provisions of the financial emergency legislation which provided for reductions of 18 per cent, 20 per cent., or 22½ per cent. during each of the years ended 30th June, 1932, 1933, and 1934? 2, What amount has been charged to revenue in respect of unemployment relief during each of the years ended 30th June, 1932, 1933, and 1934? 3, What amount has been received by the Treasury for each financial year in respect of—(a) the 4½d. in the pound under the Financial Emergency Act, and (b) the 4½d. to 9d. in the pound under the Financial Emergency Tax Act, 1933.

The TREASURER replied: As the replies to these questions are lengthy, I have prepared them in the nature of a return which I shall lay upon the Table of the House.

### QUESTION—FEDERAL MEAT EXPORT ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Was the appointment (temporary) of Mr. W. C. Angliss, M.L.C., to represent Western Australia at a recent meeting of the Federal Meat Export Advisory Committee, made as a result of recommendations by either the Pastoralists' or the Primary Producers' Association? 2, If not, will he see that those associations are consulted before any such appointment (temporary or otherwise) is made in future?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1 and 2, The question for discussion at the meeting was the consideration of the threatened imposition, by the Imperial Government, of restrictions on the importation of meats from the Dominions. The State Government had previously been asked by the Department of Commerce, in a letter addressed to the Wyndham Meatworks, to nominate a representative on the Federal Meat Export Advisory Committee, and the nomination of Mr. Farrell, the General Manager of the Wyndham Meatworks, was approved. The notice of the meeting was, however, insufficient to enable Mr. Farrell to attend, and Mr. Angliss, at his request acted in his stead.

### QUESTIONS (2)—WHEAT.

#### *Bulk Handling Machines.*

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Lands: What amount has been expended in repair and upkeep of bulk handling machines on the North Wharf, Fremantle, since 1st January, 1934?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: The cost to the Co-operative Bulk Handling, Ltd., for the services rendered by the Fremantle Harbour Trust in repairs and maintenance (including greasing) of the existing bulk handling equipment on the wharves amounted to £169 12s. 1d. for the period from the 1st of June, 1934, to midnight of the 15th August, 1934.

#### *Royal Commissioner's Report.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Premier: When will the Government take action in connection with the report of the Royal Commission on stored wheat?

The PREMIER replied: The matter is receiving consideration.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Seventh Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

—THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35]: I am sorry that any member in speaking to the Address-in-reply should have found himself hampered by the omission of important matters from the Speech delivered by His Excellency. I can assure the House that the Speech follows traditional lines. It does not purport to be original, and contains matter similar to that contained in nearly all, if not all, of the Speeches that have gone before. The Leader of the Nationalist Party was grievously displeased because of the many important matters which the Speech did not contain. He declared that the Speech filled the definition of a line in geometry, inasmuch as it had length and nothing more. In other words, he complained of its length in addition, apparently, to its want of breadth. In the course of the hon. member's speech, in which he complained of the many matters not included in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, he said it should have contained a plain and clear statement of the policy of Ministers to meet and deal with present difficulties under which the people were suffering and a plain statement of Ministers' executive acts to which they intended to resort in order to accomplish the desired end—that is, the acts to which the Government intended to resort between now and the next Governor's Speech. He said there should have been a candid disclosure of the financial position. The financial position is disclosed daily in our newspapers, beside being available to every member and everyone in the State in the official publications that are issued from time to time. The hon. member said that the Speech should have shown how the future will be affected by the report of the Federal Grants Commission. The loan policy, he contended, should have been set out in the Speech. He said the unemployment policy of the Government should have been disclosed therein, and as if that was not enough he said there were other matters of great importance to us that were wholly omitted from the Speech. He instanced the political status of Western Australia and the future of its relations with

the Commonwealth. If the Government were to adopt the role of prophet and endeavour to embody in the Speech what Ministers conceived might be the relations between the Commonwealth and the States I should be sorry for the Governor's Speech. The hon. member said there was an inescapable choice between unification and secession. He complained that in the Speech there was no advice on this question. Even that was not all. He declared he did not wish to detain the House on other matters of importance which had been entirely omitted from the document. The hon. member would have left out all that the Speech contained, and have included all those matters I have enumerated. This is the age of record breaking. In Test cricket we have Bradman beating all records. Not long ago tree-sitting records were established, also a marathon dancing record created, and most recently of all we had a record created by Ghandi's fast in India. These would all have been as nothing to the vocal record which would have had to be established by the Lieut.-Governor if the Speech had contained the matters about the absence of which the hon. member complained.

Mr. Needham: He would not have been finished yet.

Hon. N. Keenan: He might have left out everything he said, and put in that matter.

The PREMIER: If the matters I have enumerated had been fully set out, not merely referred to, but plainly set out, I can imagine how long the Speech would have been. The hon. member complained of the length of the Speech. Even if it were stripped of its length and the matter it contained, and perhaps improved with the breadth of the matters which the hon. member would have included in it, still it would have been of interminable length.

The Minister for Employment: The Case would have been nothing to it.

The PREMIER: It would almost have outstripped the Case for Secession in bulk. The hon. member said a definite campaign was being launched, not to work ourselves out of our troubles, but to talk ourselves out of them. He said, "The Premier himself, notwithstanding his utterances to the contrary made on occasions lends himself to this propaganda." Just there I would remark that if there was any man, at any rate in this State, who occupied even a semi-public position, who could least be accused of lending himself to propaganda, of talk-

ing ourselves out of the depression, I think I could claim to be that person. He said in support of that, that in a recent issue of the "Financial News," of London, an issue specially dealing with the development of gold mining in Western Australia, on the front cover was a foreword contributed by the Premier, and the foreword emphasised that Western Australia was able to meet and surmount the effects of the depression by the successful development of the gold mining industry. That is what the hon. member stated. Now, I said no such thing. Any such impression as that definitely conveyed here by the hon. member is without foundation.

Hon. N. Keenan: What did you say?

The PREMIER: The hon. member is just a second previous. What I did say was that the restoration of a high measure of profit and prosperity to the industry in the last couple of years had been a primary factor in enabling Western Australia to face and surmount the depression. To say that a thing is a primary factor enabling a State to do something is a vastly different matter from saying that that thing is solely responsible for the result. The hon. member further stated—

We are merely living in a fool's paradise if we imagine that the success of the industry has been, or ever could be, so great as to fully counteract the effects of the depression.

With that remark I entirely agree. It would be most foolish to say that the development and the prosperity of the mining industry could of themselves be wholly responsible for the improvement in the State. The hon. member charged me with saying that, but of course I did not say it at all. There was no exaggeration on my part; and I am not to be included in the category of men who talk themselves out of difficulties because I said that the improvement in our mining industry had been a primary factor in the improved condition of the State.

Hon. N. Keenan: "In surmounting."

The PREMIER: Yes; a primary factor.

Hon. N. Keenan: "Surmounting."

The PREMIER: "Surmounting" is not the real point of the matter. When one says that something is a primary factor, one implies that there are other primary factors, and perhaps factors other than primary, which have enabled the State to endeavour to recover its position. In dealing

with the unemployment position the hon. member said—

As to the diminution in the number of those receiving sustenance, which is referred to in the Speech, being any sign of returning prosperity, undoubtedly it would be so if they had gone off the sustenance roll to be absorbed in industry, but that is far from being the case; they are simply being employed as sustenance workers in doing what is called sustenance work.

That statement is definitely incorrect. The total number of men on sustenance and relief work—I ask hon. members to note those words, “on sustenance and relief work”—in August of 1933 was 14,053, and the total number of men on sustenance and relief work in August of 1934, this present month, is 10,890, representing a reduction of 3,163 on the number of men cared for by the Government in August of last year. It will be seen, therefore, that the reduction in the number of unemployed has not been brought about, as the hon. member asserts, by a mere transference of men from sustenance to loan works, because I have just shown that during the past 12 months the number of men who are the care of the Government in both categories, sustenance and relief work, has decreased by 3,163. So it is not correct to say that the reduction in the number of unemployed has been brought about by merely transferring men from Consolidated Revenue and sustenance expenditure to loan expenditure or relief work. They have been, they must have been, absorbed in industry; there is no other explanation of the figures. The number on sustenance in that period of 12 months, from August of last year to August of this year, fell from 5,901 to 1,136; and the number of men on relief work has increased only from 8,152 to 9,754. So it will be seen that the hon. member's assertion about the transfer of unemployed men to support on borrowed money cannot be maintained.

The Minister for Employment: As usual!

The PREMIER: The hon. member proceeded—

How long can we go on borrowing huge sums, as we are borrowing to-day not to carry out any great public works which, if carried out, would be a source of employment on a large scale, both directly and indirectly, but works merely to alleviate the strain on Consolidated Revenue—

Mr. Cross: That is what the member for Nedlands thinks about the water supply!

The PREMIER: I continue the quotation—

—to take over from Consolidated Revenue the task of maintaining the necessitous in our community, and passing on that task to be borne by loan moneys!

What is the position with regard to the large numbers of men who are out of work in this State and in the other States of Australia? The hon. member evidently disapproves of Governments borrowing money in order to employ those who are out of work. He disapproves of that policy. He says the work is unproductive.

Hon. N. Keenan: I disapprove of borrowing for unproductive works.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will surely admit that neither this nor any other Government would employ men on unproductive works if productive works were available. However, I am not admitting that the men are being employed on works entirely unproductive. I was coming to that aspect later. But even if the position were as the hon. member suggests, what are the facts? We have a large number of men out of work. The hon. member contends that it is a false policy to borrow money in order to employ them. Very well; we will assume that to be right. What is the alternative? There is only one alternative—to allow those men to remain unemployed, out of work, and to maintain them by sustenance payments. That is the sole alternative, unless there be a third, to which, I believe, nobody would subscribe, and least of all the hon. member. The third alternative is to take the stand that those men are not the care of the Government at all and that they must be allowed to go hungry. Needless to say, that view cannot be entertained. If it is wrong to borrow money to employ those men—

Hon. N. Keenan: I did not say, wrong to borrow money to employ them, but wrong to borrow money to employ them as they are being employed now, and not on some great public work.

