

Legislative Assembly

Wednesday, 10th August, 1955.

CONTENTS.

Questions :	Page
Housing, (a) outstanding applications and percentage for country	63
(b) financing of expenditure	63
(c) programme for Mullewa, Morawa and Perenjori	63
(d) supply of pre-cut homes	64
(e) Brentwood homes, cost	64
(f) total homes built	64
(g) charge to workers' homes applicants, Brentwood	64
(h) Housing Commission and trust funds expenditure	65
Beach erosion, report of inquiry	65
Swan River, (a) encroachment on private property	65
(b) reclamation and cost	65
(c) boat accidents at Narrows	65
Recreation ground, area adjoining Graylands school	65
Education, (a) Graylands Teachers' College, improvements	65
(b) schoolchildren, insurance scheme	65
(c) proposed school, Greenmount	66
Land agents, (a) personnel of supervisory committee	66
(b) position regarding Mr. Hansen	66
Traffic, lights for Stirling-Highway, William-st., etc.	66
Moola Bulla cattle station, overlanding of stock	67
Forests, dieback in jarrah trees	67
Fauna, protected areas, Drakesbrook, Harvey and Dardanup	67
Railways, suburban traffic	67
Wheat, storage accommodation	68
Land resumptions, return of blocks acquired for chord line	68
Narrows bridge, authority for reclamation, siting, etc.	68
Tram tracks, removal from Oxford-st.	68
Carnarvon goods sheds, removal to Babbage Island	68
Dairying industry, (a) Federal subsidy on butter	69
(b) Government charges for bulldozing	69
(c) butter production and sale	69
(d) 1953 economic survey and Government attitude	69
Natural fuels, life of Australia's stocks	70
Leave of absence	70
Address-in-reply, second day, amendment	70
Point of order	89
Amendment on amendment	102
Speaker on Address—	
Hon. Sir Ross McLarty	70
Speaker on amendment—	
The Premier	84
Speakers on amendment on amendment—	
Hon. Sir Ross McLarty	87
Hon. A. V. R. Abbott	89
Hon. A. F. Watts	92
The Minister for Education	94
Hon. D. Brand	97
Hon. L. Thorn	99
Mr. Oldfield	100
Committees for the session, Council's message	102
Bill : Supply (No. 1), £17,000,000, returned	102

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

QUESTIONS.

HOUSING.

(a) Outstanding Applications and Percentage for Country.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many applications for houses still remain to be met by the State Housing Commission?

(2) What number of country towns are still requiring houses?

(3) What percentage of the total houses being built by the State Housing Commission is being erected in the country?

The MINISTER replied:

(1)—

Commonwealth-State rental	7,847
State Housing Act	2,899
War Service Homes Act	1,804
McNess Housing Trust Act	212
	<hr/> 12,762

A recent survey indicated that a large percentage of the older applications registered with the commission are from persons whose housing problems have been solved and a large percentage of applications duplicated under all schemes.

It is estimated that after allowing for these multi applications and those of persons who have solved their own housing problems, there are approximately 9,000 applicants.

Experience over the years has indicated a wastage of approximately 50 per cent. of all applications, therefore the number of families requiring other accommodation is estimated at between 4,000 and 5,000.

(2) Applications for homes are registered with the commission from persons resident in 128 towns.

(3) 35 per cent. (excluding war service homes) to the 31st July, 1955.

(b) Financing of Expenditure.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Treasurer:

(1) Was any, and if so, how much of the housing expenditure incurred in the financial year 1954-55, financed from other than loan funds, as stated in "The West Australian" of the 24th June, 1955?

(2) From what sources, other than loan funds, was any money so drawn and to what extent in each case, if from more than one source?

The TREASURER replied:

(1) Yes, £1,740,000.

(2) From trust funds.

(c) Programme for Mullewa, Morawa and Perenjori.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What number of applications for houses exist to date from—

- (a) Mullewa;
- (b) Morawa
- (c) Perenjori?

(2) What programme of building houses is planned this year for these towns?

(3) How many native homes are included?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) (a) Mullewa	17
(b) Morawa	8
(c) Perenjori	2
(2) (a) Mullewa	3
(b) Morawa	2
(c) Perenjori	—
(3) (a) Mullewa	1
(b) Morawa	—
(c) Perenjori	—

(d) Supply of Pre-cut Homes

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What company, or companies, are now supplying the State Housing Commission with pre-cut houses?

(2) How many houses have they each contracted to supply during the financial year commencing the 1st July, 1955, and at what cost?

The MINISTER replied:

- (1) (a) State Saw Mills.
- (b) Bunnings Bros. Pty. Ltd.
- (c) Melville Joinery & Trading Co. Pty. Ltd.
- (d) Douglas Jones Pty. Ltd.

(2) Contracts have been signed with the following suppliers for the delivery during the six months ending the 31st December, 1955, of materials for the number of houses shown:—

(a) State Saw Mills	170
(b) Bunnings Bros. Pty Ltd.	150
(c) Melville Joinery & Trading Co. Pty. Ltd.	105
(d) Douglas Jones Pty Ltd.	100

All firms are supplying materials for the same price for each basic type of dwelling as follows:—

£	
Type 20A	1379.
77A	1464.
78A	1489.
33A	1498.
72A	1530.

(e) Brentwood Homes, Cost.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

What is the completed cost of each type of house being built at Brentwood?

The MINISTER replied:

Type	Price including fencing.
306A	£2,060
20A	£2,370
33A	£2,500
72A	£2,530
78A	£2,595
77A	£2,570

There is some variation in cost according to the siting of the home.

(f) Total Homes Built.

Mr. WILD asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) What is the total number of houses built in Western Australia in each of the years 1950-1954 and from the 1st January to the 30th June, 1955?

(2) Of the above, how many were built in each period by the State Housing Commission?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 1950	4,644
1951	6,050
1952	7,829
1953	7,827
1954	8,171
1955 from 1st January to the 31st March only. June quarter figures not yet available	1,943
(2) 1950	1,966
1951	2,087
1952	2,333
1953	3,248
1954	3,475
1955 from 1st January to the 30th June	2,189

(g) Charge to Workers' Homes Applicants, Brentwood.

Mr. WILD (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Further to the question regarding houses constructed at Brentwood and the figures given by the Minister, do they indicate the prices at which the houses are being sold to workers' homes applicants?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes, but it has to be appreciated that the cost of the land must be included. Those prices do not include the land. They are the cost of the houses. It must be realised that an answer relating to a particular type of house will not necessarily make sense because of the difference in sites. The difference in the value of blocks of land can vary between £150

up to £1,000. I was under the impression that the question related to the cost of the house units themselves. If this further information is required, it will cover quite a field because each block is individually valued. I can give the average value, if desired.

(h) Housing Commission and Trust Funds Expenditure.

Mr. WILD (without notice) asked the Treasurer:

In view of the Treasurer's reply to the question asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition intimating that £1,740,000 was used from trust funds last year by some departments, will he inform the House what departments were allocated the bulk of that money?

The TREASURER replied:

The State Housing Commission was responsible for the expenditure of the bulk of this money.

BEACH EROSION.

Report of Inquiry.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Works:

Regarding the inquiry into beach erosion, which was expected to take about a year, will he be able to furnish a report to the House during this present session?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes.

SWAN RIVER.

(a) Encroachment on Private Property.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Premier:

Which State department, if any, deals with encroachment by the Swan River upon private property, such as is taking place at the foot of Adelma-rd., near the junction of the Nedlands and Claremont electorates?

The PREMIER replied:

No Government department has any legal responsibility in this matter.

(b) Reclamation and Cost.

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What acreage of the Swan River has been reclaimed to date?

(2) What is the cost to date of all work in connection with such reclamation?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) None of the proposed reclamation has been completed, but an area of approximately 43 acres is being worked over in stages.

(2) £56,738.

(c) Boat Accidents at Narrows.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Works:

(1) With reference to the report in "The Sunday Times," of the 7th August, of the sinking of a launch after striking an undisclosed object in the Narrows, together with the report of three other boats going aground in the Narrows, does he know the circumstances under which these accidents happened?

(2) Was it due to any neglect on the part of the department concerned in leaving dangerous objects in the channel, and was the channel clearly defined?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No.

(2) The department has no knowledge of the actual positions where the accidents occurred.

There is no reason to believe that the cause, or causes, were due to any negligence on the part of the department.

RECREATION GROUND.

Area Adjoining Graylands School.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Has some firm arrangement been come to between the State Housing Commission and Nedlands Road Board to enable the land adjoining Graylands school to be developed as a recreation ground?

(2) If so, will he state whether the Nedlands Road Board is eventually to obtain the land as a reserve?

The MINISTER replied:

An area in the vicinity of Alfred and Davies-rds. west of Graylands school will be vested in the Nedlands Road Board for recreation purposes when resubdivision is completed and titles available. In the interim the local authority has been advised that the development of the area for recreation in anticipation of future vesting may proceed.

EDUCATION.

(a) Graylands Teachers' College, Improvements.

Hon. C. F. J. NORTH asked the Minister for Works:

Regarding the improvements to the Graylands Teachers' College, approximately what amount is to be expended?

The MINISTER replied:

£28,000.

(b) Schoolchildren, Insurance Scheme.

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Since the inception of the insurance scheme for schoolchildren, how many accidents have occurred for which claims have been made?

(2) How many of these received compensation?

(3) What was the total amount paid out?

(4) Since the inception of the insurance scheme for members of parents' and citizens' associations, how many accidents have occurred for which claims have been made?

(5) How many of these received compensation and what was the total amount paid out?

(6) Will he give the dates on which the respective schemes commenced?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Education) replied:

(1) 641 as at the 31st July, 1955.

(2) 592 have received compensation: 42 are in the course of settlement; and seven have been declined.

(3) £3,278.

(4) and (5). Answered by Nos. (1), (2) and (3).

(6) The 1st July, 1954. There is only one scheme in operation.

(c) Proposed School, Greenmount.

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister for Education:

Can he state when the proposed new school for the children of parents residing in the new housing area at Greenmount (Reserve 2101) will be commenced?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Education) replied:

This information is not available yet.

LAND AGENTS.

(a) Personnel of Supervisory Committee.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister for Justice:

(1) Who are the present members of the Land Agents' Supervisory Committee under the Land Agents Act, 1921-53?

(2) What are their respective appointments on such committee under Section 14A (1)?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Mr. G. J. Ruse (Crown Prosecutor)—chairman; Mr. C. M. Hansen, qualified accountant and auditor and practising member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants—member; Mr. C. J. Waters, licensee nominated by the Real Estate Institute—member.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(b) Position Regarding Mr. Hansen.

Mr. COURT (without notice) asked the Minister for Justice:

(1) With reference to the answer given to my earlier question, is he aware that Mr. C. M. Hansen, referred to as a member

of the Land Agents' Supervisory Committee, is no longer a member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, having been excluded in November, 1954, and the Registrar of Companies was so advised on the 25th November, 1954, and the Under Secretary for Law advised on the 7th December, 1954?

(2) Further, would he have the position examined and advise the House of the result of his examination of the position concerning Mr. Hansen?

The MINISTER replied: This person was a member of the organisation referred to prior to being appointed a member of the board, which, of course, does not alter the position. He has the qualifications and the appointment was in accordance with the Act. However, I shall have that point investigated and will give a further reply tomorrow.

TRAFFIC.

Lights for Stirling Highway, William-st., etc.

Mr. COURT asked the Minister representing the Minister for Local Government:

(1) With reference to the traffic light installations projected for Stirling Highway at—

Hampden-rd. and Broadway, Nedlands;
Dalkeith-rd., Nedlands;
Bay View Terrace, Claremont;
Stirling-rd. and Queenslea Drive, Claremont;
Leake and Napoleon-sts., Cottesloe.

can he advise—

(a) whether the local governing bodies concerned have completed their work of road widening related to the installations?

(b) (i) Whether tenders for the lights and installation have been called;

(ii) If so have they closed and been let?

(c) When is it expected the lights will be operating?

(d) Will the lights be brought into operation simultaneously or progressively as installation is complete?

(2) (a) What progress has been made in observations announced on the 29th March, 1955, of the William-st. traffic light installations and a possible co-ordinating system of lights presumably throughout the central part of Perth?

(b) What progress has been made and is proposed to solve the traffic problem in Barrack-st., Perth, and over the Beaufort-st. bridge?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied:

- (1) (a) No.
- (b) (i) No.
(ii) Answered by (b) (i).
- (c) At least 12 months. This can only be answered precisely when tenders have been accepted.
- (d) Progressively.
- (2) (a) Observations were made and showed that William-st. was not yet at saturation. Co-ordination of lights in William-st. is therefore not yet necessary. No steps have been taken for the co-ordination of lights throughout the central part.
- (b) No detailed consideration has yet been given to this problem. It must be considered in relation to the Stephenson plan.

MOOLA BULLA CATTLE STATION.

Overlanding of Stock.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Premier:

Will the overlanding of 3,600 bullocks from Moola Bulla station to Moree, New South Wales, constitute a breach of contract or a breach of faith with contracts made by the previous management of the station or with any contract made with the Government by the present management?

The PREMIER replied:

Under the contract, the purchaser of Moola Bulla is required to retain on the property 15,000 head of cattle. As far as can be ascertained, the overlanding of 3,600 bullocks does not constitute a breach of the contract.

Prior to the sale, 700 bullocks were delivered to Wyndham, and tentative arrangements made for the delivery of 850 on the 23rd August and 500 on the 28th August, by the purchaser.

FORESTS.

Die-back in Jarrah Trees.

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister for Forests:

- (1) Is he aware that die-back of jarrah trees in the Nanga Brook and Hoffman Mill areas is reaching serious proportions?
- (2) Is the cause of die-back known to the Forests Department?
- (3) Are any efforts being made to prevent die-back from spreading?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The percentage area of forests affected by this disorder is relatively small. The problem of dying patches in the Jarrah forest has been causing the Forests Department concern for the past decade but in practically all cases the dead

patches are associated with the heads of gullies and their extension has now virtually ceased.

(2) The exact cause of this disorder is not fully understood but it is thought to be due to an upset of the balance of nature due to excessively heavy cutting of the forest with the first milling operations 40 to 50 years ago and to severe bush fires in past years.

(3) The matter has been under investigation for the last seven years and successful recolonisation has already been brought about by both natural and artificial means in certain die-back areas. This work is being extended.

FAUNA.

Protected areas, Drakesbrook, Harvey and Dardanup.

Mr. MANNING asked the Minister for Fisheries:

What is the total area of Crown land on which fauna is protected in the following road districts:—Drakesbrook, Harvey, Dardanup?

The MINISTER replied:

The Lands Department is not able to advise at short notice the total area of Crown land in the three road districts mentioned. A large proportion of the area, however, is set aside for State forests.

There is no record of any land being reserved at present in the three districts for the conservation of fauna.

All fauna (except those species declared to be not protected) is protected throughout the State, irrespective of who controls the land.

RAILWAYS.

Suburban Traffic.

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Railways:

- (1) Has any substantial increase occurred in the number of passengers carried on suburban railways during the last financial year?
- (2) If so, what is the increase, and to what does he attribute the increase?
- (3) What difference in revenue has resulted?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) For the year ended the 30th June, 1955, the journeys were 1,537,986 greater than for the year ended the 30th June, 1954. This is due to the introduction of diesel railcars and the improved service which operated from the 28th November, 1954.