The PREMIER: That is so; the hon. member did say that. But the hon. member knows perfectly well that after nearly four years of unemployment in this State, it is not possible for any human being to-day to find works of a reproductive character as that phrase is understood by the hon. member. Therefore my point remains good: if we are to employ those men only on reproductive works, then, such works not being available to the hand of the Government, we

should not borrow money to employ the men. That, I think, fairly puts the hon. member's case. If we cannot find works of a reproductive nature, we should not borrow money to employ men on works not wholly reproductive and in some cases possibly not reproductive at all. That is the hon. member's case. I ask again, what is the alternative? Is it to keep the men in idleness and maintain them out of the dole, by sustenance payments? In that case, having regard to the financial position of the State, which for many years past has had heavy deficits, the thing will merely be done in another way, for if work is not found for those men and they are maintained by sustenance payments, the deficit must increase largely. We are not balancing our ledger, and whatever amount we fail to balance it by at the end of the year has to be made good by borrowed money, and by no other means. So we should have to borrow money to pay a deficit resulting from heavy payments of sustenance money to men out of work. Thus we should be increasing our loan indebtedness, and consequently our oversea interest bill, without having anything whatever to show for it in the way of either reproductive work or work of any kind whatever.

The Minister for Employment: And at the same time we should be robbing the men of their independence.

The PREMIER: At least much of the work that is being done is, if not reproductive, yet highly useful and necessary, and will be of great convenience and assistance to the people of Western Australia in the many directions in which it is being carried out. Where does the hon. member's argument lead to if followed up? Assuming that he was in charge of the affairs of the State and pursuing the policy enunciated by him in his speech of last Tuesday, he would refuse to borrow money unless he could see that it would be expended on reproductive works. Well, such works are not available here to-day—not immediately reproductive works. But many of the works now being carried out will prove indirectly reproductive, or perhaps directly reproductive in the years to come. But that does not fit in with the hon. member's policy as expressed by him; and so he would not go on with such works, but would allow men to remain out of employment and on the dole. That is a policy which, in my opinion, cannot be defended anywhere. As regards the policy of borrowing to maintain unemployed, during

these later years, I have attended many Premiers' Conferences. I have attended a couple of them during the past 12 months. There I met Premiers and representative men drawn from the various States of Australia, and it was agreed that the only possible thing that the Governments could do to-day was to borrow, to a certain extent, in order to relieve the position as we found it with regard to unemployment. If Governments had not adopted that course, I hesitate to say what the result would have been. Does the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) imagine that the large army of unemployed in Australia, an army officially recorded as numbering over 300,000 men, and, I think, as many more not recorded—the official records do not include the large number of women and youths throughout Australia who are out of work—would have remained content indefinitely if all the States had adopted the policy suggested by him and refused to borrow unless there were works of a reproductive character to be undertaken? Does he suggest that such a vast army of unemployed would sit down indefinitely and be content to draw the dole that they have been subjected to during the past two or three years? Of course, they would not be content to do so. No Government could afford to take the risk, nor should any Government attempt to impose upon the large number of men and women who are out of work in this and every other State of Australia, conditions of employment and of life governed by the payment of the dole, without any opportunity to work at all. Whether the expenditure of money involved in the borrowing policy was for works, reproductive or otherwise, there is an absolutely undoubted duty upon the Governments of all the States to do something towards relieving the distress occasioned by unemployment during this trying period. Although the amount involved may seem large, and we may not appear to have wholly reproductive work to show for all the expenditure, at least we have some assets to show for it. We have harbours that have been constructed, roads built, railways constructed or regraded, drainage works and irrigation schemes carried out. All these works that have been undertaken through the expenditure of the money are not entirely unproductive. After all, the amount involved is a very small sum used in an endeavour to ease the conditions of

the unemployed and those dependent upon them during the past two or three years, compared with what the nation made available in past years, and would undoubtedly do so again should the necessity arise, merely to be blown into the air, with nothing whatever to show for it.

Mr. Doney: We have always recognised that the works you have mentioned are indirectly reproductive.

The PREMIER: That is not what the member for Nedlands contended. If, in times of national stress and attack, we could find such vast sums of money, is it to be said that we cannot provide even this comparatively infinitesimal amount in order that the men of the nation, in times of great unemployment, may receive something to enable them to carry on under conditions somewhat approaching those they should be permitted to enjoy? I would not care to be associated with a Government that would adopt a policy of sitting down and saying, "We will not borrow any money to provide employment for those who need it, until and unless we are able to find reproductive works." I would be sorry for any Government in Australia that would adopt such an attitude. There would be such a storm around their heads as would sweep them and perhaps the Constitution under which we in Australia live, out of existence. The member for Nedlands also said—

But what plan are we following; what definite end have we in view? None whatever! It is merely a case of keeping the wheels turning over, marking time in the vain hope that somehow or sometime or other Providence may come to our aid and show us the way out.

What plan does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. Needham: He did not suggest anything.

The PREMIER: What plan did he place before his colleagues when he was a member of a Government?

Mr. Raphael: He left them, and rattled on his friends.

Member: It was just as well.

The PREMIER: Right through his speech, the member for Nedlands pointed out what was wrong with the Government's policy, but he did not give the slightest indication that he had any plan.

Hon. N. Keenan: Do you expect the members of the Opposition to lay down a policy? Is that their duty?

The PREMIER: That is altogether too hoary! It is the duty of any man who thinks

he has a plan—and the hon. member must have his plan, seeing that he talked about a plan—whether he be a member of the Opposition or not, to place that plan before the House, particularly in such stressful times of national difficulty as the present. If such a member were sitting on the Opposition side of the House, he would be quickly transferred from the Opposition to the Government benches.

Mr. Hegney: Particularly when the member for Nedlands said he desired to help the Government.

The PREMIER: Yes, so he said. Let us leave the Government out of it altogether; it is a matter of helping the people and the State. By outlining a plan, the hon. member would point the way to the Premiers of the other States as well, and he would show them the way to go. Again I repeat my query to him. He was a member of a Government for 12 or 18 months, during which time the State reached the peak period of the unemployment trouble, when the largest amount of money in the history of the State was paid away in sustenance. Where was his plan then? Was it that his colleagues would not listen to his plan, or was he unable to impress upon them the value of his proposals? If we are marking time as the member for Nedlands suggested—and I confess that we are—so is the whole world marking time. Can the hon. member point to any country in the world that, in the face of the vast economic troubles confronting all peoples, is not marking time?

Mr. Doney: Except, perhaps, the Old Country.

The PREMIER: The Old Country is marking time.

Mr. Doney: Not to the extent that other countries are.

The PREMIER: I do not say that every nation in the world is absolutely in step while marking time, but I do suggest that the world is marking time in these days.

Mr. North: It is the end of an age. It is the dawning of a new age.

The PREMIER: I believe, with the member for Claremont (Mr. North) that if it is not the end, we are certainly approaching the end of an age and of systems and conditions that have obtained for a long time past. We are approaching the end, and the age will disappear, just as ages in the dim distant past have disappeared. Ages have risen up and then gone down. That has been the history of the world throughout all time.

We are now reaching a period similar to that when former empires that had risen to great heights, passed into oblivion, and new conditions arose out of the ashes.

Mr. Stubbs: And what will happen to us?

The PREMIER: We will have to face the experience just as others have done. I emphasise that we are marking time. I could understand the type of complaint voiced by the member for Nedlands if elsewhere conditions were entirely satisfactory and if the position in other countries were not as it is in Western Australia. All over Australia and throughout the world, Governments are marking time, and so the Government in this State are merely marking time in the ranks of a tremendous world-wide army.

Mr. Doney: But why admit that you are marking time? If your employment figures are correct, you are not marking time but making some progress.

The PREMIER: I believe we are advancing to a certain extent, and I believe the world is emerging correspondingly—I dare not say that we are emerging, or I shall be accused of talking ourselves out of our troubles instead of working our way out—but I have always been very cautious to refrain from giving the people an idea that the State was around the corner. In view of the conditions that are world-wide, it is entirely idle for the member for Nedlands to lay the charge at the door of this or any other Government, that they are not proceeding along any definite plan that will help the State out of its troubles, and that they are marking time. We are compelled to mark time by international and world-wide considerations over which we have no control whatever. Then again the member for Nedlands said—

And yet we are adding to these borrowings at a rate that equals the most extravagant rate in all our extravagant years in the past.

That is definitely not correct. The loan expenditure last year was £2,684,000.

Hon. N. Keenan: What was your deficit?

The PREMIER: I am talking about our borrowing, and the remarks of the hon. member.

Hon. N. Keenan: You borrow for the deficits.

The PREMIER: Whatever borrowing we do to provide for the deficits is included in our borrowings because by no other way can a Government meet the deficits. The member for Nedlands claimed that the Government had borrowed most extravagantly. I have

indicated that the loan expenditure last year was £2,684,000, and that is 57 per cent. only of the borrowings in the highest year. That is another of the hon. member's typically extravagant statements.

The Minister for Employment: But it was fairly close to the truth for him.

The PREMIER: It was not our borrowing that may be classed as extravagant but rather the language in which the member for Nedlands couched his speech.

Hon. N. Keenan: If you add the deficit to the actual amount of money borrowed, what then?

The PREMIER: That would not alter the position.

Hon. N. Keenan: Of course it would.

The PREMIER: The hon. member cannot get away from the position because in the years of our most extravagant borrowing, we also had deficits. If it is right to add to our borrowings of last year the amount of the deficit, it would also be correct to add to the borrowings in the highest year the deficit for that particular year.

Hon. N. Keenan: Certainly, do so.

The PREMIER: And it would not alter the figures I have quoted.

Hon. N. Keenan: Of course it would.

The PREMIER: Certainly not, because in the years of our most extravagant borrowing we had large deficits that were not included in the loan figures, but had to be provided for all the same. So much for the hon. member's criticism of our borrowings and finance. The Leader of the Opposition criticised fairly strongly, and so also did the Leader of the Nationalist Party, the work of the Transport Board, both for their administration and interpretation of the Act. Both those gentlemen said the board's policy was to refuse road licenses and prohibit road transport—I am sticking strictly to the words employed by those hon. gentlemen—and both claimed that this was not the intention of Parliament. I need not read what they have said, because both their speeches will be fresh in the minds of members generally. The board has done nothing and can do nothing apart from what the Bill provided, and that anything the board may do contrary to the Act can be challenged in the courts of the land. How can it be suggested that Parliament did not intend the board to do what it has done? If members then had those opinions which they have expressed now, why did not they express them when the

Bill was before the House? In speaking on the Transport Co-ordination Bill, the Leader of the Opposition said this—

Road transport is now competing with the old system of railway transport to the detriment of the railways . . . I want this road transport to feed our railways . . . I wish to encourage other transport, not in opposition to the railways, but as feeders to them . . . The railways are there and they have to be used. I believe they can be used cheaper than any road transport. The main thing is to feed the lines and keep the trains full.

Yet now that the board is endeavouring to give effect to that policy the hon. member claims that it is misinterpreting the Act. What more has the board done than that which was said by the hon. member in the words I have just quoted? The contribution of the Leader of the Nationalist Party to the debate was on the constitutional method of appointing the board. We remember the proposal the hon. member made in that respect. What have the members of the board done to warrant the criticism which has been heaped upon them. The Leader of the Opposition says they have done nothing but refuse licenses.

Mr. Doney: Much of the criticism was that they should have journeyed out into the country to see the actual conditions there before making the changes.

The PREMIER: I am coming to that. Actually road licenses have been refused to 165 applicants and issued to approximately 350 applicants. About 40 per cent. of the 165 applicants refused have been offered and have accepted conditional licenses.

Mr. Stubbs: Pending appeal.

The PREMIER: No, not pending appeal at all. They have accepted conditional licenses, which means that instead of having a free hand as they had in the past to run daily or at any time and carry anything they like, they have now conditional licenses to trade on certain days in the week in regard to certain commodities, as is being done in the Williams district. Forty per cent. of those who were refused licenses have accepted those conditions.

Mr. Doney: But acceptance does not necessarily mean satisfaction.

The PREMIER: Of course not. Would any man with a truck who has had a free run of the main road from here to Albany, parallel to the railway, picking up all the cream of the traffic and goods—would such a man be satisfied if as the result of a de-

cision of the board his operations were curtailed in any way? Would it be entirely satisfactory to him? Of course not; but it may be entirely fair and equitable all the same. Nothing would be satisfactory to a man if it took away from him to-day a penny of what he was earning yesterday. We are not concerned with the giving of satisfaction to men running trucks, for the whole thing would not be worth the paper it is printed on if we did that.

Mr. Doney: I am not so much concerned about the giving of satisfaction.

The PREMIER: Nevertheless it is the hon. member's question I am answering, as to whether it gave satisfaction. The board has endeavoured to provide for trucks apart from direct competition with the railways. So it is futile for members to say they did not know what the Bill involved. They supported protection for the railways, as is shown in their speeches made when the Bill was before the House. How can protection for the railways be achieved without limiting direct road competition? That is all that has been done by the board. Some members claim that there should be co-ordination. That blessed word "co-ordination" seems to give them as much relief as "Mesopotamia" gave to the old woman. When members are criticising this board or the Act under which it works—and this applies to many other Acts—they cover themselves up in a vague atmosphere of "co-ordination," without ever condescending to tell us what they mean by "co-ordination." They criticise the members of the board and assume that "co-ordination" in the Bill meant that very few licenses should be refused. I say the absolute refusal of licenses in perhaps many directions comes well within the definition of "co-ordination."

Mr. Doney: Not within the generally accepted definition.

The PREMIER: Yes, it may come well within the definition of "co-ordination."

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Co-ordination could not be achieved without the refusal of licenses.

The PREMIER: Exactly. How is it possible to get co-ordination without in many cases refusing licenses?

Mr. Doney: "Co-ordination" is intended to mean what is generally regarded as a square deal to both parties.

The PREMIER: What is a square deal to one man is the other man's funeral. All the world stands for a square deal, but there are



mighty different meanings given to it. "Co-ordination" does not tell us what is a square deal. The hon. member uses "square deal" as a synonym for "co-ordination."

Mr. Sampson: "Co-ordination" does not mean strangulation.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It must mean that.

The PREMIER: The Bill as it passed this House was well known to members of the House. It must have been understood that in many instances it would mean strangulation. Indeed it would have been a worthless measure had it not meant strangulation. Moreover, I would say that the word "strangulation" comes well within the definition of "co-ordination" in some directions. It is well known that road transport cannot exist unless it charges an average of 4d. per ton-mile. Yet if the railways received a flat rate of 1½d. per ton-mile, they would make a profit after paying working expenses, interest and all charges. But the service to the community which the railways give prevents the railways from making a flat rate charge of 1¾d. per ton-mile on all goods. Let me quote a couple of outstanding instances of the way in which it is prevented: What would be said if the farthing per ton-mile now charged by the railways for the carriage of superphosphate were increased to 1¾d.? Again, what would be said if the rate now charged for the haulage of wheat were increased to 1¾d. per ton-mile? The railways can successfully carry on and show a profit at 1¾d. per ton-mile, but in the interests of industry and the State generally a much lower rate is charged. Members are well aware that the rate charged for the carriage of super involves the State in a loss of over £100,000 per annum, and I believe the rate charged for the haulage of wheat shows but a very small profit to the Railway Department. I say to those people—not so much to members of this House as to those outside—who are clamouring about this, that they cannot have it both ways. They are not going to have it that road transport is to be permitted to take away from the railways those classes of goods upon which they obtain a higher rate and which alone enable the railways to carry the other goods I have mentioned at great loss.

Mr. Doney: We agree in that.

The PREMIER: Those people are not going to be permitted to do that, to steal those goods from the railways, and at the same time enjoy the losing rate charged by the Railway Department on other goods. As

Treasurer of the State I should consider myself in duty bound to intervene if this competition which has been going on in the past were to continue, and if the activities and work of the Transport Board were to be hampered by clamour and agitation throughout the country, a clamour organised, not in the interests of the farmers, but in the interests of interested persons in the city, men who are financially interested in the sale of motor tyres and tubes and that kind of thing, but who are shedding tears of blood for the inconvenience occasioned to the people in the country. I say as Treasurer, and having regard to the taxpayers of the State, that unless this unfair competition is eliminated the railways and the Treasury will be forced, whatever the consequences may be, to get something more nearly approaching a payable rate for the large tonnage of goods which they carry at a loss.

Mr. Ferguson: You are asked to build the railways and run them in the interests of the country.

The PREMIER: But did anyone ever know a railway deputation which would not promise the moon conditionally on their pet railway being built? Shall I ever forget the deputation that asked for the Yarramony railway? They even went so far as to say they would be agreeable to levy a special tax upon their lands, which would be served by that railway, in order to cover any loss that might be incurred.

Mr. Wansbrough: Until the line was built.

The PREMIER: Yes, and then the notices from the Government asking for payment would be dealt with as are so many other notices—used to paper the walls of their houses. I would be compelled to increase the accommodation at the Treasury in order to house all the documents relating to the amounts owing to the Government for non-payment of interest and other charges. People cannot have it both ways, and they are not going to.

The Minister for Lands: We cannot carry two systems.

The PREMIER: No, not side by side. Who would argue that, when we have a railway running for 300 miles and a main road built at great expense running parallel with it, we should have two systems of transport without control in any way?

The Minister for Lands: When there is not enough trade for one system.

Mr. Doney: That arrangement was stupid.

The PREMIER: In all instances where licenses were refused, the applicants were prepared to carry from the metropolitan area only general merchandise, such as supplies for storekeepers and publicans, liquid fuels and other goods, for which the railways charge a relatively high freight. How could the board grant licenses to facilitate direct and unfair competition with the railways and still do what the Leader of the Opposition said Parliament intended, namely, make all forms of transport of service to the railway system? It is ridiculous to say that the administration of the board is contrary to the intention of the Act. It is inevitable that some licenses should be refused in order to accomplish the object of the Act, and in any event, the Act provides the right of appeal from the decision of the board. I question whether it is quite right for members of this House—I am not so much concerned about what is said outside at specially organised public meetings—to be criticising and condemning the actions of the board while the matter is sub judice. Appeals are now being heard by the court, and I think members might well withhold their criticism and condemnation until we know whether the decisions of the board are upheld by the court. Fortunately our magistrates and those who dispense justice are not influenced by public clamour or by the criticism indulged in by members of Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition questioned whether the board had given proper attention to their work because of their other activities. Since February, 66 meetings have been held, in addition to which special consideration has been given to various matters by members. The districts affected by the decisions are well known to members of the board, all of whom are old residents of the State. There was no necessity for them to travel over the routes; all the information necessary to enable them to reach a fair and equitable decision was available to them before they made their determination. If the chairman of the board were neglecting his other official duties because of the transport work, the Minister in charge—the Minister for Works—would be the first to complain. The Leader of the Opposition said he was disappointed because the board had not conferred with the railway authorities. Before one application was considered by the board, they took

evidence from the Commissioner of Railways and his officials, and subsequently asked for a further report. The board will investigate complaints regarding the transport of goods by rail. The Leader of the Nationalist Party said that compensation should be paid to carriers to whom licenses were refused. The question of paying compensation was expressly considered by Parliament and was rejected.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Hear hear!

The PREMIER: Therefore, what weight is there in a complaint to-day that no compensation is being paid? The man in the street, and the busy people who are working long hours that transport men have to work, might well draw from the statement of the hon. member the conclusion that the fact of compensation not being paid was the result of action by the board. Those people might well conclude that it was within the discretion of the board to grant compensation, and that some carriers had been refused licenses without compensation being paid. Such an inference might be drawn by many people, though it was not intended by the hon. member to convey that inference. The board have no option whatever in the matter of compensation. It is altogether too late now for any member to complain on the score that no compensation is being paid.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is purely political propaganda.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Nationalist Party uttered the following glowing, fervent, eloquent words—

An Act which means that (no compensation) is an affront to our basic conception of justice, and the statute-book on which it is inscribed is insulted by the inscription.

Evidently you did not notice the significance of those words, Mr. Speaker, because they constituted a reflection on the Parliament that decided against compensation.

The Minister for Lands: Most decidedly.