(3) The increase in revenue between the two periods was £54,457.

WHEAT.*Storage Accommodation.*

Hon. A. F. WATTS asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Does he consider any additional provision for storage of wheat is necessary in Western Australia?

(2) Have any steps been taken to provide such storage?

(3) If so, what is the likely cost and does he know what financial arrangements are to be made?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes, to meet the emergency existing this coming season.

(2) Yes, Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. has arranged to provide up to ten million bushels to meet the emergency.

(3) It is envisaged that emergency storage will be provided at a number of centres as the need develops. Cost will depend upon the bulk of wheat ultimately requiring storage.

Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. is arranging the finance, and it may be necessary for the company to obtain an increase in tolls.

LAND RESUMPTIONS.*Return of Blocks Acquired for Chord Line.*

Hon. D. BRAND asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What number of blocks required for the proposed Bassendean chord line have been handed back?

(2) Is it proposed to sell any such blocks held by the Government at auction?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 61 lots are in course of re-transfer to former owners.

(2) Not at present. The policy is to give former owners an opportunity to re-acquire.

NARROWS BRIDGE.*Authority for Reclamation, Siting, etc.*

Mr. YATES asked the Minister for Works:

(1) On whose authority was the present reclamation of Perth Water authorised for the building of a bridge across the Narrows?

(2) What is the total extent of the reclamations proposed?

(3) Is it intended that any portion of the reclaimed area will be used for parking facilities for motor-vehicles?

(4) Why did the Government proceed with the siting of the bridge and the access road without first consulting the all-party committee appointed to study the Stephenson-Hepburn plan?

(5) Why was not the proposed reclamation referred to Parliament as was the case with changes proposed to King's Park and other Class "A" reserves?

(6) When will the South Perth Road Board be called in for consultation to deal with the siting of roads and the necessary resumption of existing properties in the South Perth district for the proposed bridge across the Narrows?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The reclamation was authorised by the State Government.

(2) Approximately 43 acres.

(3) No.

(4) The determination of a suitable site for a bridge at the Narrows and the necessary approach roads was a preliminary to foundation exploration and design. The matter was considered by the Government to be one of great urgency long before the Stephenson-Hepburn plan was submitted or the all-party committee formed.

(5) The proposed reclamation was of great urgency and the matter was not governed by specific legislative directions as in the case with changes proposed to King's Park and other Class "A" reserves.

(6) Representatives of the South Perth Road Board had a discussion with the Commissioner of Main Roads some months ago and the departmental plans were tabled. The representatives were told that the board would be informed from time to time as the investigations and planning developed.

TRAM TRACKS.*Removal from Oxford-st.*

Mr. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways:

As requests are being made for the removal of disused tram tracks in Oxford-st., Leederville, will he indicate whether the department is prepared to remove the rails, and whether this is in any way dependent upon any other department or authority?

The MINISTER replied:

The disused tramway tracks in Oxford-st. will be removed in due course in accordance with the department's long-term planning on rail removal. The department prefers to co-ordinate this work with any works undertaken by local authorities, thus lessening the overall costs. In the meantime, maintenance of roadway embodying the tracks will continue when and where necessary.

CARNARVON GOODS SHEDS.*Removal to Babbage Island.*

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is it the intention of the Public Works Department to move the goods sheds at Carnarvon to a site on Babbage Island?

(2) If the answer is "yes", when is it anticipated that this work will be commenced?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Some investigations have been made with a view to assessing the value of such a possible change, but there is no intention to explore this further in the near future.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

DAIRYING INDUSTRY.

(a) Federal Subsidy on Butter.

Mr. ROSS HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Agriculture:

Will he explain to the House, briefly, the basis on which the Federal Government pays the consumer subsidy on butter to the dairy farmer?

The MINISTER replied:

The Federal Government has decided that the guaranteed return to dairy farmers for butter for 1955-56 shall remain on last year's figure, viz., 460 shillings per cwt. commercial butter.

This guarantee, however, applies only to that part of butter production which is sold on the Australian market, plus 20 per cent. of such sales.

This means that if sales on the Australian market total, say, 120,000 tons, the Federal Government subsidy will be applied to that figure, plus 20 per cent, making a total covered by the guarantee of 144,000 tons.

(b) Government Charges for Bulldozing.

Hon. L. THORN asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has the Government increased charges for Government bulldozers available for work on backward dairy farms?

(2) Is he aware that a private contractor has recently reduced his price to £4 per hour?

(3) Will he cause inquiries to be made to see if the cost of Government bulldozers is now higher than that of private contractors, and if this is found to be the case, advise the House of what steps the Government intends to take in this matter?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Charges have been increased generally to meet higher costs of operation.

(2) No. However, in any case, one should not lose sight of the fact that the size of the machine and the extent of ancillary equipment govern the price.

(3) Recent inquiries have revealed that Government prices are not higher than those of private contractors.

(c) Butter Production and Sale.

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE: Yesterday, the member for Greenough asked questions without notice which were to have been placed on today's notice paper, but for some reason they were omitted. However, I now have the answers available. The questions asked by the hon member were as follows:—

(1) In view of the altered economic conditions applying to the production and sale of butter, can he inform the House if the dairying industry will receive more, or less, from butter sold in Australia this year than last, and to what extent?

(2) What is the estimated loss on every lb. of butter to be exported this year?

The answers are as follows:—

(1) Because of the increase of 3½d. per lb. in the wholesale price of butter in Australia, the industry will receive more for sales on this market than in the previous year unless, of course, such increased price brings about a severe decline in consumption. It is not possible to say how much more or less the dairying industry will receive until the actual Australian sales are known.

(2) As export butter is now sold on a free market for the first time for over 15 years, it is extremely difficult to forecast what prices are likely to be realised during the coming year.

It has been estimated, however, that the net realisation might be at least 1s. 8d. per lb. less than the recognised total cost of production ex factory, normally 503s. 2½d. cwt. commercial butter.

(d) 1953 Economic Survey and Government Attitude.

Hon. L. THORN (without notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

In "The West Australian" of the 2nd August, 1955, he is reported as saying—

It (the Government) had already anticipated one of the major recommendations of the report which was based on increased pasture, especially on backyard dairy farms. Through the Rural & Industries Bank this was now proceeding apace in the dairying areas.

Did he mean to imply that his Government was merely carrying out the policy of the previous Government?

The MINISTER replied:

I meant to imply nothing of the kind. If we refer to the policy of the hon member's Government when it sat on this side of the House, we will see a situation down at Walpole where the scheme to increase pastures in the dairying industry was inaugurated, which created a state of chaos so that no dairy farmer could handle the situation afterwards.

What I meant in the reference was that the present Government, which, of course, knew that the survey was being held in 1953, and which has since been anxiously awaiting the report, anticipated at least one of the recommendations. It concerned one of the most urgent needs of the dairying industry today, namely, to meet a situation where more cows can be carried per farm so that butter production per head can thereby be increased.

On the figures I gave yesterday afternoon in answer to questions on the same matter, the member for Toodyay should realise that over the last two years, the present Government has been well aware of the position, and, so far as the financial resources make it possible, has attended faithfully to its job.

NATURAL FUELS.

Life of Australia's Stocks.

Mr. COURT (without notice) asked the Minister for Mines:

(1) Does the Government agree with the announcement at the Geneva U.N. Atoms for Peace Conference to the effect that Australia's stocks of natural fuels may become exhausted in from 10 to 15 years, which announcement, on the surface, appears a little extravagant and could alarm industrialists contemplating commencing or expanding in this State?

(2) (a) If the Government does agree with the announcement, does the fuel exhaustion prospect apply to Australia as a whole and would Western Australia be in the same position?

(b) If Western Australia comes in this category, what is the Government's plan to meet the situation assuming oil is not found in Western Australia in commercial quantities?

(3) Does he know who was responsible for making the statement concerning Australia?

(4) Is the visit abroad of the general manager of the State Electricity Commission (Mr. F. Edmondson) related to this problem of fuel exhaustion?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Government does not agree with the announcement referred to. As far as this State is concerned, natural fuel deposits sufficient for hundreds of years are known to exist.

(2) (a) and (b) Answered by No. (1).

(3) No.

(4) No.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Owen, leave of absence for four weeks granted to Mr. Ackland (Moore) on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second Day.

Debate resumed from the 4th August.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray) [5.7]: Reference was made in the Speech of His Excellency to the death of Hon. C. H. Henning and Hon. R. J. Boylen. I would like to express sympathy from those who are associated with me on this side of the House to the relatives of those deceased members. I had a very long association with the late Mr. Henning who was a colleague of mine, and I have a very full appreciation of the energy that he put into his public work and of the good service he rendered to the State. The late Mr. Boylen I knew only since he came to Parliament, but I know that he paid close attention to his parliamentary duties and was held in high regard by all members, irrespective of party. I should also like to express my sympathy to Hon. Sir Frank Gibson, who was bereaved by the death of his wife. She was closely associated with him for a long time in his public life.

The general rains over most of the State have, of course, been very thankfully received. It is good to know that most of our rural areas and a great deal of our pastoral areas look like having a good season. The rain in some districts has been particularly heavy, and, while it has benefited all districts, in some, including my own, it has done considerable damage. I do not intend to take the opportunity during the Address-in-reply debate to deal with district matters except to tell the Minister for Works that on Sunday last when I made an inspection of some farming lands in the West Coolup area, I could not get through by motorcar and had to be provided with a horse and cart. Some farms are flooded to such an extent that I do not think farming can be successfully carried out under existing conditions, and I am hoping that some money will be made available to provide further drainage there.

The Minister for Works: I am sure there will not be any money for drainage. There is not enough for water supplies.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am sorry to hear that. Today I received this letter, which should give the Minister for Works some heart. It is from the Prime Minister, and dated the 8th August, 1955. It says—

On the 5th April you and Mr. Watts wrote to me in support of the proposal to increase the Commonwealth financial commitment for the Comprehensive Water Supply Scheme in your State.

I have today informed the Premier that the Commonwealth will increase the limit of its contribution for this purpose to £4,000,000. For this financial year the Commonwealth will continue to contribute on a pound for

pound basis up to a limit of £681,796, the amount remaining against its present total commitment of £2,150,000. The increased contribution will be made available from 1956-1957 onwards on a pound for pound basis and will be subject to the condition that the total Commonwealth contributions towards the scheme in any one year will not exceed one-quarter of the additional sum, i.e. £462,500.

So the Commonwealth has increased the amount from £2,150,000 to £4,000,000.

The Minister for Works: But not all for this year.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, but it must make a very considerable difference in the outlook of the Treasurer and of the Minister for Works, in regard to future commitments.

The Minister for Works: It is not as good as you think, because what the Commonwealth Government has agreed to find will not enable us to carry out the full programme designed for this year.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I thought this information would give great heart to people in those areas wanting water supplies urgently.

The Minister for Works: It is well to know the facts, and that is the position.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is well for them to know that, instead of the Commonwealth providing £2,150,000, it will provide £4,000,000, and it is as well for them to know that this Commonwealth Government is not the niggardly, mean Government which it is made out to be. I remember a most extraordinary development which took place during the last Address-in-reply debate. The Premier created a precedent by amending his own speech. I know that was the first time it has ever happened in this Parliament, and I would be surprised if it has happened in any other Parliament—to present an Address-in-reply in Parliament and then amend it because of some criticism.

In listening to the questions tonight, I got a surprise. The Treasurer admitted that he has actually been using trust funds. During the general election campaign, I remember listening to his melodious voice over the air. This is the gist of what he said: I cannot give the quotation word for word. I remember him saying—

And this Premier and Treasurer has dipped into the trust funds of the State.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That was true, was it not?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, of course it was true; I am not denying it. This is what the Premier said—

And, ladies and gentlemen, you know what trust funds are, don't you?

He went around the country also, telling the people how I dipped into the trust funds, and in that solemn voice of his said—

And, ladies and gentlemen, you know what trust funds are, don't you?

Why, that got in thousands of votes, because people said to themselves, "By Jove, the present Treasurer that we have is not the man we thought he was. He is the type of man who interferes with trust funds!" They would consider that he was a person to watch. Yet, despite all this, the Treasurer comes here and tells us, in reply to a question, "I took a mere £1,700,000."

The Premier: I do not remember using the word "mere."

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Perhaps I could say a word or two with regard to the Minister for Housing.

The Premier: Yes, that is better!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am sorry for the discomfort of the Premier; but I turn now to the Minister for Housing, and I refer to him because of a reply which he gave to a question asked by the Deputy Leader of my party. That question related to housing. I was interested to hear the Minister, at a civic reception a few weeks ago, make a statement that the housing position was solved. I thought that was a most interesting statement. Yet today, in answer to a question, he told us that there are still 12,762 applicants.

The Minister for Housing: No, that is wrong. Applications, not applicants.

The Minister for Education: That is a different thing.

The Minister for Housing: There is a great difference—a difference of thousands.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: All right. I will agree that it is quite likely that a fair percentage of those people are now housed. That has been the case for some time. The Minister suggests the number is 9,000. Then he tells us that the number waiting for houses today is 4,000 or 5,000. I put it to the Minister: Does he consider he was justified in saying at a public reception that the housing position is solved when, on his own admission today, there are thousands of people still waiting?

The Minister for Housing: That is one year of building only. We built over 4,000 last year.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: But people are still coming to the country in large numbers, and young people are getting married. There will still be a keen demand for houses.

The Minister for Housing: Of course there will, as long as the country continues to grow. That will always be so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Does the Minister still maintain that the housing position is solved?

The Minister for Housing: I did not say that.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, you did!

The Minister for Housing: No, I did not!

The Minister for Lands: Do you expect him to anticipate marriages?

The Minister for Housing: If the Leader of the Opposition would like to know, what I said was that statistics indicated that the housing problem had been solved because there were more houses per head of population today than ever before.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I did not get that impression. But getting right down to tints, though I suppose I have no right to ask questions at this stage, I would ask the Minister for Housing whether he considers, in view of his statement today in answer to a question, that the housing position in this State is solved. I do not think it is.

Mr. Lawrence: Would you consider that it is a sight better today than it was under your Government?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I will say that with all the improvement in material supplies and availability of labour, the position is a disgrace to the Government the hon. member supports.

Mr. Lawrence: I asked whether it is or is not better.

Hon. D. Brand: If it is better, it is better only to the extent of £1,700,000 from trust funds!

Mr. Lawrence: You be quiet, little boy!

Hon. D. Brand: I am not a wharfie; do not talk to me like that!

Mr. Lawrence: They would not have you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Coming to the Speech of His Excellency, I was struck by this paragraph—

The economic condition of the State continues to be sound. There has been a satisfactory sale for our primary products, with the exception of wheat.

When the Premier decided that this should be the Speech of His Excellency, I think he would have read this paragraph carefully and would have given fair consideration to it. The Speech says that there has been a satisfactory sale for our primary products with the exception of wheat; but, of course, wheat is one of our main products. Wheat supports a great percentage of our population and keeps many rural areas going. The wheat position is certainly uncertain.