The PREMIER: The outside public would think that the severe condemnation contained in the remarks of the hon. member was properly and rightly levelled at members of the board. It has nothing to do with the board. That, of course, was typical of the hon. member's extravagant language. The board are carrying out the intentions of Parliament, and it is wrong for Parliament to shirk its responsibilities and hide behind the board. That

is what is being done, merely for political expediency and political propaganda, which was evidenced by the fact that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Nationalist party addressed the public meeting held, I believe, in the Town Hall, condemning the board. It was political propaganda. The Act requires the board to report to Parliament in October of each year, and I think that before members express themselves too freely, they might await the first report of the board. The board are doing their work conscientiously, and I venture to say that before the Act has been in operation for 12 months, most of the clamour will have died down and the present-day critics of the board will admit that good work has been done in the interests of the State by eliminating unnecessary and wasteful services. The Leader of the Opposition attacked the Railway Department for the additional charge of 9d. per ton imposed for the haulage of bulk wheat. That is the only aspect of the question with which I intend to deal to-day. The extra charge of 9d. per ton on 12,000,000 bushels represents approximately £13,000, equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per bushel. Although all the bulk wheat has not yet been transported, the charge has barely covered the extra cost to the department. Let me give a few items which have been entirely overlooked by the Leader of the Opposition but which show that the charge is justified. There is the extra tare of approximately 5 cwt. on vehicles altered to transport bulk wheat. These are equal to 200 4-wheeled steel trucks. There is empty haulage. The trucks are unsuitable for hauling other traffic, and entail empty haulage, except in respect of a few trucks forced into the super traffic following on the washaways. Moreover, the trucks remain idle when no bulk wheat is available. Trucks that carry bagged wheat need never be idle: they can be used for carrying all kinds of goods.

Mr. Patrick: They are ordinary trucks and are not specially fitted up.

The PREMIER: But they cannot be used for carrying other kinds of goods. Could they be used to carry rails and piles? Yet the trucks that carry bagged wheat can carry piles, rails or anything else. The truck used for bulk wheat cannot be so used.

Mr. Doney: They could be used for many other purposes.

The PREMIER: For some purposes they could not be used.

Mr. Doney: But for many other purposes they could be used.

The PREMIER: Yes. I am giving reasons why the extra charge is justified. It is because the trucks used for bulk wheat cannot be used for transporting many other kinds of goods. Extra shunting is necessary to sort out the trucks. When trucks return from the goldfields and country centres, they have to be sorted out, and to sort out the bulk wheat trucks entails additional expense as compared with trucks used for bagged wheat. It should be evident to members that additional shunting is incurred in sorting out the bulk trucks at the wharf. There is extra maintenance for the improvised trucks. Many of the wooden trucks are not strong enough to stand the pressure of bulk wheat. Converted trucks are more costly to maintain, and in numerous instances repairs to tarpaulins were necessary. One member gave an estimate of the saving that would have been made at one siding this year if the wheat had been handled in bulk. It is questionable whether the installation of bulk handling during the past season has resulted in any saving at all to the wheatgrowers.

Mr. Patrick: You cannot tell them that.

The PREMIER: Perhaps not, but they will agree with me when I say that they cannot hold wheat in bulk if it has to be sold, that is, they cannot hold it indefinitely.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You cannot hold it in bags any more than you can hold it in bulk.

The PREMIER: Could it remain the property of the grower?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The wheat must go on, whether in bags or in bulk.

The PREMIER: In bags I could hold my wheat until the next season if I liked. I ask whether it is possible under this system for the grower who handles the wheat in bulk to continue to remain the owner of the wheat.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: At the present time, yes, but the bins must be emptied before the next season's wheat comes in. The owner can hold it as long as he likes, provided he pays for storage.

The PREMIER: Where is it to be stored?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: In the bins.

The PREMIER: But the bins have to be emptied. Have we storage enough for all

the wheat being handled in bulk? It would be possible to store the whole of the harvest in bags.

Mr. Patrick: But you never do.

The PREMIER: It could be done: it was done during the war. It would not be possible to store the whole of the season's wheat if it were handled in bulk.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The position is practically the same with bags as in bulk. I know that I have saved about £100 by bulk handling, and I think, as a farmer, I understand the business.

The PREMIER: No balance sheet has yet been published by the companies handling wheat in bulk.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I have my own balance sheet.

The PREMIER: The company handling wheat in bulk may be able to show the hon. member a satisfactory balance sheet, that is to say that he saved £100. But we do not know that, and a Royal Commission would enable us to find out where some of that hundred pounds might have come from—through association with the Pool or by some other manner of handling the wheat. The balance sheet of each individual farmer is known to him, but we do not know how the general operations of the company handling wheat in bulk are affected.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What has that to do with it?

The PREMIER: It has a lot to do with it. The balance sheet of the company is not available to any wheatgrower until October; it is not available until the year's operations are concluded. There is such a thing as a wheat pool, and say the average farmer had put his wheat into that pool. Has he always been satisfied with the balance sheets of the past?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Quite satisfied.

The PREMIER: I have had a brief but disastrous experience of wheatgrowing. I put my wheat in the Pool for a couple of years, and although a balance sheet may have been available, I never saw it.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The Minister for Lands gets one every year. I can see we want a Royal Commission.

The PREMIER: Yes, we do. With regard to farmers' difficulties, I should like to compliment the member for Greenough (Mr. Patrick) on the very thoughtful speech he delivered last night. My compliments are not due to the high praise he gave me for a famous speech of mine on another

occasion, but generally speaking it is admitted that the great difficulties of the farmers in this State, and indeed all over Australia, are one of the problems confronting us, and I agree with all that has been said and that can be said about the need for some action being taken to enable the wheatgrowers to overcome the financial troubles which now surround them so that they might continue to produce. Unfortunately I have not the time just now to dilate upon this subject, but whatever may be said of the value of production from our secondary industries, undoubtedly in Australia primary production is our foundation, and unless that is on a firm basis, the others will have a bad time. I do not propose to deal with that question further because the farmers' difficulties today can best be considered when we are debating the report of the Royal Commission on the Agricultural Bank. With that is interwoven the other institutions that are dealing with the farmers, and as I have already promised, the opportunity will be given for a full discussion.

Mr. Thorn: When will the full report be available.

The PREMIER: In another week or so. It is in the hands of the printer, but the Government Printing Office just now is very busy with the Federal rolls. I daresay we shall have the report before us about Tuesday week. This House can then employ itself on a full discussion, not only of the report, but all that might emanate from it, and also the future policy of the bank and the difficulties of farmers generally. I desire now to offer a few comments upon the report of the Commonwealth Grants Commission appointed by the Federal Government. The case submitted to that Commission by Western Australia was based chiefly on disabilities arising from the tariff. The committee appointed by the Commonwealth Government to inquire into the question of tariff recognised these disabilities in its report issued in 1929. That committee stated that Western Australia suffered a greater burden under the tariff than any other State. I shall read an extract from the committee's report—

So it comes about that the same two States, Victoria and Queensland, both get the greatest increase to income per head and pay least per head for it. New South Wales is in a middle position, and the other three States both receive least and pay most, with Western Australia in a somewhat worse position than South Australia and Tasmania. It is to be noted that

those three States are all claimants for special Commonwealth assistance.

The cost of protection was estimated at £6 per head of the population of the whole of Australia. Each State received a gain varying according to the benefit it enjoyed as a result of the policy of protection. Western Australia's gain was calculated at £3 12s. per head, the net loss under the tariff therefore being £2 8s. per head, which was greater than that of any other State. Our tariff disabilities were also recognised by the Commonwealth Royal Commission of 1925 which issued a majority recommendation for an annual grant to Western Australia of £450,000 for 10 years, pending fiscal economy. As a result of that recommendation the Commonwealth passed an Act giving us £300,000 a year for five years. Since then grants have been made from year to year. It is important to remember that this grant was solely for Federal disabilities. The present Grants Commission was not so limited. Its report was to cover all reasons for grants, for instance, droughts. The Commission in their report agreed that Western Australia did suffer greater disabilities, because of protection, than any other State, but they said they were unable to measure the amount. Hence they had to get some other basis on which to work. They said that any disabilities would be reflected in the budgetary position. So they confined themselves to an examination of the finances of the three claimant States as a means of arriving at the grants to be paid. Their first step was to arrive at what our deficit should be if we were on a basis equivalent to non-claimant States. They took the average per capita deficit for the three States not claiming, for 1932-33. This was £1 15s. per head. For Western Australia in the same year it was £1.98 per head. From this they concluded that we were entitled to an additional grant of £83 per head, in other words, £370,000 above the grant then being received of £500,000, making a total of £870,000. The Commission then investigated the budgets of the claimant States to ascertain whether any factors affected the deficits that were not common to the other States. Western Australia had taken into revenue from loan, interest due to the Agricultural Bank, but not collected, amounting to £220,000. On this they allowed only £120,000, because they considered that much was due to unsound financial methods. On group settlement they

found that a shortage of interest of £297,000 had been made good by transfer from the group settlement reserve fund. They agreed with the principle, but said that the amount transferred was excessive, and they allowed us £100,000. These two amounts, namely the £120,000 for the Agricultural Bank and the £100,000 for group settlement, added to their figure of £870,000, brought our total grant up to £1,090,000. They then turned their attention to economy in administration, to see what should be taken into consideration there. They found that Western Australia was extravagant to the extent of £130,000 under the heading of social services, above what they considered a fair Australian average, and they deducted this amount from the grant. They then proceeded to ascertain the severity of taxation in the claimant States, and concluded that Western Australia was under-taxed to the extent of £400,000 on a fair Commonwealth average. This sum they also deducted, thus reducing the grant to £560,000. As they admitted that much of the information was unsatisfactory they considered they should add 10 per cent. as a margin for error to each State. They agreed they should add 10 per cent. as a margin for error to the claimant States, but in our case they added only 7.14 per cent., making a total of £600,000.

Mr. Patrick: They wanted to make it even money.

The PREMIER: A remarkable coincidence is that whilst they agreed that the three States should have a 10 per cent. margin for error, they departed from their own agreement and allowed us only 7.14 per cent., which brought us exactly to £600,000, the amount we received last year. I will now summarise these figures to show concisely how that sum was arrived at.

	£
Grant in 1932-33 .. .. .	500,000
Add amount to reduce deficit to fair Australian average ..	370,000
Add amount for Agricultural Bank interest credited but not collected .. .. .	120,000
Add ditto on group settlement .. .. .	100,000
<b>Total .. .. .</b>	<b>£1,090,000</b>
Less excess cost of social services .. .. .	130,000
Less amount undertaxed .. .. .	400,000
<b>Leaving .. .. .</b>	<b>560,000</b>
Plus 7.14 per cent. for error .. .. .	40,000
<b>Net amount .. .. .</b>	<b>£600,000</b>

I wish now to proceed to examine in some detail these figures and the calculations by which the Commission arrived at the results. In the first place it is a matter of opinion whether Federal disabilities must be essentially reflected in the Budget, or at any rate, to what extent. They say our disabilities should be reflected in our Budget. It might well be that a State would suffer disabilities under the Federation and not have any deficit at all. On account of Agricultural Bank interest paid from loan, the Commission allowed us £120,000 out of £220,000, or 55 per cent. They were not consistent. To Tasmania, which followed a similar practice with a smaller amount, the Commission allowed 94 per cent. of the sum involved. They gave no reason for this differentiation. Had they allowed us the same percentage as was allowed to Tasmania, we would have received £207,000, or an additional £87,000. If we turn to the deductions for extravagance in social services, we find that the Commission based their figures on a table showing the cost of education, health and charities, and law and order. This showed the average cost of these services for Australia as 62s. 11d. per head, whereas the cost for Western Australia is 66s. per head. The Commission decided that because of undue extravagance in New South Wales, and undue economy in Victoria, a fair Australian average should be 60s., instead of 62s. 11d. They therefore deducted from our grant the difference between our figure of 66s. and their Australian figure of 60s. per head, making a total of £130,000. They admitted that some allowance should be made for scattered population and large area, and they fixed on 2s. per head as a fair thing. But having arrived at this figure, they apparently forgot all about it, as they made no allowance for it. On their own figures this would have reduced the deduction from £130,000 to £87,000. The reasons why the Commission fixed on 60s. as the Australian average are not convincing. To have been consistent they should have taken the average of the three non-claiming States, as they did in arriving at the basic deficit. This would have given an average of 64s. 1d. Western Australia's supposed excess of cost is largely accounted for under health and charity. In arriving at their figure, however, the Commission took, under hospital tax, the

collections instead of the expenditure, and the difference was £3,000. They also took an amount of £60,000 as payment for miners' plithisis. I consider this amount should not have been included, because in assessing our taxable capacity the Commission frequently emphasised the prosperity here as being due to gold mining. If that is so they should have allowed the £60,000 which is the essential cost of procuring that prosperity. The point is that if we are in a position for which we have suffered in their eyes, by receiving a lesser grant because of our mining prosperity, they should in all fairness have deducted the £60,000 which it costs us to obtain that prosperity. If these two items be taken into account the cost per head for social services in this State is reduced from 66s. to 63s. The Commission agreed that we were entitled to an allowance of 2s. per head for scattered population and large areas, which they did not give us, but no reasons are given to justify that figure. If the Commonwealth figures be taken as a guide, their excess cost of administration in this State on comparable services is 3s. 5d. per head, and not 2s. This further reduces our costs to 59s. 7d. per head, against an average of 64s. 1d. for the three non-claiming States, making us entitled to a contribution on this account of 4s. 6d. per head. In other words, instead of the Commission reducing our grant by £130,000 on account of social services, they should have increased it by £98,000. These figures are carefully compiled by our officers in the Treasury and the Government departments generally, and I invite the Commission to fault them in any particular. On the question of taxation, the Commission stated as their opinion that a State claiming a grant should be taxed as heavily as the highest taxed State. They came to the conclusion that Western Australia fell short of this by £400,000 and accordingly deducted this amount from the grant to be paid. The data on which they based their conclusions took into account both the taxable capacity and the tax collections for 1932-33. The Commission admitted that this was not entirely satisfactory. To us, the means used to arrive at their result seem most unconvincing. It would take a long time to give all the details.

Mr. Latham: It is the same old figure that was used over the previous year.

The PREMIER: A most unsatisfactory feature was the adoption of the taxation collection figures for 1932-33, despite the fact that those for 1933-34 were practically completed and were supplied to the Commission, together with Estimates for 1934-35. In 1932-33, the year taken by the Commission, our taxation was £2 19s. per head of the population. Last year the figure was £3 9s. 4d. If we assume that our taxable capacity remained the same, this means that a sum of £226,000 was wrongfully deducted from our grant, because last year we actually collected that much more than was collected during the year taken by the Commission. As the grant has been made for the finances of 1934-35, it is only reasonable to take the figures for the nearest possible year, which they did not do.

Mr. Griffiths: And which they already had.

The PREMIER: Yes. If they accepted the estimates of taxation for the year in which the grant is to be paid, it is anticipated that the deduction on account of taxation would disappear altogether, namely, the £400,000. In other words, they say we are under-taxed to the extent of £400,000, but the taxation that we are collecting to-day leaves us not under-taxed at all in comparison with the other States. The financial emergency tax should operate for 12 months this year as against nine months last year. No doubt the Commission will make allowance for this in future years, but that is unsatisfactory, as it is undesirable to have to lag two years in this respect. The Commission said they would add 10 per cent. to the net figures for errors and omissions. South Australia received an extra 11 per cent., Tasmania 38 per cent., but Western Australia only 7 per cent. The reason given for this varying addition was that we have been extravagant in social expenditure, and low in taxation.

Mr. Patrick: Infernal cheek.

The PREMIER: But deductions had already been made for both of these features. They had considered the fact that we were extravagant in our social services and were low in taxation, they had taken that into consideration, and yet they meted out a further punishment to us because of those features. We have been penalised twice for the same offence, for which our guilt is denied. The most disappointing feature of the whole report is the failure on the part of the Commission to attempt to assess the

value of the tariff disabilities, the main burden of our case. By an extraordinary process of reasoning they say they cannot measure this burden, but that whatever it may be, it is offset by the benefit we get from the exchange, which they are also unable to measure. In other words a varying factor is exactly cancelled out by an unknown quantity. This astounding sample of mathematical logic was perpetrated by what was supposed to be a scientific and careful inquiry into our disabilities. Even though the Commission could not measure the tariff disabilities they had something to go on, as the burden of disabilities had already been assessed by the committee which reported in 1929. Accepting the Commission's own basis, but correcting its miscalculations, the grant should be—

	£
Commission's figure for fair deficit basis .. ..	870,000
Interest on Agricultural Bank and group settlement ..	307,000
Extra allowance for social services .. ..	98,000
	<hr/>
	£1,275,000
Less amount under taxed 1933-34 .. ..	174,000
	<hr/>
	1,101,000
	<hr/>
Plus 10 per cent. for error, a total of roughly .. ..	£1,200,000

Even allowing the full deduction of £400,000 for taxation by taking the figure for 1932-33, the grant should still be £962,500. I have written a letter to the Prime Minister pointing out the facts I have explained, and asking that the matter be given consideration. I regret, owing to its importance to the State, having had to hurry through this matter. I have been obliged to do so because I am not able to be here after the tea adjournment. I should like to have referred to other points, but will have to defer that to another time. I appreciate very much the patience with which the House has listened to me, and the goodwill displayed towards me over what has been, I am afraid, a long and rather wearisome speech.

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

**MR. DONEY** (Williams-Narrogin) [7.32]: The Premier in his speech to-day cited certain employment statistics which would assist him in proving his claim that within the past 12 months the State has made some little economic advancement. One or two of his

explanations, however, the hon. gentleman did not carry quite far enough. He said, for instance, that in August, 1933, the number of men on sustenance and relief work was 14,053, and that a year later, in this current month, that total had shrunk to 10,890, representing a balance of improvement of 3,163. In part, the question becomes one of just exactly how that figure 3,163 is made up. I am given to understand that it includes a considerable number of single men who last year were in receipt of relief but who have since been taken off relief. I do not assert that that is so, but merely ask for information on the point. Nevertheless I do say that if the position is as I have been informed, then the net improvement is very little indeed, because those men are still a charge on the community, having become a direct charge on the more sympathetic householders of the State.

Mr. Raphael: Surely you do not mean that?

Mr. DONEY: In any case, the improvement shown is only just about proportionate to the general improvement shown in that regard throughout Australia. I am indeed glad to admit, for that matter, that the Minister in charge of unemployment has been putting up strenuous endeavours to improve the situation. As regards the Speech of the Lieut.-Governor I find myself on common ground with the Premier. Despite the fact that the Speech is his own compilation, the Premier was not particularly flattering with regard to it. In my opinion the Speech can only be regarded as a pretty useless sort of document. It is a mere summary of the year's happenings in the various fields of State activity, and is consequently little other than a recital of facts already known to most members. Unfortunately the Speech said little about the future, and that little was not very encouraging; in fact, it was definitely discouraging to a person with a rural outlook. The Speech indicated that during the current session this House would be called upon to give consideration to Bills dealing with metropolitan public utilities, amendment of the Administration Act, renewal of financial emergency legislation, State lotteries, the Agricultural Bank, and amendment of the Constitution Act. That is a dull programme. There is not a single suggestion tending to increase the income of the State, not a word about farm rehabilitation or bulk handling. Therefore, in view of the omissions from the Speech, to

members on this side of the Chamber it is a disappointing document. Possibly we can squeeze some hope out of the item "Agricultural Bank."

Mr. Sampson: If you can, you are the only one.