Only last night we had a considerable discussion about the future of butter. Would the Premier regard the position

of butter and dairy products generally as satisfactory? Then there is the position of meat. Only recently the Commonwealth Government provided a subsidy in regard to meat exports. The Speech of His Excellency says that 29,000 cattle have gone through, or are expected to go through, the Wyndham Meat Works. I do not think the growers know what they are going to get for that meat. They have no idea of the price they will receive. Perhaps I should not say "no idea." They may have some idea, but it does not appear that the price they will get will be satisfactory, despite the fact that a subsidy is being provided.

Let us have a look at something other than agriculture. Can we be satisfied about the coal position at present, and its future? I will say something about that is I proceed. Then, as the Minister for Mines knows, the Commonwealth Government is still providing a subsidy to keep certain gold mines in production.

The Minister for Mines: Can you tell me any specific mine that it is helping?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, I cannot; but I know it was agreed that a subsidy should be paid, and I take it that the promise will be honoured.

The Minister for Mines: Very little has come forward up to date.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I have mentioned these facts in order to induce members to do some thinking in regard to economic conditions in this State generally. Are they as sound as the Speech would lead us to believe? Last night I made reference to the amount of money which the Premier had, and I find that I was £2,245,000 short. The Premier received £45,719,845 in revenue and he got £16,525,000 from loan funds. So he had £62,244,845. Then he tells us that the Electricity Commission raised another £2,760,000, to which I did not make reference last night. I find that the amount spent by the Main Roads Department last year was £4,400,000. So there again is some indication that this shortage of money we are being told so much about needs further explanation.

The Speech also says—

The industrial possibilities of Western Australia are being increasingly realised both overseas and in the Eastern States, and judging from frequent inquiries covering a wide range of industry, it can be anticipated that industrial expansion will be even further accelerated.

I think that depends on how far we can keep our costs of production within bounds. We know that the first thing that business enterprises do when looking for openings, is to see what the production costs are likely to be; and with the keen competition that is taking place in regard to all

forms of production, I think it will be found that any industry making inquiries about conditions in this State will want to know not only what the present production costs are but what they are likely to be in the future.

The Minister for Lands: That applies to primary production, too.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It does.

Mr. May: Have you any ideas about the wheat situation?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not an authority on wheat. The hon. member has had more practical experience in that regard than I; but I do know that I do not take a pessimistic view of wheat. World conditions can alter very quickly, and so can seasonal conditions; and I think that while at present we are experiencing difficulty in regard to wheat, there is no need for a pessimistic outlook about the future.

Mr. May: Do you think we are asking too much for it?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would not say that. I believe the costs of production have been assessed after a full inquiry, and we all agree that the producers, no matter in what industry they may be, are entitled to their costs of production plus a reasonable margin of profit.

The Minister for Health: What do you think of the idea of selling our wheat on credit?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think it has something to commend it. If there is a market for world stocks of food, I believe it would be better to sell them on credit. I would prefer to see our wheat sold on credit rather than have it eaten by weevils, or have it deteriorate in some other direction. Here is an interesting item in the Speech—

Fourteen-hundred tons of Wundowie charcoal pig iron were exported overseas during the last 12 months and all surplus production for the next 12 months is already booked for shipment abroad.

The Minister for Industrial Development: That is a misprint. It should be 14,000 tons.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes. The Speech continues—

Orders for an additional 30,000 tons have so far been refused because of a lack of production capacity at Wundowie. Ministers are now giving close consideration to proposals which aim at greatly expanding the industry's capacity to produce pig iron.

I hope that, as soon as an opportunity arises, the Minister for Industrial Development will give us all the facts about this industry. We should have a balance sheet

which can be easily understood, because this is a public concern and the public should know just what the receipts are and what the expenditure is, and what amount of loan money is involved. We should be given a close-up of this particular industry. With regard to expanding the industry, I would say that in view of the shortage of loan funds, the Premier could find avenues in which there is a more urgent need for the expenditure of such funds than is the case with Wundowie, and consideration should be given to those more urgent requirements before providing more money for Wundowie.

Mr. McCulloch: You do not believe in expansion?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, I do, but last night the Premier told us there was a shortage of loan money, and I believe that loan money should be first directed into the most urgent channels. The Premier said there was a shortage of schools and hospitals and an urgent need for country water supplies; and I believe they are more urgent than this particular work. The Minister for Housing no doubt submitted this to the Premier when the Speech was being compiled—

Sawn timber production is being maintained at record figures and timber supplies are generally satisfactory.

It would be very nice if occasionally he paid some tribute to his predecessor who showed a great interest in timber production and worked very hard in that direction.

The Minister for Housing: You closed up one or two and would have closed more if it had not been for the change of Government.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We got these great mills going in the South-West.

The Minister for Education: State owned?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, some of them.

The Minister for Education: I thought you were not in favour of socialism.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: They were already there, so we had no option! We will have a discussion on timber and prices if the Minister wishes. He must admit that the previous Government and the previous Minister did a considerable amount of work in stepping up the production of building materials.

Mr. Heal: And so he should have!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not denying that, but the Government does not admit these things.

The Minister for Housing: You told the electors all about this a couple of years ago.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I will tell them again.

The Minister for Housing: It is stale news.

Mr. Heal: They will take no notice of you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Do not believe it. You will be surprised at what I have up my sleeve.

The Minister for Lands: You must have the £500,000 up your sleeve that you were going to find yesterday.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister should do something about it and not be facetious about a great industry. According to the Governor's Speech the Minister for Railways has told the Premier that—

Railway passenger and freight train time schedules have been considerably reduced by the introduction of diesel locomotives and rail-cars. The faster and more frequent services have resulted in a heavy increase in suburban patronage. The net revenue position of the railways has substantially improved.

I am glad to know this, but here again I think some credit should be given to the previous Government for ordering these diesels and for looking ahead. Further on in the Speech, His Excellency said—

Hospital improvements throughout the State are being undertaken to the full extent of Loan Funds available for this purpose. A new maternity hospital has been opened at Midland Junction and work has commenced on a 200 bed chest hospital at Hollywood. The construction of the second section of the Royal Perth Hospital is expected to be completed by June, 1956.

If I remember rightly, we started the Midland Junction hospital. From reading the Speech one would think the Government was supplying all the money for these hospitals whereas I think that the whole of the money for the 200 bed chest hospital at Hollywood is being supplied by the Commonwealth Government. I believe that hospital is to cost £1,500,000. Plans for this particular hospital were drawn up when my Government was in office.

His Excellency goes on to say—

A decision on the selection of a site for a new mental hospital will be made at an early date.

Here again we have something to thank the Commonwealth for because it is providing up to £10,000,000 for this purpose. The Commonwealth provides £1 for every £2 that the State makes available for capital works, so the State will benefit considerably in this regard.

Mr. May: Where does the Commonwealth get the money from?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: From the hon. member, from me and all the other taxpayers. As this is the last session of Parliament before the general elections, I expect we can look forward to a good deal of window dressing.

The Premier: You have been doing some already.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Might I retort, so also has the Premier. He is an expert at window dressing.

Mr. May: He is an expert Premier.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I expect this party propaganda and I am not objecting to it, but just saying what will happen. I suppose it is because the Government's tenure of office has not been a spectacular one.

The Minister for Housing: It has got you worried.

The Premier: We do not go in for glamour.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the Premier is a glamour boy.

The Minister for Lands: I think you are whistling in the dark to keep up your courage.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am glad the Minister does think sometimes. I think this Government has been a pretty lucky one. The state of the country has been such that full employment has continued, but I did not think the Government would have the effrontery to take the credit for that. I think that the credit for the satisfactory economic set-up in Australia today must be given to the Commonwealth Government.

The Minister for Housing: It was not too satisfactory last night.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: What does the Minister mean by that?

The Minister for Housing: You and half a dozen of your colleagues were bemoaning the economic circumstances of a certain industry.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That is so, and we were trying to impress upon the Government the urgency of the matter, so that something would be done.

The Minister for Housing: Now you are telling us everything is lovely.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Commonwealth is doing something. We were trying to tell the State Government that it also had a responsibility in this matter. I would say that the future of Australia and of this State is at the present time at the crossroads. The people have to decide whether they want socialism or antisocialism.

World events have moved pretty rapidly since we last met. We have seen the result of the British elections. Without a doubt the socialist party in Britain went

to the country with a socialistic programme by naming some of the great industries that it would nationalise. But what happened? It suffered not only a defeat, but one of the heaviest defeats that a party has suffered in Britain for many years.

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: There is no unemployment.

The Premier: Economic conditions in Britain have gone to pieces quite a bit since then.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think so. I think Great Britain is holding her own pretty well today in world affairs.

The Premier: They have slipped back in the last few weeks.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We know, too, that a decisive result was obtained in Victoria. It may have been because the Premier was not able to get over there. Other great world events have taken place during the parliamentary recess, the most important being the meeting of the Big Four in Switzerland at what was known as the Summit.

The Minister for Housing: You are not taking credit for that, are you?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I said the Big Four in Switzerland, not Hobart! The great objective of this meeting was world peace. From what we have read, some success has been achieved. The fear of nuclear warfare has set the whole world thinking, and there is no doubt that there is today a strong desire for world peace. Even so, the fact remains that tremendous sums of money are being spent on defence programmes by all nations and there are still huge armies in the field. While that tremendous expenditure is going on, by what I shall term not only members of the British Commonwealth, but also our allies, we have to play our part.

Millions of people throughout the world still fear the menace of communism and until the iron curtain is completely lifted and all nations can see what is happening in all countries in regard to armaments, this fear of war will continue. In striving to bring about world peace we, as a nation, have a part to play.

Mr. Lawrence: How should we, as a State Government, try to make peace?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: As a State Government we can do something towards that end. I think I said it was our duty to support the other members of the British Commonwealth in any steps that they, after consultation, take in regard to defence matters.

Mr. Lawrence: Do not you think we should take some positive action?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We can take positive action by supporting the plans which the respective Commonwealth Governments and our allies have agreed to.

Mr. Lawrence: You have evaded my question.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I have done nothing of the sort. I was about to say that in striving to achieve world peace, we, as a nation, have a part to play, as have all other nations, great or small. Wars are not always started by large and powerful nations. One factor that we must keep in mind is the paramount importance of loyalty to our country and to the British Commonwealth. What is meant by loyalty? It is certainly not a matter of just singing the National Anthem, but of giving the best service we can to our country. If we are to give that service, it is essential that the laws of the country, both civil and industrial, shall be obeyed. In these enlightened times, when our laws are made to deal with all circumstances that may arise, surely Governments, irrespective of party considerations, should see that they are upheld!

Mr. McCulloch: Why did not that apply to the s.p. bookmakers before last session?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We are told by certain people that there should still be a right to strike. What are these rights? Is it right that there should be a strike against the decision of the Arbitration Court or of an industrial tribunal? Is it right that there should be a strike against the laws of an elected Government? Surely, if there is dissatisfaction with these laws, the proper thing to do is to alter them in accordance with constitutional procedure, and until such action is taken, it is the solemn duty of Governments to uphold the law.

Mr. Lawrence: Do you not agree that people have the right to strike?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No.

Mr. Lawrence: Do you believe in the right to sell your own cattle?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do.

Mr. Lawrence: I believe in the right to sell my own labour.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not know what point the hon. member is making. If he is working under an industrial award and does not agree with it, he thinks he should disobey it and go on strike.

Mr. Lawrence: I believe I can withdraw my labour and walk out just as you can withdraw your cattle from a sale at Midland.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I wish I could.

Hon. L. Thorn: How much do you think you should get for your labour?

Mr. Lawrence: I get my fair corner.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I referred to the laudable efforts to bring about world peace, but there is also an urgent need for peace in our own country. This is vital

to us if we are to progress and provide for the reasonable needs of our people and their general welfare. If we are to compete on the world markets, it is necessary for our exportable products, which mean so much to our general welfare, that we should have peace. I agree with the remark in His Excellency's Speech, that in our own State we have been free of great industrial unrest, but unfortunately that has not been the case in other parts of the Commonwealth.

There has been grave industrial unrest in New South Wales. Only recently there was a move to bring about a 24-hour strike on a nation-wide basis. The Australian Railways Union had called for a 48-hour stoppage in support of a claim for higher wages and it was good to see that the secretary of the National Union of Railwaymen had described the proposal as madness and said that the stoppage was part of a communist conspiracy to destroy the national economy. I think there was a report in today's Press that the A.C.T.U. had called for a 24-hour stoppage. I notice that the meeting of unions last night decided not to agree to this suggestion, and I congratulate them on showing good sound commonsense in this respect and upholding the law of the country.

Mr. Lawrence: You were not at the union meeting.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No. My only regret is that the meeting took so long to make the decision. I do not know why it should have taken a long time when the question was one of either upholding or breaking the laws of the country, but still they made the right decision.

The Premier: Every delegate was given an opportunity of expressing his views.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Every delegate should be given the right to express his views.

The Premier: It is fair enough.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, and they came to the right decision.

Mr. Lawrence: If there was a 24-hour stoppage, how would that break the law?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Men work under industrial awards and if in any industry—it might be a vital one—they can say, "We are going to stop this industry for 24 hours," surely that is breaking the law.

Mr. Lawrence: You said "surely," but I say it is not breaking the law. Can you quote the section of the Arbitration Act that it breaks?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I cannot quote the particular section.

Mr. Lawrence: You certainly cannot.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: But I am using commonsense.

Mr. Lawrence: You have not any commonsense.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I left myself open there and, with your smart mind, I would expect something like that from you!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition must address the Chair.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I say again that I would regard a stoppage as breaking the law.

Hon. L. Thorn: It is, definitely.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I also noticed in "The West Australian" of the 21st July last that the seamen on a State ship had refused to handle pearl-shell, because Japanese divers had been employed in the pearling industry. Surely, we cannot tolerate that sort of thing; I believe that the pearl-shell was loaded into other boats, and I would like the Government to tell me the position regarding the handling of future shell. We know that in the interests of the pearling industry it was decided that a limited number of Japanese divers should be allowed into the country for a certain period, under supervision. I understand that the State issues the licences for these divers, and I noticed, too, that the R.S.L. approved of their coming into the country.

Mr. McCulloch: Some of them; not all of them.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: They approved of divers coming into the country and I do not think any differentiation was made as to who they should be.

Hon. L. Thorn: The State executive, which is the parent body, agreed.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Now we find that a certain body of men will not handle the shell; it has taken direct action, and surely that is breaking the law.

Mr. McCulloch: It is human nature.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Even if it is human nature, the hon. member and I are not permitted to break the law unless we suffer the consequences. The law protects us against human nature.

Mr. May: What law?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: As the hon. member knows, there are two sets of laws, the civil law and the industrial law.

Mr. McCulloch: I would not let them into the country.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The hon. member has a perfect right to his own opinions, and I know that his views are shared by others. But the Commonwealth Government, after full consideration, allowed them into the country at the request of the pearl-shellers of this State, and the State Government issued the necessary licences to enable them to work. That being so, surely the law should be obeyed.

Mr. Lawrence: The law was obeyed; they were allowed to work.

Hon. A. F. Watts: They have their shell but they cannot export it. That is wrecking their living.

Mr. Lawrence: That was not the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. A. F. Watts: That was the point he was trying to make.