Mr. DONEY: If the hon. member will wait just a couple of minutes, I shall indicate the direction in which I hope to obtain something of use. It may be that revaluation of the farmer's assets and the reconditioning of his debts will be two results accruing from our consideration of the report of the Royal Commission on the Agricultural Bank. Anyhow, I fervently hope so. I wish to deal with the report now. It will have been noticed that speakers who have referred to it already, have done so very briefly indeed. They side-tracked it, presumably because the House is to have, a little later, an opportunity of debating the subject. I am afraid I cannot be quite so patient. I wish to see ventilated without delay the charges which the report brings against certain individuals. The House understands perfectly well that if a report of this nature is held immune from criticism for any length of time, its assertions, whether true or not, tend to be regarded as facts. In the interests of justice I want, if possible, to break down that tendency. The report as made known through the Press is an amazing document, but nevertheless it contains much that is undeniably valuable. On the other hand, there is in it a great deal that is of doubtful worth owing to the fact that its authenticity has not been vouched for by independent inquiry before being given to the world. The report is outspoken. No one minds outspokenness, provided always that it is justified by truth and decency. I accept the bona fides of the members of the Commission to the extent that I regard Mr. Hale, the chairman, as a highly reputable lawyer whose fitness for the work of the Commission was no doubt enhanced by his having been a member of the Farmers' Debts Royal Commission which sat in 1929, and that Mr. Donovan is one of our best and best-known farmers and entitled to the esteem of the public, while Mr. Diamond has been prominent as a banker. The more I probe the report which these gentlemen have put up, the higher is my regard for some of their comments and recommendations; but still the more do I deplore the fact that good, honourable men should have been publicly pilloried, as some



were, without having been given a reasonable opportunity of speaking in their own defence. That, to me, seems unforgivable. It certainly offends against one's sense of British justice. Quite plainly, judgment should never be delivered upon anyone unless there has been an equitable consideration of both sides or all sides of the matter. One thing we have to remember is that probably the Commissioners are not to be blamed for the premature publication to which I am referring. On whom the blame should be put, I am not prepared to say. We have also to bear in mind that in fairness to the public, and in fairness to those who have been charged, the weight of those charges should not be left in the present state of uncertainty. In particular, Messrs. Fauckner and Roberts have been placed, by the premature publication of the report, in a most unenviable position. It is indicated in that document that those two gentlemen, while in the employ of the Agricultural Bank, dishonestly dealt in certain properties belonging to the Institution. If that fact is established, then the punishment suggested by the Royal Commission is certainly merited; but I have been given to understand that Mr. Fauckner—I may say here that I know nothing of Mr. Roberts—was involved, certainly, in a deal concerning a property mortgaged to the bank, which was acquired and later disposed of, but that Mr. Fauckner was not at that time in the employment of the bank at all, and thus was not in any way amenable to the provisions of the Agricultural Bank Act; from which it would follow that he was legally entitled, at the time, to do what he did. It may be that my information regarding the matter is not correct; but if it is correct, as I am assured it is, exactly what amends can be made to Mr. Fauckner? I do not think we can make any amends that would be of any value whatever. Information broadcast through the world in this manner can seldom, if ever, be overtaken. And so we may find a man like Mr. Fauckner—whose integrity, I believe, has never previously been impugned—with his character unjustly blasted for all time. I believe the Minister in charge of the department employing Mr. Fauckner can be depended upon to give that gentleman a square deal. I have already indicated my regret that such a valuable document as this report should have had its usefulness impaired by pre-

mature publication, or let me say a lack of discrimination in its publication.

Mr. Warner: Have you seen the report yet?

Mr. DONEY: I have seen the summary which appeared in the Press, and I give to the Press credit for having sufficient sense to preserve the actual meaning of the document and render a just account of it.

Mr. Raphael: The salient points, so to speak.

Mr. DONEY: Yes. The hon. member has assisted me a great deal for the first time. Undoubtedly the report will be used to cripple our credit both abroad and in the Eastern States. It is always well that we ourselves should know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about our public men and our public activities, including all our public departments.

Mr. Raphael: It does not do as regards our public men. We have tried that, and been defeated at law.

Mr. DONEY: I strongly doubt the wisdom, however, of broadcasting our woes and our weaknesses to a world of enemies and creditors, and remaining absolutely silent about the strength and worth of our securities and our resources. That is, to my mind, rank stupidity. In order that we may properly appreciate the disproportionate growth of the liabilities of the Agricultural Bank, it might not be unwise if we indulged in a brief survey of British colonisation. It will be found that the chapter dealing with Western Australia was the last to be written. It was not so many years ago that this State first discovered that it was peculiarly fitted for primary production, as previously it had also been determined in the Eastern States. The point is that we started our development later than the Eastern States, and so we find that our pioneering effort per unit cost a great deal more than it did in the older parts of Australia. There the bulk of the developmental work was effected by 1910, during which period low prices obtained. We had only just commenced our development in earnest when we found ourselves involved in that whirl of rising prices that were the forerunner of the present depression. The State had commenced upon a big undertaking; there could be no turning back and we probably aimed at completing quickly the bulk of our developmental work lest still further rising prices involved us in increasingly higher costs. That waste

led to ghastly errors: there is no doubt about that. The State did not give itself time to think, and caution then was a lost art. Those incursions that various Governments made into the extreme east and south-east of the wheat belt were blunders that were obvious to us all at the time. Then, too, the practice of advancing practically 100 per cent. on improvements was recognised at the time as being unsafe. It will, too, be agreed that successive Ministers seemed to think that they would not justify themselves unless they opened up large new districts for the production of wheat. Of course, the inevitable happened. Shump followed boom, as is customary, and it surprised no one when, with the advent of the depression, we found ourselves swamped by our debts. The point I am arriving at is: Who was it financed these projects? Of course, it was the Government of the day, through the Agricultural Bank. When the millions of pounds were handed over from time to time to the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, the House will agree with me that the transfers must have been accompanied by instructions and conditions. So we certainly cannot blame the Agricultural Bank for the subsequent results. The function of the trustees of the bank, as I see it, was to assure that the money, probably expended against the better judgment of the trustees of the bank, was spent in accordance with the provisions of the Agricultural Bank Act. Therefore, primarily, we cannot blame the trustees for the huge sums of money that were lost in the far eastern and south-eastern portions of the Wheat Belt. We must blame Parliament and successive Ministers; we must blame Perth businessmen, the men on the land and the man in the street. After all, the trustees of the bank were merely carrying out the policy of the Government in office for the time being, and, further, were carrying out the policy of the people. They gave effect to the spirit of the times. There was money to burn. In those days we were not so economically-minded as we have been forced to become in these stressful times. The members of the Royal Commission hold that the trustees were not responsible to any Minister or to any department, and claim they could have resisted instructions of the Minister for the time being, who, they assert, was not in control of the bank. I may be wrong but I think at one time, I do not know exactly when, a ruling of the Crown Law

Department was obtained on the question, and it was held to be incumbent upon the trustees to follow the policy of the Government to the extent that that policy did not conflict with that of the Agricultural Bank Act. That implied that the managing trustee was subservient to his Minister. In my opinion, the trustees are not independent trustees at all. They have untrammelled discretion respecting their dealings with individual clients, but, in regard to matters of major policy, such as the extension of the bank's activities to new areas, they have to follow the dictates of the Minister in control for the time being. In the circumstances, there could be implied no malfeasance on the part of the trustees, should securities prove to be unsound. Can it be said that the members of the Commission were as keen to search out the virtues of the Agricultural Bank as they were to ferret out its blemishes. I think it is highly questionable whether they went to any trouble at all to reveal the better aspects of the bank's work. I do not know whether other members noticed the fact but throughout the Commission's report there seemed hardly a decent word about the trustees or their achievements over the many years the bank has been operating in this State. I may be wrong, too, in my views in another respect but, recalling the nature of the cross-examination to which the trustees were subjected, I feel that Mr. Hale, following natural impulses of the lawyer, endeavoured not so much to ascertain the facts, good, bad, or indifferent about the bank, as he was intent upon building up a case against the bank. It may be it was just Mr. Hale's way, but that is how it struck me. He impressed me not so much as a judge, as he should have been, as he quite definitely did as a prosecuting counsel. Hon. members will oblige me if they carry their minds back to pre-depression days. It will be recalled that the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, in carrying out the great work of development, were applauded by every public or businessman, and Mr. McLarty was held up by everyone as a veritable Hercules, who was carrying on his broad and willing shoulders, jobs sufficient to send an ordinary man into his grave with the worry of it all. Then it seems as though over night, this big, strong man of the Public Service has become a poor, plastic individual, who, in the

hands of the members of the Royal Commission, was made to appear a poor, stupid dud who seemed to know not the tiniest thing about his work. I regard that as one of the most regrettable features of the Commission's report. That is what they ask the public to believe, and I do not believe it, particularly when I recall the expressions of public appreciation of Mr. McLarty during his term of managing trustee of the Bank. Now that the depression is with us and a scape-goat must be found, this good man has been dragged to the stake. I hope members of this House will show no tendency to assist at the burning. There have, of course, been many tragic mistakes. Members know that, and the trustees quite readily admit it. I claim that no three men, I care not by whom chosen, would not have made similar mistakes, in view of the circumstances. It seems to be the intention of the members of the Royal Commission, if their recommendations be adopted, to discharge the present three trustees from the service and to replace them with three other trustees. Personally, I cannot see that that would effect any improvement upon the present situation. Even a board of three bankers, which is apparently what the Royal Commission desires, would not, I believe, achieve results a great deal better than those obtained under the present management except, of course, that they could be relied upon not to repeat the manifest errors of the past. The point is that the farmers do not want a board of bankers at all, for such a board would not suit them. What they want is a board composed of men with practical knowledge of farming, so that the peculiar worries and needs of the man on the land may be sympathetically understood. Thus it was that, right from the start, the trustees of the Agricultural Bank have been men possessing a practical knowledge of farming, mostly themselves farmers. What is more, the Agricultural Bank, despite its name, is really not a bank at all. It is generally understood that the prime and quite proper function of a proprietary bank is, by means of sound banking practice, to make profits. I do not think that the Agricultural Bank preforms many functions of a bank at all. On the contrary, the first consideration of the Agricultural Bank is not to show a profit, but to assist

settlers, who cannot fully finance themselves, to make good on cultivable land. Apart from all that, the history of land colonisation in every part of the world has been precisely the same; always a record of blunders, whether in the Eastern States or the United States or Canada, Rhodesia or New Zealand. The point is that blunders have ever been inseparable from progress. It is being urged just now that the trustees have been far too lenient and sympathetic. Yet in the past, the trustees have been applauded for that self-same sympathy. Despite the Commission's report, I still think that sympathy of a proper kind is one of the essential qualifications in a trustee of the Agricultural Bank. I have said that I regard the report as a valuable document. Yet in my mind it would have been still more valuable had there been no attempt on the part of the Commissioners to blame the trustees for faults which, properly, lie elsewhere. No doubt the trustees have been forced to act according to the instructions of their Ministers. They certainly could not have done otherwise, and therefore, I do not think they should be left to face the storm alone. In the work of re-casting the functions of the Agricultural Bank, a work that is manifestly becoming due, having regard to the changed conditions and needs of the rural areas, this report should be invaluable. I think also that if it is possible to take this report and make it the starting point for the great work of re-conditioning the farmers' debts, and re-valuing their securities, it will be shown that the report is, as I say, of extreme value, and the Commissioners in those circumstances might well be regarded as the benefactors of Western Australia. I had bulk handling and other matters to refer to, but I shall have to pend them until some more suitable opportunity, for as it happens I have an appointment which is interfering with the pursuance of my remarks.