Mr. Lawrence: He has not yet made any point.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this argument to continue.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The point I am making is that the Commonwealth Government permitted these Japanese divers to enter the State; the State Government issued the licences, and then a certain body of men refused to handle the pearl-shell.

Mr. Lawrence: Now you have made the position clear.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: What is the use of allowing Japanese divers into the country if the pearl-shell they recover is not to be handled?

Hon. L. Thorn: It has to be sold.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Unless a stand is taken to uphold the law, where will this kind of thing end? If one body of men, even a small body, can get away with an action like this, other men will probably follow suit.

Mr. Lawrence: I do not think it is very serious.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is serious enough. I believe that the great majority of workers in this country want to uphold the law.

Mr. May: And do.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes. Let us, as far as possible, endeavour to bring about better and closer relationships between employer and employee; but in regard to both sections, let the existing law be upheld or, if necessary, be altered by Parliament. An attempt is being made to saddle the Commonwealth Government with the responsibility for some of these strikes; the facts are that left-wing Labour is responsible, and that applies particularly in the Eastern States.

Mr. Lawrence: You want better relationships, eh! Yet you speak like that.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes.

Mr. Lawrence: You ought to be ashamed of yourself. You should not be in Parliament.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That is your opinion.

Mr. Lawrence: That is my opinion.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am here and I have been much longer than the hon. member has; and he has not made much progress since he came here.

Mr. Lawrence: You have been lucky.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for South Fremantle must refrain from making these constant interjections.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I think the fact that the Federal Labour leader has succeeded to a considerable extent in diminishing the influence of what are known as "The Groups" has given the extremists greater encouragement to engage in much more active work inside some of the unions.

Mr. May: We will deal with them.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I hope that is so. There is no doubt that the groupers exercised a steadying influence in the unions and took a stand for constitutional methods.

The Minister for Housing: And a few other things, too.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister might tell us what they are.

Mr. May: You know, but will not admit it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I repeat that in the interests of all sections of the people we must have peace on the home front, and subversive activities in our midst are more dangerous than such activities carried on outside the country. I know we have our own party views as to how these objectives can be attained. On numerous occasions the Premier has aired his views in the Press in regard to rising costs, but every statement has had a distinct party or propaganda flavour about it. In fact, I would say that the propaganda has been foremost in his statements.

Mr. McCulloch: They are good tactics.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I suppose the hon. member thinks that the more propaganda the Premier can spread, the better for his party.

Hon. L. Thorn: He is agreeing with you.

Mr. May: Does not the Leader of the Opposition believe in that, too?

The Premier: Not much!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier has already said that I am spreading some of it.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Apart from complaining about rising costs, what has this Government done to try to assist the position during the last eight or nine months? I cannot see that it has done anything.

Mr. Lawrence: It has had to put up with you.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: If the Premier is so concerned about the position, why did he not make some effort to bring together the different sections of industry

and place his views squarely before them and ask for their active co-operation? I do not think the Premier can say that that is not a practical proposition. I think if he had said to the leaders of the unions in this country, the leaders of commerce and industry, "I want to discuss certain aspects with you regarding prices and production generally", he would have received co-operation. But he did not do that. He preferred to indulge in this propaganda, giving it a strong party flavour.

I ask—and the Premier when speaking to the debate might answer the question—what action has he taken to see that Government money is spent to the best advantage? As I move around the country, I am told frequently by people not interested in party politics that money is being wasted, and they point out where extravagances are taking place—

Mr. Heal: Whereabouts are they?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: —and where money could be used to better advantage.

The Premier: I heard the same sort of thing from 1947 to 1953.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I dare say. However, if people speak their minds, they will tell the Premier about it. I used to hear the same sort of thing when I was Premier, and I used to try to do something about it. The Premier must hear these things and know that certain extravagances are going on, so I ask him: What action is the Government taking, departmentally, to tighten these avenues up?

The Premier: If the Leader of the Opposition will submit specific instances I will certainly have them investigated.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I ask the Premier: Is he satisfied with the present transport set-up today? Does he not think that economies could be effected in that direction?

The Premier: It is much more satisfactory than it was five, six, seven or eight years ago.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We have seen huge amounts of money spent on transport and on roads in this State and it would be a sad and sorry state of affairs if that were not so.

Mr. May: Well, what is the Leader of the Opposition grizzling about?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is always room for improvement.

The Premier: Yes, there is always room for improvement.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I suppose the Premier thinks that, by some artificial means, he can bring down costs.

Hon. A. F. Watts: What have the diesels done to improve transport conditions?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is no doubt, as the Minister for Railways pointed out in His Excellency's Speech, that railway conditions have greatly improved.

Mr. Heal: Well, why are you complaining about it?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Because I have already mentioned that there is still room for improvement.

Mr. Lawrence: You are like the little boy who has lost his hat.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier gives the impression that we prevented the Arbitration Court from giving a decision on the quarterly basic wage adjustment, but the facts are that the court has full power to alter the basic wage if it thinks fit after taking into consideration all the economic factors. To gain political advantage he blames us for rising costs, but I am sure the Government has in no way shown any desire to curb inflation. Why, if the Premier and the Deputy Premier could get hold of millions more, they would certainly spend the money.

The Minister for Works: I could spend £2,000,000 more quite easily.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Of course, the Minister would.

The Premier: Yes, on drainage works in the Murray-Wellington area and in the Coolup area.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier at least knows where the money should be spent. I want to give him full marks for that. If the Premier and his Deputy could find more money they would spend it.

The Premier: On what?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: On anything they could find.

The Premier: On what mainly?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: On water conservation, hospitals, schools, and on some of those urgent works which the previous Government spent it on.

The Premier: Correct!

Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver: And on s.p. shops?

The Premier: We will have to buy the hon. member one, I think.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think this Government has taken into consideration the needs of every industry in this State when it talks about the millions it would spend; when it describes the Commonwealth as being niggardly and suggests that that Government should give the State all the money it wants. That is certainly not a policy that would curb rising costs. Today, the member for Toodyay gave notice that he intends to introduce a motion relating to land resumption. I did not know that he had this matter in mind and he has not discussed it with me.

However, I know that there is still much concern about land resumption. I still get a great deal of correspondence on the subject. In fact, this can still be described as a burning question. I cannot remember a time when there has been so much concern about land resumption as exists at present and that despite the fact of the Minister's recent statement.

The Minister for Housing: Fancy that coming from the greatest land resumer of all time—yourself!

Hon Sir ROSS McLARTY: I tell the Minister this: If I was the greatest land resumer of all time—

The Minister for Housing: And you were!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: —we certainly did not have these protest committees being set up from one end of the State to the other.

The Minister for Housing: Party politics! You and Mr. de Burgh!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is no party politics about this. I have not attended one meeting on land resumption and I have not urged these people on.

Mr. Heal: What about in Collie?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The member for West Perth should know that hundreds of these people have acted of their own volition. They are so concerned about land resumption that they have formed associations and vigorous action has been taken.

The Minister for Housing: Eight thousand acres in one month!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, eight thousand acres of virgin land!

The Minister for Housing: That is your record.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, but we did not go out overnight and resume the homes of small holders and let them wait until the next morning to inform them that the Minister had resumed their land. When speaking on the Address-in-reply the member for Leederville said something about what the king did in the centuries gone by, and how in those times the king rode over the meadows followed by his retinue, destroying pastures and crops without any compensation having been paid. By Heavens, history does repeat itself. Our present Minister rode roughshod over these pastures that were resumed, as did the kings of old.

The Premier: So did the King of Pinjarra!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Never in the history of the State has such concern been apparent as has been expressed at the action of the present Government in resuming this land.

Mr. J. Hegney: What about the resumptions your Government made in Bayswater for the Bassendean-Welshpool chord line?

The Minister for Housing: You also took houses from the people there.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We made provision for those from whom we took houses. We appointed a committee to see that justice was done to these people. But in this case the Minister goes out like the kings of old and rides roughshod over these people.

The Minister for Housing: You took their homes.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: And provided alternative housing for them.

The Minister for Housing: You took their homes and resumed 8,000 acres and gave yourself a knighthood for doing so.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I know the Minister for Housing dislikes a knighthood as much as he dislikes the sight of a military medal. The Minister says that we grabbed too much land. He has grabbed more and still more, and then for political gain he announces to the people that no more will be taken.

The Premier: More propaganda!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Good party propaganda right on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, but it is not going down with the people.

The Minister for Housing: You hope!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The people still fear that the Minister will grab more of their land. I notice that this matter of land resumptions came up in the Federal Parliament, and the two States most under fire were New South Wales and Western Australia. When they rose to speak, member after member said that a just price should be paid for the land. In Western Australia we are told in many directions that a just price is not being paid.

The Minister for Housing: Can you give examples?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We are told that not only is a just price not being paid but the people cannot get their money.

The Minister for Housing: Oh, yes, they can!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I have had many complaints.

The Minister for Housing: They have not made claims.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I know it is harder to get money from the Government when land is acquired than it is when it is sold by private treaty. The Minister cannot deny that.

The Minister for Housing: Not under this Government.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, under this Government.

The Premier: That was under the McLarty-Watts Government.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier can say that if he likes.

The Premier: It is true.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Even the Premier cannot deny that there has been a greater public outcry over land resumptions that have been made by this Government than ever before in the history of the State.

Mr. Heal: Have you done anything about it?

The Minister for Lands: You are not getting on too well, you know.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister must let the Leader of the Opposition continue.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister might not think so. The Government does not hesitate to tell people that their electricity supply will be cut off if their account is overdue. It does not hesitate to tell people that their water supply will be cut off if payment is overdue for a short time. If it is right in one case to inflict a penalty, it is right in the case where land has been resumed and held by the Government for an indefinite period without any compensation having been paid.

The Minister for Housing: You have been badly briefed.

The Premier: Your Government did not pay for all its resumptions.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There may have been some in that category, but they would have been paid for had I remained in office.

The Minister for Housing: They were three years overdue when you left office.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Some of them were five and six years overdue.

The Minister for Housing: Some of them were taken only 12 months ago, but those were overdue when your Government was in office.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No, it was before my Government was in office; there was land that had been resumed that had not been paid for.

Hon. A. F. Watts: There is land that was resumed in 1945 that has not been paid for yet.

The Premier: Yes, in Bunbury.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: This is a matter to which Parliament should give consideration. It should also give consideration to the right of appeal against resumptions and also in relation to compensation.

The Minister for Housing: That is already in the Act.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: They do not get much satisfaction and there should be an easier way.

The Minister for Housing: You are reflecting on the judges.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not surprised to see that there has been considerable uneasiness at Collie. There is much concern about the future of coal, and it appears that the least concern is being shown by the Government. Something was said in His Excellency's Speech about consideration being given to the coalmining industry.

Mr. May: Who ordered those diesels?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We did, but surely the member for Collie is not going to argue that we should not keep up with progress. Diesels are being ordered all over the world. I want to place on record the views I hold with regard to coal. I am not surprised to see that there is considerable uneasiness about coal. The member for Collie himself is uneasy about it; he said so.

Mr. May: When?

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I was referring to the position at Collie and said that I was not surprised to see considerable uneasiness there. Much concern is felt about the future of Collie. I said that the Government did not appear to be showing any concern. Certainly there is a reference to this matter in His Excellency's speech. We know that coal is already facing considerable competition, but this competition will increase greatly in future. There is the keen competition from oil which will be intensified even if oil is not found in payable quantities in our own State.

Mr. May: I notice that you did not couple this remark with your remarks on butter last night. Both these industries are in difficulties.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I spoke about butter. I have already mentioned the diesel engines. There will be the use of atomic power. The Premier of South Australia expects to have a great atomic power station operating in about five years' time. The search relating to power production is a ceaseless one. We saw some evidence of this only a few days ago and of what is expected to result as the outcome of research into atomic power in Great Britain. So it is no wonder that the Collie miners and residents are concerned about their future.

Again I ask: What has the Government done about it? If it is really concerned it would be doing something to get industries going in the Collie area. As far as I know, it has not done anything in that direction. Then there is the price factor of coal; if it is to continue as a fuel, it

can only do so on a competitive basis. I say again that diesel engines are replacing coal-burning locomotives.

Mr. May: That applies everywhere.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Of course, and in many parts of the world. Industry generally is using much more oil.

The Premier: Tell us something about the agreement which your Government made with Amalgamated Collieries.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier was going to do a great deal about that.

The Premier: Your Government bound the State to an agreement for three years, and that period does not expire until late this year.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That does not prevent the use of coal.

The Premier: It is causing consumers to pay more for coal than they would otherwise.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: With the mechanisation of mines and with the great open-cuts operating, coal can be produced at a lower cost.

Mr. May: You are pushing the other two companies to the wall by your agreement.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not think that is so.

The Minister for Mines: You ought to realise that by now.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It must not be forgotten that we have to compete not only on the world's markets, but on the internal markets as well. We have to keep up with progress and if the price of coal here is not competitive with that of other fuel produced elsewhere, its use will surely be restricted.

From all I can learn about diesel engines in use on railways throughout Australia, they are much more economical in running costs. They carry much greater loads and I am told that the repair bill is very much less. If my Government were in office at present I would consider the future of Colliie as a matter of the utmost importance. As a first step, I would bring the owners' and miners' representatives together with a view to obtaining their opinions and suggestions for encouraging industries in the Colliie district.

The Minister for Mines: You must have had your ear to a key-hole.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I do not do such things.

The Minister for Mines: It sounds as if you had.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The hon. member is wrong. I do not propose to deal with budgetary matters during the address-in-reply debate, except to say that we have three forms of taxation. There are direct, indirect, and in recent

times greatly increased voluntary taxation. This last form of taxation is obtained in large amounts by means of lotteries, by direct giving, by street appeals and in other directions. I might say that these lotteries are increasing at a tremendous rate. The Premier has decided to avail himself of this form of taxation and has made a start by telling the University that if it raised £150,000 through direct giving, the Government would provide a similar sum. I notice that the appeal is now for £400,000. What is the attitude of the Premier towards this increased amount that is sought to be raised? Does he propose to contribute on a £ for £ basis?

The Premier: That will not increase the contribution of the State.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I fully recognise the need for a medical school in Western Australia. When my Government was in office, that proposition was put to me on a number of occasions. I was told that the Government would have to find something like £1,000,000 to get going, but apparently this estimate has been modified somewhat. I hope that the appeal being made to the public will succeed.

It was also stated by the Premier that the Government will provide £100,000 a year to meet the running costs. I thought that this would be a natural consequence to the amount of money which the Government would have to find to establish a medical school, and any Government would undertake to do this. What I am leading up to is that, while I hope this appeal will be successful, I hope the Premier will not make it a practice of stipulating that a certain amount of money to be raised for public or charitable bodies should be supplemented on a £ for £ basis by the Government only if those bodies could find a large sum of money.

In my opinion, he can expect to obtain considerably increased revenue from the turnover tax on betting, which is sure to increase under the new set-up, and also larger amounts from the entertainments tax. He has stated that the revenue to be obtained from these taxes will be used for social services. The Lotteries Commission in 1953 showed an amount of £343,000, which was an increase of £43,000 over the total for 1952, and it is safe to assume that there will be a considerably increased amount this year.