**MR. SAMPSON** (Swan) [8.5]: I do not propose adversely to criticise the Transport Board, for in my opinion the board is an excellent one. I acknowledge, however, that we have given the board a very heavy task, one indeed which no body of persons, however earnest they might be, could discharge to the satisfaction of all concerned. Not only is it impossible for the board to carry out its duty to the satisfaction of those using the roads, but it is impossible also for it to

give satisfaction to those who view the matter impersonally and in an independent way. The Minister for Railways unfortunately discloses such a lack of sympathy with those operating the motor trucks that the work of the board is necessarily the more difficult. I want to ask, will the co-operation provided in the Act assist the railways to any material extent, and will it convert the heavy loss which the railways are now creating into a profit, however small? Again, will the sacrifice which the road operators are being called upon to make, ultimately help the railways to any material extent?

The Minister for Railways: The railways have never attempted to pay their way. Their job is to develop the country.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know that, but at the same time it would be a shocking thing if, since the Transport Co-ordination Act has been passed, a real effort were not put up to make the railways pay their way.

The Minister for Railways: They could easily pay their way if they liked to charge people a reasonable rate.

Mr. SAMPSON: I suggest that a review of the time-tables would be helpful. There are many trains running which should not run. I daresay this matter is receiving the consideration of the Transport Board and that it is carefully scrutinising the time-tables to ascertain whether some of these trains which run in the metropolitan area should not be struck off the time-table.

The Minister for Railways: And then you would lead a deputation asking for their reinstatement for the convenience of the public.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister did not allow me to finish. I say there are many trains running practically empty, and I hope the Transport Board has the necessary power closely to scrutinise the matter and, if necessary, see that those trains cease running and that some arrangement be made for motor buses to take their place. There is no doubt the running of empty trains between Perth and Fremantle and out in the suburban areas does not make for the development of the country, but makes for the bankruptcy of the railways and causes the Treasurer no end of difficulty. So I suggest to the Minister that the Transport Co-ordination Act be not used as a means whereby the staff of the Railway Department shall be unduly increased. No doubt additional officers and men will be required, but

the list should not be added to without full justification.

Mr. Hegney: Do you suggest that the men should work longer hours?

Mr. SAMPSON: Whose is this voice from the wilderness, with such a ridiculous question? Do I suggest they work longer hours? Nothing of the sort. But do we want the Minister to be taken to the Arbitration Court and charged with a breach of the award? With all the faults of the Minister I do not desire that. I said the Minister has acted with lack of consideration and sympathy in regard to the Act. When the Bill was before the House last session and the question of the license fees to be charged was being discussed, the Minister said the license fee should be on the basis of 10 per cent. of the gross proceeds. I had the temerity to suggest that in place of its being the gross proceeds, it should be the net proceeds. On that occasion the Minister was distinctly rude, and his reply was most uncalled for.

The Minister for Railways: I had forgotten all that.

Mr. SAMPSON: The Minister should not have forgotten it. It has been suggested that the trains are run for the development of the country. I admit that, but I say some of the trains should be cut out, not only suburban trains, but trains in other districts, and I hope the Transport Board will do its utmost to put this matter on the fairest basis. In 1924, on my return from Queensland, taking my political life in my hands I came to the House and advocated the creation of committee-of-direction methods of marketing. The then Minister for Agriculture, now the Minister for Lands, brought down a Bill, the effect of which was to give controlled marketing. However, the Bill came to grief in another place.

The Minister for Lands: At the hands of the people who now want it.

Mr. SAMPSON: To-day the world has advanced to such an extent that there is little need to advocate controlled marketing. There has been an advance all along the line, and even in the House of Commons, control has been inaugurated. So it is in New Zealand, New South Wales, and various countries of the world. But the position is not as the opponents of controlled marketing would have others believe. Controlled marketing really means marketing controlled by the producers or growers.

The Minister for Lands: Is not the consumer to have a say?

Mr. SAMPSON: Yes. The Minister gave the consumer some consideration in his Bill, and of course the consumer must have some consideration. I was with the Minister right through the different stages of that Bill, and if a Bill giving the producer control were to be brought down, I would be with it again. The opinions of those concerned have developed in the last few years. They are beginning to realise that the man who produces commodities should have a say in the marketing of them, and I hope the day when that will come about will not be long delayed. It is impossible to defer the time indefinitely. What I am now about to say is a sad commentary on Western Australia. Not long ago, a meeting of a fruit organisation was held in Melbourne, and practically the only representatives who opposed a measure of control were those who attended from this State. The opinions of those who speak against control must be respected, but I hope that before long they, in common with growers in most parts of the world, certainly of the new world, will give their support to it. A few weeks ago in Sydney I attended a conference called by the Fruitgrowers' Federation of New South Wales, at which a resolution was passed that indicates the growth of public opinion and grower opinion on marketing. The motion read—

That conference represent to the State Parliament the necessity for having the present Marketing Act amended to permit of the construction of marketing boards for specific purposes, such boards to be subject to the control of the growers concerned.

(Growers in every country are more or less individualistic in their outlook. They are not extremists. They do not take to a new line of thought quickly. They think it out carefully. The conference in New South Wales that carried the motion represented growers from all parts of the State. This is symptomatic of what is occurring throughout the English-speaking world.)

Mr. J. H. Smith: They have a different line of thought from that held by the Fruitgrowers' Association of Western Australia.

Mr. SAMPSON: There is a division of opinion; growers here have decided that they do not desire control. I wish to make it clear that I am not advocating the type of control that some people urge. What I wish to see inaugurated is grower control. Give the grower the right to control the marketing of his own products. The last thing

I would do would be to interfere with those most concerned. Still, I am to some extent personally concerned in fruit growing and wheat growing, but whether I were or not, I would claim and exercise the right to say what, in my opinion, should be done. As I have already mentioned, in 1924 I introduced the subject to this House. It was then quite new to Western Australia. I was the apostle of controlled marketing. Some day I hope to see it recognised and in full operation. A few weeks ago a largely attended meeting of poultry farmers was held in the Sydney Town Hall, and, according to a newspaper report, a majority of about nine to one favoured the re-establishment of a board of control. Any remark on the Address-in-reply would be incomplete unless reference were made to sustenance workers. I stand with my leader in uttering detestation of compulsory unionism. Any one who would compel those men who through stress of circumstances are compelled to accept sustenance, part-time or relief work, to pay to belong to a union before being permitted to provide food and clothing for their wives and families, is utterly unworthy and guilty of improper behaviour.

Miss Holman: Not half as bad as your Government charging them all emergency tax.

Mr. SAMPSON: I was not in favour of that, but I think if the hon. member looks into the question, she will find that the then Government took the very sensible view now taken by her.

Miss Holman: You charged them the tax.

Mr. SAMPSON: The tax was charged when they received over £2 a week.

Miss Holman: The tax was charged to single men receiving over £1 a week.

Mr. SAMPSON: I would not stand for anything that was wrong. Last session I asked the Minister for Employment a question regarding the payment of union fees. I am sorry the Minister for Health is not present, because the other night he endeavoured to refute a statement by the Leader of the Opposition that the present Government had made it obligatory for sustenance workers to belong to a union. I asked the Minister for Employment last session whether he was aware that a notice had been posted at different places where relief work was being carried out stating that union fees could be paid by instalments. The Minister, without equivocation, replied that that was so.

Mr. Wansbrough: There was nothing wrong in permitting payment by instalments, surely!

Mr. SAMPSON: It is difficult to express in ordinary language one's opinion of any step compelling men on relief work to pay into union funds. There are very few men indeed who would be a party to it. If I remember aright, the amount taken was half-a-crown each fortnight. A comparatively small matter, but one that ought to be ventilated, concerns the loads carried by motor trucks, particularly in the hills districts. Such loads should be limited to the weight for which the trucks were designed by the manufacturers. Additional weight is sometimes approved if oversized tyres and additional springs are fitted, and alterations made to the bodies. The added weight imposes an undue strain on the brakes, and this constitutes a real danger to other users of the road in the event of a breakdown. I am told that on two occasions trucks carrying loads in excess of those for which they were built got out of control of the drivers on the Welshpool hill. That road is part of a licensed motor bus route, and it does not require much imagination to realise the great danger that over-laden trucks constitute to other road traffic. There should be no broadmindedness in allowing trucks to carry loads in excess of those for which they were built. It is not the fault of the road board that this occurs because the trucks are not always licensed in the district. I do not wish to prefer a complaint against any officer, but I suggest that there should be stricter supervision, and there should be some policing of the Traffic Act to ensure that excess loads are not carried. By this I mean that the excess should not be serious. I do not believe in being pernickety or unfair. It is perhaps difficult to tell within one or two hundredweight, but when a truck is loaded to the extent of one or two tons in excess of what it is designed to carry, it is time action was taken. Speaking of the Welshpool road reminds me that that thoroughfare from a point on the Albany road, through Welshpool, up Welshpool and Lesmurdie hill, through to Kalamunda, over the railway line, over Piesse's Brook and past Mundaring Weir to Mundaring on the York road, has been approved as a developmental road. So far the constructed portion has reached Piesse's Brook. About six miles remain to be completed, and it would be in the interests of the State if

that work were completed. It would relieve traffic on the York road, open up a good deal of cultivable land, and make available a round trip. I know that the Minister for Works is keen on constructing roads, and this road would not run alongside a railway. In that respect it is a correct route for a road. If one wished to be satirical, one might say that if there had been a railway line through that part, the road would have been built years ago.

The Minister for Railways: The railways enable the country to be settled first of all, and then the roads are built.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is impossible for settlement to proceed in that part unless the road is provided. I have driven through that part many times, but only in dry weather is it possible to get through. The seepage is very severe, and it would be utterly impossible to get through at all seasons of the year. If the road were built, it would be much appreciated. Let me now refer to the trouble with the school teachers. Though it may be greatly daring on my part, I venture the opinion that there must be two sides to the question. I am aware that the feeling of the public generally is against the teachers. My experience of school teachers induces me to believe that they are most helpful in all matters, and that they frequently give up a great deal of their private time in helping the children. I have been associated with musical and elocutionary tests, functions connected with the establishment of small school orchards and different project clubs, and other things of the kind which have been carried out by the teachers who have afforded the utmost encouragement to their small charges. I will not embarrass the Minister by making statements, because I do not know enough about the subject. My knowledge of the teachers, both male and female, is such as to justify me in saying that they are concerned with the welfare of the children, and have done much work for them outside their ordinary hours. Anyone who has been to the Royal Show and noticed the work of the teachers, particularly those of the South-West, wherein they have encouraged the children, will agree that the sooner this debacle is brought to an end the better it will be for all concerned.

The Minister for Lands: The sooner this childishness is brought to an end the better.

Mr. SAMPSON: I will not make any comment on the matter. I think we had better not refer to either side. I do not want to say anything that may prevent the matter from being put into order.

The Minister for Lands: It is an exhibition of petulance or childishness.

Mr. SAMPSON: The children are suffering because of it. I hope that sweet reason will prevail, and that on both sides a disposition will be shown to meet the position half-way, and close what has been a very regrettable episode.

The Minister for Justice: If we could wipe out from the statute book the financial emergency deductions the teachers would be well satisfied. Unfortunately, this cannot be done. They will not realise facts.

Mr. SAMPSON: I understand there are certain anomalies.

The Minister for Justice: It is all very well to talk about anomalies.

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not want to say anything that is incorrect. The teachers no doubt have some right on their side. So far as I have been able to judge from their actions I am prompted to say—

The Minister for Justice: You cannot discover in the public Press or anywhere else that they have right on their side.

Mr. SAMPSON: I know it is said that the teachers are overpaid, and that compared with the farmers they are doing very well. The teacher is limited to a certain income, and neither male nor female teacher can go beyond it. In the case of the farmer, however, a brighter day may be coming.

The Minister for Justice: They have had some dark days, but they are brighter now. Their conditions will improve when the financial position improves.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope some rapprochement may come about between those concerned, so that the school children may derive that help which was previously accorded to them outside school hours, help which the teachers themselves most generously co-operated to give.

The Minister for Justice: In the past.

Mr. SAMPSON: At the moment I am awaiting a reply with regard to the holding of a field competition for the children. I know what is happening. There is an attitude of masterly inactivity.

The Minister for Justice: And there will continue to be so long as that attitude con-

tinues. Nothing will be done until the teachers alter their attitude.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope that whatever the Minister can do, in honour to himself—

The Minister for Justice: We cannot be forced into doing anything that is unjust by the childishness of such people.

Mr. SAMPSON:—will be done to end this unfortunate trouble.

The Minister for Justice: The Minister will not be bounced into doing things that are not in the interests of the State.

The Minister for Lands: I think the children will pull through.

Mr. SAMPSON: But not as well as they did when the old system was in operation.

The Minister for Lands: I think so.

Mr. SAMPSON: I am pleased the Minister for Railways anticipates being able to spend £560,000 in extensions of the electricity supply. According to the Speech, the electricity supply last year showed an improvement of approximately £16,000, over the previous year, when the profit was £17,000. I hope the Minister will be able to do what I know he is anxious to do, namely, extend the supply into the suburban and outer suburban areas. This would lead to a vast improvement in the financial position of growers who at present in certain localities cannot make a living. I trust it will not be long before the necessary extensions are made. I now wish to deal with bulk handling.

The Minister for Justice: Are there any wheat farmers in your district?

Mr. SAMPSON: No, but I grow wheat myself. The installation of the new system, with the financial help provided by the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company, over a considerable portion of the eastern Wheat Belt, has already been brought about. I understand the installation has proved satisfactory. The company is now asking for further sites. I believe that is the extent of their request to the Government. One realises the great difficulties which confront the farmers. The cost of production must be kept as low as possible so that the national wealth may be increased to the greatest possible extent. I hope even at this late stage the Government will forgo the suggested Royal Commission and get on with the job.

Mr. Wansbrough: Who will provide the rolling stock?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Government, whilst the company will do all that is necessary in the erection of silos and other equipment. It is economical to handle wheat in bulk. It is no use saying that the scheme is in the experimental stage. In 1928, in company with the Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. O'Keefe, a journalist of Subiaco, I went through a flour mill in London Wall. We were informed that everything had been done to enable the wheat to be handled in bulk. We must move with the times so that we may compete with other countries. If our wheat is sent abroad in bags there will not be the same demand for it, and if it is emptied out of the bags at the port of shipment, a considerable sum will be added to the cost of handling. There is a growing belief that the Government will not have anything to do with bulk handling, and that whilst they remain in office there will be no chance of extending the principle. I hope there is no justification for that rumour.

The Minister for Lands: When your party was in power the Government could not agree upon it either.

Mr. SAMPSON: The then Minister for Works spent hours putting up a case for bulk handling, and I recall some objections being raised by the then Opposition.

The Minister for Lands: Don't you remember the then Minister for Works reporting against his own proposal?

Mr. SAMPSON: No. I am not going to dispute that statement, but no doubt, if Mr. Lindsay were here, he would clarify the position in such a way as to make it clear without offence to the Minister.

The Minister for Lands: He did not agree with the proposition, and was opposed to it personally.

Mr. SAMPSON: Opposed to bulk handling?

The Minister for Justice: To the scheme, not to the principle. Perhaps this Government are opposed to the scheme and not to the principle.

Mr. SAMPSON: The member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) said he had saved £100 last year through bulk handling. We are continually reading in the Press that the farmers had made savings by means of the scheme. Would not the Minister for Lands himself make a saving if he could handle his wheat in bulk?

The Minister for Lands: I would not save a shilling.

Mr. SAMPSON: It is becoming out of date to market wheat in bags. We must do what other countries are doing. That is only fair to our farmers.

The Minister for Lands: When some of them got it they found they had something that was of no use to them.

Mr. SAMPSON: There has been widespread gratification over the fair and proper attitude of the Premier in respect to the vote taken by the people on Secession. I hope the Premier will maintain that attitude right through. He will then have the satisfaction of knowing that he has given effect to the will and the vote of the people. We have yet to learn how the Case for Secession is to be presented to the Imperial Parliament.

The Minister for Justice: We have been authorised to appoint a delegation.

Mr. SAMPSON: According to the legislation that was passed, the Premier is to appoint the delegation. I hope it will comprise a representative of the Government, the leaders of the two Opposition parties, the Solicitor General (Mr. Walker) who did so much in preparing the Case, and Mr. H. K. Watson, Chairman of the Dominion League.

Mr. Wansbrough: You are adding one.

Mr. SAMPSON: No: I am mentioning three: a representative of the Government, the Leader of the Country Party, and the Leader of the National Party; and I am suggesting that those three gentlemen should have the assistance which Mr. Walker and Mr. Watson would be able to give.

Mr. Wansbrough: What about the Agent General?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Agent General is there, and no doubt he would help materially.

The Minister for Justice: What about the leader of the independent party?

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope the Minister will not treat the matter with levity.

The Minister for Justice: Oh no!

Mr. SAMPSON: I do not regard it with levity. The Act provides for three delegates only: otherwise I would say, "Yes, let us send the member for Mt. Marshall." But I cannot go further than the Act goes. We have been struck with amazement at the futility or the stupidity of the Federal Government in proposing to send copies of the Case for Union to the people throughout



Western Australia. I do not know whether all members have yet received copies of the Case. I have received one. The general public, however, have not yet been furnished with copies. To me the distribution contemplated by the Federal Government appears a perfectly unjustifiable waste of money. We have all had an opportunity of reading the Case for Union when it was published as a supplement to the "West Australian." I anticipate that hundreds of people in this State will refuse acceptance of the copies of the Case for Union, or, alternatively, that the copies will be burnt in the streets.

On motion by Miss Holman, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.48 p.m.*

## PAPERS—COOLGARDIE MINERS' UNION, ANNUAL CONSULTATION.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon, ordered: That the file relating to the application of the Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union to hold their annual consultation be laid upon the Table of the House.

## MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT.

*To Disallow Regulation.*

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from 14th August, on the following motion by Hon. A. Thomson—

That Regulation No. 48, made under the State Transport Co-Ordination Act, 1933, as published in the "Government Gazette" on 16th March, 1934, and laid on the Table of the House on 7th August, 1934, be and is hereby disallowed.

**HON. J. J. HOLMES** (North) [4.37]:  
I move—

That the consideration of this Order of the Day be postponed for a week.

I understand that this matter is being looked into and it is hoped that within the week a solution of the difficulty will have been arrived at.

Motion put and passed.

## Legislative Council,

*Tuesday, 21st August, 1934.*

	PAGE
Leave of absence	169
Papers: Coolgardie Miners' Union, annual consultation	169
Motion: State Transport Co-ordination Act, to disallow regulation	169
Address-in-Reply, sixth day	169

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

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. A. Thomson, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Hon. H. V. Piesse (South-East) on the ground of ill-health.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Hon. L. B. Bolton (Metropolitan) on the ground of urgent private business.

[9]

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Sixth Day.*

Debate resumed from the 15th August.

**HON. E. H. H. HALL** (Central) [4.38]: While not the possessor of a very good memory, I would have to acknowledge a poor one indeed if my mind on this occasion did not revert to a sitting about six years ago when I rose to participate in the Address-in-reply debate. Animated by a desire conscientiously to carry out my duty to the people who had had sufficient confidence in me to send me to this august Chamber, I am afraid I lent point to a well-worn old saying, "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread." I rose in my place and spoke with no desire to hurt any member's feelings, but merely anxious to say what I thought should be said: the result was that I did hurt someone's feelings. I would like to state very plainly on this occasion that I realise many old members of this House