I ask the Premier whether he is satisfied that this large sum of money is being spent to the best advantage. I think the Government and Parliament might satisfy themselves as to whether the money raised by the lotteries is being spent to the best advantage. All will agree that the public is bearing a heavy burden of taxation, and the indications are that we are not going to obtain much relief. In

view of this it is to be hoped that the Premier will not make further stipulations regarding increased voluntary taxation or, indeed, increased taxation in any other direction. The Western Australian people are generous and will continue to assist worthy and charitable institutions, although they may not be able to do so in future to the same extent as they have done in the past owing to the difficulties arising from the falling prices in some of our great primary industries.

Next, I wish to make reference to town planning. The report on town planning is creating great interest, and it has been agreed that an all-party committee should be set up to consider these proposals. I have read that in principle the proposals have been accepted by the committee. I must say that I thought the Government would have waited for the committee to report before proceeding with the work of filling in that is taking place adjacent to Mounts Bay-rd. This work is so important and is creating so much public interest that surely it was the duty of the Government to submit its proposals before proceeding with that work. I hope that the Government has not made any other major decisions before consideration has been given to the report of the committee. If the Government has made or has in mind the making of such decisions, I cannot see that the continuation of the committee will serve any good purpose.

As I have said before, this Government is the most socialistic that the State has ever had. I do not think the Premier will deny that he is a socialist.

The Minister for Education: What is a socialist?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: For instance, the Premier supports bank nationalisation, which is the first step towards the socialisation of industry, distribution and exchange.

The Minister for Education: Tell us what is a socialist.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I regard the Minister as one. The policy of the socialisation of industry, distribution and exchange is still on the platform of the Labour Party.

Mr. May: Have you dropped the communist business now?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The socialist party of Australia, both Federal and State, has adopted the policy of Dr. Evatt. This means that it has taken a big step to the left. Members might try to laugh that off, but they will not succeed. By taking this step, members of that party expect to achieve their complete socialistic objective in a much shorter time.

The Premier: There is a big bulge in each of your cheeks while you are saying that.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The slogan of the Labour socialists used to be, "Socialism in our time," but now it is "Socialism in our time and in quick time." If Evattism can obtain control in the Federal Parliament we shall undoubtedly have the socialised state to which the Western Australian Labour-Socialist Party is giving full support.

The Minister for Mines: Who is indulging in propaganda now?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Speech of His Excellency says that Western Australia has enjoyed a year free from industrial disputes of a major nature. I am doubtful whether this will be the case in future, particularly now that we have a powerful left wing controlling the A.L.P.

The Minister for Education: You will want a powerful wing soon.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Only recently a general State election was fought in Victoria on the policy of Evattism, and the Labour Government, which, as this Labour Government has done, supported the policy, was crushingly defeated. The Victorian Premier told the people of the State that any Government that supported the Evatt policy should be put out of office and the Victorian people took that advice in no uncertain manner. The same great principles that faced the people of Victoria apply to the people of Western Australia.

The general economic position throughout Australia affects every State. It affects Western Australia more directly, because we are more dependent than is any other State upon imports from the Eastern States. Consequently, if there is industrial trouble in the other larger States, it must be to our detriment. I challenge members opposite to deny the fact that the influence of what is known as the "groupers" has been responsible to a large extent for maintaining industrial peace. Their influence has now been very largely set aside as a result of the influence of Dr. Evatt and his left wing supporters. Already communist influence has made considerable advance in some unions.

I notice in an election pamphlet, issued at the last State elections and authorised by Hon. H. C. Strickland, the following statement—

State Liberals are also guilty. They have increased taxes, rates, duties, licence fees, etc.

We could add a lengthy list to that as a result of what has happened in the last year or two. Then follows the statement—

They are no different to their colleagues throughout the Commonwealth, being all of one party, directed and financed by powerful organisations.

I do not deny that we are of the one party and, of course, members opposite cannot deny that they, too, are of the one party.

The Minister for Housing: What about your colleagues on your left?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister need not worry about them. I am speaking of the Liberal Party and I do not deny that we are of the one party, just as members opposite are of the one party. They follow the lead of Dr. Evatt just as we follow the lead of Mr. Menzies.

The Premier: You do not do anything of the sort.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The State Labour Party and the Federal Labour Party devotedly follow the lead of Dr. Evatt.

The Premier: Who was selected by a majority of the parliamentary members of the Federal Party.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: And supported by the Premier.

The Premier: We follow the decisions of the rank and file as laid down at our congress.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier and his followers adopted the Evatt policy.

The Premier: We follow a policy decided by our rank and file members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: There is no doubt that the Labour Party is supporting Dr. Evatt. I say they have helped to destroy, to a large extent, the moderating influence in the industrial and political life throughout Australia, and they have given encouragement to extremists. This cannot do other than cause discontent generally. Reading from the newspaper reports, I can safely say that the Western Australian section of the Australian Labour Party has taken a strong stand for the Evatt policy. Again, it was only because of certain circumstances that the Premier did not go to Victoria to urge the people to accept the Evatt policy.

The Premier: The Labour policy.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Evatt policy.

The Premier: No.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, it is. We cannot have a policy without a leader.

The Premier: You have.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No. Even if that were so, it would not be nearly as dangerous as the policy the Premier has now adopted.

The Minister for Lands: Your side has a leader without a policy.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: No doubt the Premier will talk about price fixing and other controls. He is a great controller.

He and his Government have decided to support the policy that is now known as Evattism.

The Premier: The Labour policy.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Yes, led by Dr. Evatt.

The Premier: The Labour policy decided by the rank and file of the Labour Party.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Under the influence of Evattism. I say to the Premier that all his price control and other control measures will not be able to counter the detrimental effect of his new policy.

The Premier: Your big business friends have already done terrific damage to the economic stability of Australia.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We will hear from the Premier who they are.

The Premier: Yes, you will, too.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I shall be glad to.

The Premier: You support them absolutely.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is just as highly dangerous to the people of Western Australia as it is to the people of Victoria to accept this new policy of Evattism, which our Labour Party in Western Australia has accepted.

The Premier: The Labour Party in Western Australia supports Labour policy as decided by the rank and file of the Labour movement at properly convened conferences.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We all know that Dr. Evatt played a most prominent and dominating part recently in framing Labour socialistic policy in Australia.

The Premier: Not at all.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: It is of no use the Premier trying to deny that. The Victorian elections were fought on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask members to give the speaker who is on his feet a reasonable chance to put forward his arguments. This incessant barrage of interjections has to cease.

Mr. Lawrence: What about letting him tell the truth?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Sit down! I hope that members will play the game reasonably and give the speaker a chance to finish his speech without constant interjections.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: On the 25th March, Dr. Evatt is reported in "The West Australian" as saying—

Industrial groups for a long time have done a good job but had now ceased to regard themselves as carrying out Labour policy.

We all know the good job they did in their fight against communism and subversive influence in the unions, and what they did to keep industry going. I think that is generally recognised, but from Dr. Evatt's statement it appears that this is no longer Labour's policy. It is easy to understand why the Labour leader holds these views. When he was on the High Court, he once said communism was a philosophy and was inevitable. He led the fight against the anti-communist legislation in the Federal Parliament.

The Minister for Housing: He had the majority of Australia on his side, too.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Minister was on his side.

The Minister for Housing: Too right!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: He was the spearhead of the attack against the anti-communist referendum. He appeared in the Petrov case in which he alleged a conspiracy against him. His object, no doubt, was to discredit the inquiry in the eyes of the public, and, as I previously stated, he has now gone a long way to destroy the industrial groups, and this is the man whose policy the State Labour Government supports. Such action can have no effect other than that of creating uncertainty in industry. It is useless to say that the policy of Evattism will not affect Western Australia. It must have a vital effect on the general well-being of this State, and create uncertainty and unrest. I repeat, the Federal Labour Party and the State Labour Party are the one party. Therefore, I think the circumstances are such that I should move an amendment to the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the Address-in-reply—

But, in view of the impact of industrial unrest in Australia on the increasing economic difficulties facing this country, this House regrets that your Government has not indicated what steps it intends to take to counter communistic influence in sections of the trade union movement now that the Federal Leader of the Labour Party (Dr. Evatt) by his activities has virtually destroyed the anti-communist influence of the industrial groups.

THE PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam—on amendment) [7.53]: This, of course, is obviously a pre-election attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to play on the question of communism.

Mr. Yates: The elections are not until next year.

The PREMIER: I understand that some by-elections are to be held in this State on the 10th September next. I am surprised that the member for South Perth has not been informed of them.

Mr. Yates: I know of them. I have been working in those districts, but the by-elections do not affect this amendment.

The PREMIER: The amendment has been cooked up, obviously, for the purpose of trying to appeal to some people in the community who are susceptible to propaganda aimed against the Communist Party and against communist influences. We all know that for several years in Australia this issue has been of great political value to the Liberal Party; and we know that the Liberal Party has, in season and out of season, worked hard upon it. The Liberal Party has been strongly supported by the newspapers which represent big business interests in Australia.

The record of the present Government in this State, in regard to this issue and with respect to the maintenance of a reasonable policy and of industrial peace stands out very clearly for anyone who has unprejudiced eyes with which to see. There can be no doubt at all that the people of Western Australia have considerable respect for the policy which has been followed by the Government. The record of industrial peace which we have maintained in Western Australia is far better than that maintained by the Leader of the Opposition when he, for six years, was Premier of this State.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Yes, because he stood up to the extremists.

The PREMIER: He did not do that at all.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What about the metal trades' strike?

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition, when Premier, and when the metal trades' strike was on, was responsible for prolonging that strike unduly.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: He always stood for the law.

The PREMIER: Because of his stupid attitude in refusing to exploit fully the possibilities of settlement, the then Premier extended the strike. It is, as a matter of fact, well known in Western Australia that it was the Labour movement of this State which settled the metal trades strike, and not the then Government. The Government of the Leader of the Opposition was inept, incapable and hopeless in the situation and as far as it was concerned in connection with that dispute the strike might well have been still on, except for the skilled intervention of the leaders of the Labour Party in this State.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: We consulted with the legitimate trade union leaders as often as they would consult us, but would not deal with this subversive element.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition consulted with the trade union leaders, but did not take notice of what

they told him until public opinion eventually compelled him to settle the dispute on the basis which the trade union movement had recommended to him many weeks before.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: We made a firm stand in favour of arbitration.

The PREMIER: I say, therefore, that in this matter we have to decide upon the basis of practical experience and not upon a basis of sheer, miserable, low-down, party-political propaganda such as the Leader of the Opposition has indulged in here this afternoon and this evening and such as is contained, in essence, in this amendment. From the way the Leader of the Opposition has talked and the way other representatives of the Liberal Party have spoken, one would think there was only one dangerous influence in Australia—the Communist Party.

Those of us who look more deeply into this situation know only too well that the people who have created most damage to the economic system and who have been the greatest danger to the economic stability of the country are those in the big business world who have shamefully profiteered upon all producers and upon the community generally over the last several years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: A good sweeping statement, of course.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition can describe my statement as "sweeping," but it is true. The Leader of the Opposition, I should say, knows of the tremendous profits which have been plundered from the producers and particularly the primary producers, and from the general public by big business concerns in Australia. He knows that record profits have been earned by a great number of companies; profits which went far beyond reasonable levels. Where does he think these excessive profits come from? Does he not realise that they come from the producers whom he often tells us he represents?

Do we ever hear from the Leader of the Opposition any criticism of the profiteers who plunder the primary producers? I will say, to the credit of the Leader of the Country Party, the member for Stirling, that he and some of his followers in this House have voiced criticism of that character from time to time, but never on a single occasion—never, ever—have I heard the Leader of the Opposition voice even the mildest criticism of this legalised plundering which has been inflicted upon the primary producers and the public generally, particularly in recent years since his party—the party of the Leader of the Opposition—used their power in the Legislative Council of this State to abolish any control whatsoever over profiteers and would-be profiteers.

Mr. Yates: Name one of the companies.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition and the member for South Perth, and all the rest of this parliamentary Liberal group, are afraid to voice any criticism of these people in the big business world, because they know that finally the influence of big business determines who shall get Liberal Party endorsement at elections. That is what they know! That is what they are afraid of, and that is why they dare not stand up and voice any criticism of the profiteers who are increasing in number in the business world and who are continually—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You take all you can get from them.

The PREMIER: —profiteering more and more at the expense of the community.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It would be interesting to know where some of your party funds come from.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition is beginning to do his block. The blood is rushing to his face and to his head, because he hates the truth.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I have put the truth to you. You take party funds from big business.

The PREMIER: For months now the Leader of the Opposition and the shrewd heads behind the Liberal Party have been working out a move which they could launch in this House as soon as Parliament met, for the purpose of trying to exploit, for sheer party political advantage, the fears in the minds of some people in this State with regard to communism, and this amendment is the great result of all their intensive labours during the whole of this year from the 2nd January—I imagine they took a holiday on the 1st January—until now.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Would it surprise you to know that big business does not even know the amendment was to be moved? If you want the truth.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker, I am beginning to think the Leader of the Opposition does not even know how big business works through the Liberal Party in this State. I know it does not work through the office of the Leader of the Opposition in this building. I know it works through another office of the Liberal Party not far from this building. As a matter of fact I was generous enough, only a few days ago, to give the Leader of the Opposition a lift, in a Government motor car, over to that building.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: And I told them all about it.

The PREMIER: That is where big business lays down its rules and instructions to the Liberal Party. That is where it exercises its tremendous influence over Liberal Party tactics and particularly is it the place where it exercises its subtle

influence over who is to get Liberal Party endorsement at election time. Should any member of the Liberal Party dare to get out of step with big business—

The Minister for Housing: Dave Grayden!

The PREMIER: When any member of the Liberal Party gets out of step with big business he is marked down for slaughter.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I know what has happened to your men when they have got out of step with Dr. Evatt.

Mr. Oldfield: See what happened in Victoria.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition very well remembers—I do not think the member for Maylands would remember because he does not remember anything worth while—the action of the former member for Nedlands, one David Grayden, who in his sincerity and desire to serve the public and protect them against monopolies, semi-monopolies and all the rest of it, without consulting his Leader or the headquarters of the Liberal Party, and without getting the angle of big business on the proposition, introduced a Bill into this House.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: And what happened? He got endorsement.

The PREMIER: He introduced the Bill, but did not go very far with it. I think the emphatic answer and the true answer to the question of the member for Mt. Lawley as to what happened to Mr. Grayden is the fact that he is no longer with us.

Mr. Oldfield: Mr. Grayden was told that you were going to oppose that Bill.

The PREMIER: I am sure, if I might once more take some notice of the noise coming from the member for Maylands, that the then member for Nedlands, Mr. Grayden, would not have been the slightest bit influenced or scared by anything which any member of the Labour Party said to him. It was what big business interests said to him, through the Leader of the Opposition, which scared the daylights out of him and caused him not to proceed any further with the Bill.

Mr. Oldfield: Rubbish!

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: What a wonderful flight of imagination!

The PREMIER: Before I was drawn away from the point, I was explaining that when the profiteering sections of the business world take excessive profits from primary industries and the general public they immediately began to deal damaging blows to the economic system and economic stability. I know the views of the business world, especially in these days of large-scale business concerns. I know the great ambition is to be successful and I know that the people who regard themselves as

being most successful in the big business world are those who can mount up the greatest profits and pay the highest rates of dividends.

Although that might be all right from the point of view of the personal success and business sense of those who do it, it does tremendous damage, even in a short-term view, to the community and to economic stability, and in the long-term view it undermines both. So I say that while we realise the danger of communists and communism, we also realise the greater danger and the greater menace of profiteers in the business world because those people are in possession of tremendous power. There is no legal power over them; there is no law which they can break because the Leader of the Opposition and his Liberal Party colleagues used their power in the Legislative Council of this State to abolish the law which controlled the extremists of the business world.

Yet this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition stood up here and preached to us and to the industrial workers of Western Australia about the wickedness of a man who is working with his hands for his daily bread and butter stopping work for a day, a week or a month, and thereby breaking the law. Is it not an amazing set-up when we have upon the statute book laws to decide how much the worker shall receive for his labour and laws to penalise him grievously if he refuses to sell his labour according to the rates which are set down in the appropriate award or agreement; and yet at the same time, on the other hand, we have no laws, because the Liberal Party destroyed them, to say how much profit those engaged in the business world and in the manufacture and distribution of products shall extract from the community.

Obviously the Leader of the Opposition and those associated with him in the Liberal Party in this House are, in the political sense, completely hypocritical in regard to this question, as to the dangers to our economic stability, as to the dangers to our economic system and the dangers to our community generally. I say, without any hesitation and without any apologies, that those in the business world who are profiteering at the expense of the community, at the expense of the dairy farmers, the wheat farmers and all other primary producers, are as great a menace to the economic system, the economic stability and the welfare of the community generally as are the communists in Australia. They are all in the same class and should receive the same consideration. They ought to be regarded with the same contempt. The Labour movement of Australia—

Mr. Oldfield: Which one?

The PREMIER: —is as much opposed to communism as it is opposed to the profiteers in the world of business. We

oppose them both and we do what is in our power legally to do to see that the community generally is protected against them. Yet the Leader of the Opposition and those associated with him in this Parliament condemn one group which is a menace and instead of condemning the other group at the other end of the scale—the profiteers in the big business world—what do the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues do? They are part and parcel of the same set-up.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Of course, that is not true.

The PREMIER: It is true beyond any shadow of doubt and the Leader of the Opposition knows that it is true.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: He does not.

The PREMIER: He does indeed. He knows that those engaged in big business are the very foundation of the Liberal Party and he knows that it could not exist as a worth-while organisation in public life without that foundation. He knows, too, that if a Liberal Party Government is in office it does everything within its power to advantage those people and help them and make them stronger and so places the community more completely under their domination and exploitation.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I know that big business has helped your party financially.

The PREMIER: So it ill becomes the Leader of the Opposition to come forward with an amendment which is so one-sided and which concentrates entirely upon one group in our community, which is a menace—namely, the Communist Party—and at the same time does not voice one word of criticism or protest against a much more powerful group which is plundering the community day in and day out by taking from it much greater profits than it is reasonable and fair to expect. As a matter of fact, it is these people in the business world—not all of them because quite a number of people play the game—who are taking unfair profits, who, to a large extent, are creating difficulties in the primary industries of this State—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: Who are they?

The PREMIER: —and are making it harder than it should be for the wheat farmer, the dairy farmer and all other primary producers.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Who are they?

The PREMIER: They are the people who make too great a profit—

Mr. Oldfield: Who are they?

The PREMIER: —upon the things which they produce, handle or distribute, often-times through many expensive channels, and which finally find their way on to the farms and at a price far in excess of what it ought to be.

Mr. Yates: You are not on safe grounds and you cannot name them.

The PREMIER: I do not desire to name them. The hon. member knows them.

Mr. Oldfield: We do not know.

The PREMIER: He knows that farmers by and large are paying too much for most of the machines which they have to buy.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Are you talking about Chamberlain's?

The PREMIER: I am talking about the business world generally. I know that the member for Mt. Lawley is out to kill one of the very few large-scale secondary industries that we have in this State.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: No, you do not know that.

The PREMIER: I should say that his reason for wanting to kill it is that he has some friendly relationships with people who are prominent in firms which are in competition with the local manufacturing industry. So this amendment is one which requires some attention and I propose to amend the amendment by moving to delete all the words after the word "but".

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are going to amend your Address-in-reply again, are you?

The PREMIER: My amendment also proposes, if my motion to delete these words succeeds, to add words expressing the regret of this House at the failure of the Liberal Party—those Liberal members in this Parliament—to protect the community against profiteering by virtue of the action of the Liberal Party in refusing the people of Western Australia the protection of price control. I move—

That the amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "but".

Mr. SPEAKER: The Premier has moved to amend the amendment by deleting all the words after the word "but". The question is that the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is cutting it a bit fine.

HON. SIR ROSS McLARTY (Murray—on amendment on amendment) [8.22]: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this amendment on the amendment, the Premier did not deal with my amendment at all but proceeded to criticise big business. He made no reply to the charge that I made. That was that he is now dominated by the leadership of Dr. Evatt and what is known as "Evattism." He was uncomfortable about it, of course, and naturally wanted to change his ground. He is adept at that and he now proposes to amend my amendment and, by force of numbers of course, he will carry it. He tries to give the impression that we stand dominated by big business.

The Minister for Housing: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That we get our funds from big business and that we cannot get candidates into Parliament unless they are approved by big business.

The Minister for Housing: Hear, hear!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: To use a mild expression, I can say that is untrue and that so far as I am concerned I have never been dominated by it. I have never been told what I should do and what I should not do. However, I will say this: When it comes to excessive profits and exploitation by any concern in this State, such action does not meet with my approval. But I would say this, too—

The Minister for Lands: What have you ever done about it?

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I would say that we have had certain experience on controls in this country that have been exercised to prevent what is called profiteering. They have been responsible for blackmarketing, dishonesty and also for a shortage of goods. I must say that I am perturbed about the Premier's suggestion and, I believe, intention, to bring in some form of control. What that control will be, I do not know.

However, I do know that the Premier is a very control-minded person. I am certain that the Premier does not believe that control should be imposed only for a certain time. He would like to see us have controls indefinitely and he would set up some bureaucracy which would examine companies, go into their financial affairs and all the other affairs connected with their business and tell them what their profit should be and whether it was a fair profit. He would have an army of people going around inquiring what they are charging and shoving them into court and interfering with their business generally. Let us make a review of the effect of this control that is so firmly entrenched in the Premier's mind. What was the position in days gone by? We know perfectly well that under control, in all States, prices continued to rise and these price-fixing authorities were nothing more than bodies created to approve of price rises.

Even in the days of Commonwealth price control, later taken over by the States, prices still continued to rise and, what is more, they rose at a faster rate under control than when control ended. We will now take the position today in regard to trade generally. We find, amongst some of these great companies to which the Premier has referred, that there is extremely keen competition. Only in this morning's paper I noticed full-page advertisements by firms who were offering goods for sale at a certain price and encouraging people to deal with this firm or that firm where the people can get the cheapest goods.

Recently I heard one business man say that if this throat-cutting competition did not cease, a number of firms would be forced out of business. The experience of all countries in regard to control, which the Premier so vehemently advocates, has been that it has led to a chaotic state of affairs. Even in wartime, when we had controls and rationing, what member of this House can deny that there was black-marketing, dishonesty and all sorts of subterfuges going on, and yet we were powerless in trying to prevent it?

The Minister for Education: You said you would keep prices down. "I tell you now."

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: So we have the Premier getting up on his feet today and talking about huge profits. I think that we do have certain profiteers in this country and that the average person has not got very much time for them, but the encouragement which profiteers received in the past is not so pronounced today as it used to be. Perhaps I have put that wrongly. I would say that the profiteer does not receive the same encouragement today as he previously did. Competition is much keener and people seek to buy on the cheapest market. Taxation is very much higher, and when a person gets above a certain income figure, I think the Commonwealth takes from him something in the vicinity of 14s. in the £.

Mr. May: If the Taxation Department can catch them.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: These great companies to which the Premier refers have to pay a flat rate of 6s. or 7s. in the £ before they can distribute any profits, and when the dividends are paid, they are taxed again in the names of the various shareholders. So I say that the Premier, in getting up and making the vehement speech that he did, in throwing innuendoes over to this side of the House that we are standing for profiteers and that we have no concern for the working man of this country, is merely indulging in political propaganda. The Premier is a past master at that, and he never fails to take any advantage that is offering.

However, I say again that the amendment which I moved to the Address-in-reply, and which the Premier is now attempting to have amended, set out to give protection to the working man and not to do him any damage. So we find again that the Premier instead of facing up to the amendment before the House—and I say he failed lamentably to do so—goes off on another track and proposes to amend his own Address-in-reply as he did previously. If I had an amendment moved to my Address-in-reply, I do not think I would amend it. I would debate it and defeat it. I hope I will never be placed in the position of having to amend my own Address-in-reply.

Mr. Heal: You will never be in that position.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier had better think much more deeply, if he ever gets the chance again to produce a speech for His Excellency to read to us, about finding one that he does not have to amend.

The Premier: The present Address would be all right if you did not amend it.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: We have a perfect right to amend the Address-in-reply.

The Premier: And we have the right to amend your amendment.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier is departing from precedent.

The Minister for Education: You are now starting to squeal.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I am not, and the Minister will kindly keep his finger down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier did not reply to my amendment; he completely side-stepped it. He did not deny the influence which I said was over him. He did not deny it.

The Premier: It is not true.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: The Premier wanted to get on more acceptable ground.

The Premier: I wanted to expose your hypocrisy.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I still stand by what I said. I suppose that this amendment the Premier has moved will be carried by force of numbers and not by logic. I can only say that I oppose his amendment and I deny the charge that my party is under the influence of big business.

The Premier: Keep your finger down.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I challenge the Premier to deny that his party has not received funds from big business.

The Premier: I think all parties receive money from big business.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: That is an admission if members like—particularly after all the criticism the Premier directed at us about accepting money from big business! The Premier now says that all parties receive money from big business.

The Premier: I did not say your party received money from big business.

Hon. Sir ROSS McLARTY: I oppose the amendment moved by the Premier.

Point of Order.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before I rise to speak I should like to know whether this amendment is in order. It seems to me that it

does not deal with the actual motion before the House. It is something entirely different. I was rather under the impression that an amendment had to deal in some way with the subject matter before the House and I would like your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on that point before I start to speak.

Mr. Speaker: In reply to the member for Mt. Lawley, I would point out that I would agree with his view if the amendment dealt with any motion other than that for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. As the member for Mt. Lawley and other members are aware, nobody when speaking to the Address-in-reply, ever deals with that subject. They deal with everything under the sun except the Address-in-reply. Accordingly I think I would be in order in treating any amendment to the Address-in-reply in the same manner, and also any amendment upon that amendment. I would say that neither the mover of the first amendment or the Premier spoke to the amendment. I allowed the Leader of the Opposition full scope to speak on any subject he wished while talking on the amendment; I permitted the Premier to do the same. Thus I repeat, I would accept the view of the member for Mt. Lawley if the amendment dealt with any motion other than for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

Debate Resumed.

HON. A. V. R. ABBOTT (Mt. Lawley—on amendment on amendment) [8.36]: I must say I was rather surprised at the heat engendered by this somewhat harmless amendment. After all it was meant to emphasise to the Government that there is a force in the Labour movement that requires careful watching by people interested in that movement.

Mr. Lawrence: How would you know that?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: This is an extremely controversial matter. In the voting in Victoria we saw a very large number of people voting for candidates who were supporting a view opposed to that held by the Premier.

Mr. May: You are really worried.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: We know that one of the senior executives of the party, the general secretary, has a very strong influence in the Labour world today.

Mr. Lawrence: Who would he be?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Mr. Chamberlain. He is an influence in that part of the Labour world that would seem to swing to those influences that favour a view so far left that one would say they are closely related to the point of view that is continually put forward by the communists. A point of view that is always being supported by communistic influences.

Mr. Lapham: Have you any particulars on that?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Nothing in particular.

Mr. Lapham: Then why do you generalise and make assertions against an individual who is not here?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: One has only to read "The Tribune" week after week to know that in that paper, which is the official publication of the Communist Party, they are continually praising the work and attitude of Dr. Evatt and others of the Labour Party; they are continually supporting the point of view they put forward.

Mr. Lawrence: When you say that Chamberlain was right with the communists, you are doing so behind parliamentary privilege.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I made no such charge at all.

Mr. Lawrence: If you were half the man that Chamberlain is you would be a good fellow.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I will not enter into that argument. All I say is that he is an extreme influence in the body now in control of the Labour Party which Dr. Evatt leads. I firmly believe, and I know the Premier is sincere, that he and his party do not have anything to do with communism in any way. But that does not mean that all the members of his party are of the same point of view; nor does it mean that all the members of the unions are of the same point of view, because we know of many cases of extreme people in control, both in the past and in the present, in industrial unions.

Of course, I know that no union can be affiliated with the Western Australian Labour Party while a communist is in control of that organisation. I understand the Collie Miners' Union cannot be so affiliated because the president, who is a paid official of the union, is an admitted communist. Some reference was made to the metal trades strike. Everyone knows that the unions in Western Australia were made the guinea pigs by the very large organisation with which the local metal trade unions were affiliated, but which were controlled by it. Three men controlled that union and two of them were communists.

Mr. Lawrence: You refused to discuss the matter further.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I can give their names. Of the three members of that council, there was Mr. Rowe, a communist; Mr. Wilson, a communist; and Mr. Cranwell, a member of the A.L.P.

Mr. Lawrence: How many men were out on strike?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Even in the local strike committee a number of its members apparently very much sympathised with the communist point of view, because it contained, for instance, Mr. Arthur Smith, who had spoken from a communist platform in Midland Junction.

Mr. Lawrence: What does a communist platform mean?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: He spoke from a platform on which communist speakers also spoke and he allied his address with theirs. Then there was Mr. Torbutt, who was also a member of that committee, and who had spoken from a communist platform on the Esplanade. He was dismissed by the State Engineering Works for distributing communist literature. Yet he was a member of the strike committee! Another member of that committee was Mr. Marks and he had spoken from a communist platform on the Esplanade. In those circumstances, can we doubt that very influential members of the committee had strong communist tendencies and were, in all probability, communists?

Mr. Lawrence: Rubbish!

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The hon. member may call it rubbish, but it was people of the nature of Mr. Rowe and Mr. Wilson who kept the unfortunate metal trades workers of Western Australia out on strike, while their colleagues were not on strike in the Eastern States. The strike in this State was one of the rolling strikes.

Mr. Lawrence: The men said they were out on strike of their own accord.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: They may say so but I have attended a few of their meetings.

Mr. Lawrence: You have not attended a union meeting in all your life. You would not be admitted.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes, I have. I attended a ship's meeting the other day.

Mr. Lawrence: If I had known that, I would have sunk the ship.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I see no reason why the Premier should have become so heated when he was asked about the policy of the Government in dealing with this influence that might get control of the unions again, because, we know the same influence undoubtedly had control in the past. Everyone knows that. Everyone has heard of faked ballots in Australia. Were it not for the legislation for ballots to be conducted by the Arbitration Court under fair and proper conditions, there would be more of them. We know that Mr. Short, who is now head of a union in New South Wales, only got that position because the court held a ballot and another man was displaced.

Mr. Lawrence: If you were closer to me and pointed the finger, I would bite it off. Where can you find better ports than those in Western Australia?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The hon. member is only a Western Australian. I should have thought the Premier would have treated this matter in a quiet mood, and not flared up. I have never before heard him make such a soapbox speech as he did tonight.

The Premier: Did you get a shock?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Usually, the Premier is a cool, logical and keen debater, but tonight he was flaring and waving his arms about. He threw insults left and right as though he had no other means of defence. We know there has been a disturbance in the Labour Party in this State because a number of its delegates apparently failed to carry out certain instructions which they did not think were fair and reasonable. They were pilloried before the organisation in this State. What did the Premier say about it? He did a very logical and reasonable thing. He said, "We will not punish them now. We will let the selection ballots deal with them." The selection ballots did deal with them by confirming the attitude of Mr. Burke and Mr. Beazley.

Mr. Lawrence: No, they did not.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Yes, they did because those candidates romped home in the selection ballot.

The Premier: Why did Senator Tangney win the Senate ballot by an overwhelming majority, when in the same ballot there was a candidate who was pro-Burke and Beazley?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: She won the selection ballot last time.

The Premier: What has that to do with it?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I think she is a very popular little woman. I have travelled with her several times and she is a charming person. But that is by the way. The voters of the Perth seat had the right to confirm or reject Mr. Burke, but they confirmed his point of view by what I would call a strong majority.

The Premier: Mr. Beazley and Mr. Burke saved their situations by refusing to join the the Joshua-Mullens group.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not see why they should join that group.

The Premier: You would have liked to see them join it.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: They were brought to book because they thought the conduct of the Evatt group was unfair. Members opposite are always talking about the rank and file having control, but I have not seen a party so dominated from the top as the Labour Party.

The Minister for Lands: Except the Liberal Party. You do not even have a selection ballot in your party.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: A few officials were able to dispense with the services of all the elected executive in Victoria, and if that is not government from the top, I do not know what is. Three men in the Ironworkers' Union were able to call out on strike all the metal trades workers in Western Australia.

The Premier: How is your struggle to get party endorsement going on?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I am struggling for endorsement. I know that there are a couple of Labour candidates doing likewise.

The Minister for Housing: You are struggling with some of your colleagues at present.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not know who they are.

The Premier: There is one sitting behind you.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: We must not treat this matter too lightly. When tempers become frayed—and they were frayed a little tonight—members usually relent and return to a proper frame of mind and discuss the subject reasonably. I ask, what is there about this amendment to cause members to become excited? It says—

But in view of the impact of industrial unrest in Australia on the increasing economic difficulties facing this country—

We know of the economic difficulties in New South Wales. The industrial unrest there is so great that the Premier is at his wits' end to know what to do. He even called on Mr. Menzies to convene a conference of other Premiers to help him out of his difficulties.

There is nothing wrong with the wording of that portion of the amendment and nobody should take offence at it. Any industrial unrest in the great cities of Australia—Melbourne and Sydney—has a very serious effect on the economy of this State because we are not able to procure steel supplies and the hundred and one other things we need. To continue with the wording of the amendment—

—this House regrets that your Government has not indicated what steps it intends to take to counter communistic influence in sections of the trade union movement.

The Premier knows that there is communistic influence in sections of the trade union movement. Has not Mr. Latter a strong influence in a certain union and is he not giving the Government trouble now?

The Premier: Not half as much trouble as the politically dishonest agreement which your Government made with Amalgamated Collieries. That is the basis of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Premier to keep order and refrain from interjecting.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The Premier is being occasioned some worry by Mr. Latter and his communistic influence at Collie. So is the Minister for Mines. They are doing all they can to avert trouble, and I suggest that, but for Mr. Latter and his communistic influence, their task would be very much easier. Everyone in Western Australia realises that Mr. Eddie Ward is a politician who is a very close ally of Dr. Evatt's. There is no doubt that Dr. Evatt has encouraged the leftist group in the Labour movement and that a great many honest and genuine Labour men who were strongly averse to communism have been expelled. I believe that members here are equally opposed to communism, but some people feel that this is a real danger. Rightly or wrongly, that is their feeling. Those men who were expelled from the party did what they could to avert the danger, and it would have been much wiser for the Labour movement had it retained those men and their influence in the unions. In common with other members, each of them had only one vote.

The Minister for Lands: You in your party do not have that.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I think we do. Dr. Evatt felt that his power was being menaced and undoubtedly it was. His followers had a similar feeling, and probably Mr. Chamberlain felt that his power was being menaced and so they said, "Let us remove this influence while we have a chance." We know that this amendment cannot be carried, but its whole object is to suggest to the Government that this communistic influence is a danger. We have a number of communists in this State. I have a number in my electorate of Mt. Lawley, far too many, some 600 or 700.

The Premier: There would not be so many as that.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: There is quite a number.

The Premier: But how do you get those figures?

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: A communist stood against me at the last election. I suggest that those who voted for him were communists and that those who made their papers informal would not have Val Abbott at any price. There was a large number of informal votes—a fact that I freely admit.

This amendment could have been treated much more seriously by the Premier. He endeavoured to create a diversion by debating big business. I do not propose to discuss that subject now, because I expect it will be debated within a few days and no doubt the Premier will join in the debate. That is the time when the subject should be discussed, and not now. My views and those of the Premier differ strongly on this point, but in regard to communism, I think that he has thoughts very much like my

own and that he would like to do something so that communistic influence will not gain control of the unions. The Premier does not want trouble in industrial circles and he needs to be very careful because the communists are very clever.

I believe that Mr. Latter is a Bachelor of Engineering and a trained communist—a man trained for his present job. I think he was a member of the Seamen's Union for a while and he has been trained in communistic tactics. Although a Bachelor of Engineering, he went to Collie and worked as an ordinary labourer until he could make his way up to become president of the union. Those are communist tactics and show how clever these men are. A communist who will spend four or five years as a labourer, although he holds a degree of Bachelor of Engineering, represents a very serious danger.

The Premier: The point is that there has been very little industrial trouble at Collie.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: If communists gain control, the Premier is likely to have much more trouble and surely he does not want that! Which unions are causing most trouble? We are always having trouble with Mr. Troy and Mr. Latter, whose admitted policy is one of destruction.

Mr. Lawrence: Do not talk such rot.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: Have not we had trouble with Mr. Troy? He works on the waterfront.

Mr. Lawrence: Talk about something of which you have knowledge.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: The hon. member does not know everything. He might know South Fremantle, and something about football.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: He does not know much about that.

Hon. A. V. R. ABBOTT: I do not want to enlarge on this subject. I hope that other members on the Government side will look at the amendment in the way in which it is meant, and appreciate the danger that we face, and treat this proposition as a friendly warning.

HON. A. F. WATTS (Stirling—on amendment on amendment) [9.0]: I am terribly sorry that the Premier did not give us what I might call a considered reply to the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition because it would be most interesting to me to know what his reactions are to the amendment. All he has done is to fail to cover the majority of the ground in the amendment, and then he has moved to strike out all the words except the first. I suppose that in speaking to the Premier's amendment I am in the position of offering reasons, if I wish to, against why the words should not be struck out. In other words, I am in

the same position as I would be if I were supporting the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Hon. A. F. WATTS: Thank you, Sir. I cannot view this situation from the point of view of either the Leader of the Opposition or the Premier. I feel that the question involved in the amendment has much wider horizons than those that have been discussed up to the present time. Before dealing with what the Premier said, I would like to remind him that price control was maintained by the Government with which the Leader of the Opposition and I were associated, until at least some time in 1953. Therefore it was not, I suggest to the Premier and to the community, so much a matter of not having price control when circumstances warranted it, as of having slowly, and in my case a little more slowly, come to the conclusion that it would not achieve any further useful purpose.

It was not a question of abolishing price control at the first opportunity, because for the whole period of the Government in question the legislation remained on the statute book, and was for some years strictly enforced because the Prices Commissioner was left to his own devices. One day during a period when I happened to be Acting Minister for Prices for a fortnight, I found myself in the unfortunate position of signing complaints for 19 charges against a person in my electorate. So, one realised that the commissioner was a man who was no respecter of persons, but administered the law as it stood on the statute book at the time. That is all I have to say about the references made by the Premier to price control. It remained in being until such time as, I believe, there was a bona fide belief—after six years of its continuance—that it had lost its effectiveness.

I now come back to the matter with which the Premier did not in any way attempt to deal—the question of the communistic influence in Australia. As I said, I believe it covers wider horizons than those that have yet been discussed. I suppose that nobody in this Parliament, and few if any people in Western Australia, wish to impose their way of life or their methods upon the peoples of other countries. I think the belief is growing, and is now held by virtually all people in this State, that we must learn to live in the world with other people, no matter what their methods of government are, if they will leave us in peace.

So, we would not attempt to send our agents to endeavour to convert the nationals of another country to our way of thinking, and then to use those nationals for the purpose of subverting the institutions and probably the government of that country. But that is what the communistic ideology dictates and what it has

been doing to a great number of the western democracies, and what it most certainly has been doing in Australia. We know perfectly well, although it may not be here on the gigantic scale that it is in other countries of the world where there has been continual disruption as a consequence, that infiltration has existed in this country, and today it does exist and has existed for a considerable time.

It is not something new. It is something which has been with us for many years and has occasioned great concern not only among the people who are not associated with industrial unions, but among those who have been closely associated with those unions for a great number of years. I have no animus of any kind against trade unionism. In fact, I believe, because of many things with which I am closely associated myself, that collective bargaining is the only method by which reasonable conditions can be achieved in some cases. But I want to make certain that these industrial trade unions are left to carry on their normal functions consistent with the good Australian way of life and the good domestic methods which we have been accustomed to employ.

We know, as I said, that there have been moving in our midst for a good number of years, elements which have attempted to uproot them. One has only to turn to the daily newspapers of 1949 to see where, under the authority of the Prime Minister of Australia at that time, Rt. Hon. J. B. Chifley, full page advertisements appeared calling on the trade unionists of this country to drive the communists from their midst. Day after day, practically speaking, for weeks, and at tremendous cost to the Commonwealth Government of that time, these advertisements appeared. Why was this done? Surely, only to draw to the attention of the people of Australia the fact that these elements were present and must be combated by responsible government!

Having reached that stage, we know that the same influences have been at work, but there did grow up, as I understand the position, in the trade union movement, particularly in the greater populations of the Eastern States of the Commonwealth, active resistance in the trade unions to the growth of these influences, with extremely beneficial results. For some reason that I do not know—but one must give them a name—they were referred to as “the industrial groups”, but it was undoubted that they attained a reputation throughout Australia for bringing what I call these good domestic influences back into a considerable proportion, at all events, of the unions that had been affected by the infiltration—I think that word will cover the position. Then all of a sudden we find that they are attacked

and it appears that the spearhead of the attack is the Leader of the Australian Labour Party.

At this distance from the hon. gentleman it is difficult for me to appreciate the reasons which caused him to do it, but we do know—or it appears to us in this way—that as a consequence of the attacks that he made on these particular organisations, not only has the Labour Party in the Eastern States been almost split from top to bottom, but also there has been some resurgence, in certain unions, of the communist influence, as demonstrated by one or two recent ballots that have taken place. I say that Australia cannot afford to allow this kind of influence to have any resurgence at all.

It is the duty of every one of us to indicate, as far as we can, what we are prepared to do in order to prevent this influence becoming a greater menace than it is. It is the duty of everyone to endeavour to keep it out of any organisation with which he is associated. Now there has been, I would say since the quarrels—more particularly in the Eastern States admittedly—that were developed, as far as the public can ascertain, substantially by Dr. Evatt, this resurgence which I spoke of, and it cannot be other than detrimental, as I see it, to the Australian people.

Certainly, it is high time that the Labour Party took stock of itself, because I feel that there are many members in the rank and file of the Labour Party and many people who are supporters of it, who are desperately worried today, in view of all that has taken place, as to where it is going and what is going to eventuate when the resistance—as I have seen it—which started with the appeals by Mr. Chifley seven or eight years ago, and which was built up against the infiltration of the communistic influence into these industrial organisations, has been slowly but surely broken down.

As I see it, that is what the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is asking, but the Government has not indicated what steps it intends to take to combat this menace, if it should arise, and I am convinced that to a degree it is here already. I have noticed also, as have other members of the House, what have been called the summit talks between the Big Four and I am hopeful that as regards hostilities, the net result will be that these talks will succeed, but I am satisfied that if they do succeed it will not be because of the desire of the communist section of the negotiators necessarily to keep the peace of the world—to keep away from hostilities—but because both sides are equally frightened now of what the result of hostilities might be in view of the scientific developments of recent times.

Assuming that they do reach agreement about hostilities, there are more ways of conquering the world than by force of arms. Had the late Adolf Hitler realised that, he might today have been the controller of a great part of this globe. The communist influence, as it has reached out into other countries and is reaching out into them now, can reach out to Australia and undermine some of our most cherished and worth-while organisations and ways of life. I am not for one moment suggesting that change is all bad; far from it. Change, in many cases, means progress, and progress, if it is likely to achieve good, should be welcomed at all times.

It is not that I am afraid of change arrived at by the methods to which I am accustomed—the democratic way, as we call it, of trial and error and discussion—but that I am afraid of what we might be going to have if there is not some determined resistance of a national character, joined in by everybody, including the trade union movement, to this infiltration as the years go by becoming worse and worse and more difficult to combat, because these people are very shrewd and capable and are not to be underestimated.

We have only to read current literature to ascertain that, and people like the Federal Leader of the Labour Party—a man who ought to be one of the highest judgment and capable of assessing a problem of this nature—is not making any great contribution to the welfare of the country by taking the attitude that he has taken, as Leader of the Opposition, in belittling the commission of inquiry and fighting battles on the hustings—whatever his beliefs are—and in court at times, while still leader of the most important political organisation in Australia, for the communists. In doing that he is not making a contribution to the welfare of this country and so I cannot see that there is anything in this amendment that should have aroused the ire of the Premier. I would have preferred him to give a considered and sensible reply to the points that the amendment and the speech which accompanied it endeavoured to make and so, believing that, I have no option but to offer my opposition to the Premier's amendment on the amendment to strike out all words after the word "but".

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
(Hon. W. Hegney—Mt. Hawthorn—on amendment on amendment) [9.19]: I do not propose to take up a great deal of time in connection with the amendment, but wish to say at the outset that it is a very feeble result on the part of the Liberal Party and apparently also the Country Party, after many long months of trying to determine what the method of attack should be when Parliament opened.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: This is not an attack.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I repeat that many months of consideration must have been given to what the method of attack should be when Parliament opened and the statements which have been made this evening by members opposite—I think the member for Stirling made the most valuable contribution, although it lacked sincerity in view of the circumstances under which his remarks were delivered—indicate that the Opposition is at its wits' end to find some concrete criticism of the Government. Last evening I listened closely to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and other speakers and when one examines those remarks one realises that there has been no definite or justifiable criticism of the actions of this Government over the past two years.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You are a self-satisfied individual.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As I say, this is a feeble and I hope futile attempt on the part of the Opposition to embarrass the Government. This attempt is the result of many long months of thinking.

Mr. Oldfield: Make your own speech and not the Premier's.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member will have an opportunity to make a speech if he wishes. I am indicating what I think has actuated the launching of this amendment. It is an attempt to try to embarrass the Government and, in other words, it is a start in the impending Federal and State election campaigns, which will take place shortly. Let me point out the hypocrisy of the Leader of the Opposition and those he represents. He started his speech by saying that this was the most socialistic Government that had ever occupied office in Western Australia.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: True.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: He said that it believed in controls and monopolies. Some years ago I mentioned that when the present Opposition held office from 1947 to 1953, a period of six years, the socialistic undertakings—to use the Leader of the Opposition's own terms—established by various Labour Governments over many years—and to name a few I shall refer to the State Saw Mills, the Wyndham Meat Works, the State Shipping Service, the State Brickworks, the State Electricity Commission and the State hotels—were carried on. Yet that was a Government which stood for private enterprise, full and complete, and even though it had the opportunity, had it so desired, to abolish or dispose of these so-called socialistic undertakings, in actual fact it extended them in certain directions.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: It is hard to dispose of them once they have been established.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Let us have a look at the monopoly which the Leader of the Opposition talks about and the control which we want to exercise. In 1948 the present Leader of the Country Party introduced a Bill to amend the Workers' Compensation Act. He was in charge of that Act and among other amendments included in the Bill was one aimed at giving the State Insurance Office a complete control and monopoly over the insurance for the mining industry of Western Australia.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Minister supporting the deletion of the words?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: No, I am not supporting the deletion of the words I am supporting the deletion of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister must give his reasons for so doing.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I shall do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister must stick reasonably close to the subject matter under discussion.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I want to preface my remarks because that aspect was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition when speaking to the amendment. Now let me quote the first part of the amendment moved by the hon. member. It reads—

But, in view of the impact of industrial unrest in Australia on the increasing economic difficulties facing this country, this House regrets that your Government has not indicated what steps it intends to take to counter communistic influence in sections of the trade union movement

First of all, the Commonwealth Court of Arbitration recently increased marginal rates by a considerable sum. The Commonwealth Public Service Arbitrator also increased Commonwealth Public Service salaries by substantial amounts, but such increase is the subject of appeal to the Commonwealth Arbitration Court.

The Commonwealth Liberal Party Government substantially increased the salaries of highly placed officers in the Commonwealth Public Service. Does that indicate that there is any impending economic regression in Australia? Only yesterday, in our own State Arbitration Court, His Honour Mr. Justice Neville decided to grant to workers who are working under awards and agreements of the State Arbitration Court an increase of 5s. 11d. His considered judgment does not indicate that this will increase the economic difficulties facing this country.

Mr. Oldfield: You agree with his decision, do you not?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am glad of that interjection. It is one of the few sensible ones made by the member for Maylands. Since the Commonwealth Arbitration Court delivered its findings, the State Government of Western Australia has done its utmost to ensure that the appropriate marginal increases are paid to all Government workers in this State. Only the other day the Teachers' Union indicated that its members were completely satisfied with the attitude adopted by the Government and with the increased margins that had been effected. The same applies throughout the Public Service, the trade unions and other branches of public works; it is conducive to industrial peace.

The Leader of the Opposition did not quote any figures to show the number of industrial disputes that have taken place over the past few years. As a matter of fact this State has been relieved of any major industrial dispute and I suggest that the Government, having done its best in that direction, has demonstrated to the trade unions that it is anxious to see that fair and reasonable conditions are granted and operate from time to time.

Now to get on to the other part of the amendment which makes reference to communistic influences in trade unions. As I have done on previous occasions, I make no apology for saying that when the communist organisation first started in Australia—I think it was in 1922—action was taken by the trade union movement. Two of the big unions in Australia—I refer to the A.W.U. and the Federated Clerks Union—have in their constitutions a provision that no member of the union who is a member of an organisation—and the Communist Party is the organisation mainly aimed at—which has for its objects the overthrow of constitutional Government shall be entitled to hold office. Under the constitution of the Labour Party of Western Australia no member of the communist or any other party is entitled to hold office in the State executive or in any branch of the A.L.P. and indeed no union which has one or more members of the communist party amongst its officers is entitled to be affiliated with the A.L.P.

You, Mr. Speaker, have made a close study of industrial affairs and the attitude which should be adopted in regard to organisations generally. I say that the control of the trade unions of Western Australia, or of any other part of Australia, can at all times be in the hands of good Australians, honest trade unionists, if they can only throw off the apathy and indifference which unfortunately is present in many trade unions.

The Premier: And in many other organisations.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, not only in industrial organisations but in others. As a matter of fact, in the Federal sphere, the Commonwealth Arbitration Act was amended some years ago to grant to any number of members of a union the right to approach the court to hold ballots to elect officers and to have control exercised by the court and not by any member of the union.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: That has been useful, has it not?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes, and yet, knowing that this motion is being used for political purposes, I say in all sincerity that when the average decent Australian cares to take an active interest in his union, he controls it and makes it work in accordance with the Australian way of life and sentiment.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Tell us what you think of the destruction of the influence of the groups.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition that this is just an attempt to embarrass the Government to try to influence the minds of the public against the Labour Government in Western Australia.

Hon. A. V. R. Abbott: Why should it embarrass the Government?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not embarrassing the Government, but that is its object. At all times I am one of those who are prepared to accept the decision of the people, and I believe that the people of Western Australia will not be influenced by a very subtle attempt to embarrass the Government by criticising its actions over the past 2½ years. I thought that, if the Leader of the Opposition, acting on behalf of Opposition members generally, had any strong objection to the action of the Labour Government, he would have voiced it in a straightforward manner, but he read the Governor's Speech, paragraph by paragraph, and made some comments that were very innocuous.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: In your mind.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am entitled to express what is in my mind. Then the Leader of the Opposition finishes up with this resolution, which has been cooked up with a view to trying to divert the minds of the public from realising what this Government, despite all the difficulties, is attempting to do in the interests of the people. Reference was made to price control which could have some bearing on industrial peace and harmony. I do not wish to impose on your good nature at this stage, Mr. Speaker, but suffice it to say that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mt. Lawley conveniently forgot to tell the House that from the time the Commonwealth

Government relinquished price control, their Government took up the running from 1947 and 1952 inclusive and introduced a Bill to continue it at each successive session. However, in the year in which this Government took office, what did we find? In 1952, the previous Government introduced a Bill to continue price fixing legislation for one year and included a small paragraph to repeal the Profiteering Prevention Act. Now we are not able to use either piece of legislation.

When that continuance Bill was introduced in 1953, the Legislative Council threw it out. Actually, this Government has never had a reasonable opportunity to ensure that price control would have some measure of effect on rising prices. So I hope the House will not agree to the amendment that has been submitted by the Leader of the Opposition because, as I said earlier, I believe it has been put forward after months of consideration and, if I am any judge at all, this move stems from the Federal organisation of the Liberal Party in view of the fact that there will be a Federal election before Christmas, and I am sure that from now on—although I do not blame them for it—the Opposition will use every effort to try to mislead the people of Western Australia in regard to what this Government has done—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: You were pretty good at that, too.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:—and will try to mix up State politics with Commonwealth politics. However, I believe the people of Western Australia will judge this Government on its actions—

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: I hope so.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:—and I am at all times willing to trust the people in that direction.

HON. D. BRAND (Greenough—on amendment on amendment) [9.34]: Like the previous speaker, I do not propose to delay the House, but I would like to quote from a speech made by the Minister who has just resumed his seat on the 25th August, 1949, when he was member for Pilbara, and which appears on page 1485 of the 1949 Parliamentary Debates. This is what he said—

Anything I say, however, will be of a purely political nature, not personal. I take this opportunity—it may be one of the last that some of us will have, although I am not a pessimist—of expressing my appreciation to members on both sides of the House for the goodwill and personal friendship they have shown to me since I have been a member

. . . . Before I resume my seat, I may say a few hard things about the parties comprising the Government.

Then he went on, I think, for some four hours quoting from "The West Australian"

in respect to the qualities and the publicity relative to the two parties in the coalition.

Now, the Minister for Education accuses the Leader of the Opposition of being hypocritical in moving this amendment. I know that he was talking politically and not personally, and I feel sure, as the Leader of the Country Party said last night, that history is repeating itself because, in that four hours of speechifying by the present Minister for Education in 1949, there was a great deal of political hypocrisy. This amendment stems from the belief that the country will revert to an industrial revolution, as it was at the time the late Ben Chifley had to take such stringent measures—and he was a Labour Prime Minister of great merit at the time—when he recognised that the whole influence and the whole of the trouble that was causing the industrial crisis during that period was brought about by the activities of communism.

We believe that, not only the Liberal Party, the Country Party and conservative organisations of that kind are a bulwark against communism, but also that the Labour Party can be a great bulwark against it and can in fact resist communists in places where other political parties have little influence, namely, in the trade union groups themselves. As a result of the activities of communism in those days, industrial groups were established by true Labour men who appreciated the danger of communism in their midst and its threat to the economic and national life of Australia.

Judging from what one sees in the Press at the present time there appears to be an upsurge of industrial crisis and union difficulty generally. I would point out that this follows a situation where the industrial groups have been divided in the political and industrial world. Their real power has been attacked and that attack has been led by none other than the acknowledged Leader of the Federal Labour Party, Dr. Evatt. Surely we cannot be accused of being hypocritical in drawing the attention of the people of this State to that situation; even although we know that Western Australia has a fair industrial record—

The Minister for Lands: What action would you take?

Hon. D. BRAND:—the fact remains that as this State becomes more industrialised, and as there are more and more unions and greater membership of those unions, we will find that the communists will be in ever-increasing numbers in an endeavour to undermine those unions and organisations of workers. No one can deny that. Accordingly we urge upon the Government some action to discourage this move; we urge that it should say on the public platform that it is prepared to take action against these men.

We know that when we formed the Government and following the metal trades strike, we strengthened the power of the Arbitration Court to deal with strikers and the like. We said so at the time and you know well, Sir, the people who would be most affected would not be the law-abiding unionists but those who were undermining the economy and implementing strikes, not for the purpose of getting better conditions for the workers as a whole, but with the idea of bringing about great difficulties and creating industrial strife and chaos and setting us back in our programme of industrial development.

Therefore we appeal to this Government to do something; even though when in Opposition they said they would make an issue of repealing those penal clauses which we included in the Industrial Arbitration Act. I am not sure that it may not be said that only a half-hearted attempt was made to remove those clauses; they still remain in the Arbitration Act. There was a time not so long ago when unionists in Collie felt that they might use some of those clauses to safeguard their unity. Mention has been made of Mr. Latter, president of the Collie Miners' Union. We know he is working surely, but truly, to one end. We know that he is creating embarrassment for the Premier, the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Labour, whether they are prepared to admit it or not.

Accordingly we believe that no attempt should be made to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act to allow these people to carry on without fear of being fined or penalised. We feel that the Government should take a stand and that it should in every corner and on every occasion make sure that the genuine unionist, the man who is opposed to communism, should come out and fight it. The Government should be prepared to give them moral support at least, if it does nothing else.

Mr. Moir: The people to whom you are referring stand up for their rights and they are branded as communists by you people.

Hon. D. BRAND: Not at all.

The Minister for Lands: You are just stirring up a mare's nest.

Hon. D. BRAND: How very foolish of the Minister for Lands to say that when the whole of the Labour movement has been split from top to bottom; when men like Joshua and Burke have seen fit to risk their political future and sit apart from the party led by Dr. Evatt.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: And what happened to them?

Hon. D. BRAND: They have been outed and that is our concern. Joshua has not been outed, but the party as a whole suffered some defeat in the Victorian elections.

Mr. Moir: The electors of Victoria did that.

Hon. D. BRAND: Yes; they voted for a Liberal-Country Party Government. These people who are grouped in the Federal House have been prepared to take a stand. They know it is most likely that with the organisation behind Dr. Evatt they will not get endorsement or get the full support of the unions.

Mr. Lawrence: How do you know?

Hon. D. BRAND: I am assuming so. It could easily be that a state of affairs would follow in the Federal sphere as occurred in Victoria.

The Minister for Lands: Why not speak about Western Australia?

Hon. D. BRAND: I will certainly speak about Western Australia. We believe that in spite of our very good industrial record there should be vigilance on the part of the Government, the Opposition and everybody else to see that communism does not enter here. It is our fear that what is happening through the elimination of industrial groups, and through those people who are prepared to work within the union, might quite easily lead to communism coming to Western Australia.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: It is here, now.

Hon. D. BRAND: It could come in such force as to cause disunity and trouble similar to that which exists in the Eastern States.

Mr. Lawrence: They are allowed to stand for elections.

Hon. D. BRAND: I know that, and I trust they always will be. But nevertheless small as their representation may be, they have been able to exert a great influence on the economic and industrial life of the State so much so that the late Leader of the Labour Party tackled them through the Press and urged every unionist to stand by the principles of arbitration. We all know that communists do not stand by arbitration.

Mr. Lawrence: You would know more about communists than I do.

Hon. D. BRAND: Do not talk such utter rubbish! I am only grateful that it has never come my way to know so much as the member for South Perth.

Mr. Yates: You mean the member for South Fremantle.

Hon. D. BRAND: That is so, and my deepest and sincerest apologies go to the member for South Perth. With those few words I support our own amendment and I feel that the amendment of the Premier to place the responsibility of industrial difficulties—

Mr. Ross Hutchinson: His amendment is to delete all the words after the word "but."

Hon. D. BRAND: I know that, but it purports to include in place of the words proposed to be struck out an amendment which says that the action of the Liberal Party in not allowing price fixing has brought about a difficult economic situation in this State. We know that price fixing is not the solution. It does not matter how much talk there is in this House or anywhere else, price fixing and price control are not the solution. The solution is more work by everybody; a better day's pay for a better day's work.

Communism is the very thing which aims at giving us less work for the money that is paid, breaks down the returns of industry, and upsets the whole economic situation. This can lead only to Australia being placed in a weaker position to compete with countries outside. We are still so dependent on our primary industries that we must compete with countries outside and if we are to cut down our costs, we must deal with the communists and return to industrial peace.

HON. L. THORN (Toodyay—on amendment on amendment) [9.51]: The main object of the Leader of the Opposition in moving the amendment to the Address-in-reply this evening was to give the Labour Party an opportunity of expressing its views on the Labour upheaval in the Federal sphere.

The Minister for Lands: It is very kind of you.

Hon. L. THORN: Nothing would please the present Labour Government better than to support the industrial groups. It knows that in the history of the industrial groups, they have done more to deal with the communist threat to the Labour movement than any other section of the party. They know that Dr. Evatt is out to destroy the industrial groups. I say to the Labour Party that the risk is too great.

The Minister for Lands: What are you out for?

Hon. L. THORN: I am out to help the Labour Party to defeat communism. I know deep in my own heart that although members on the opposite side are ridiculing statements made by members on this side, they would give half their salaries to be able to support the industrial groups, because they know that those comprise loyal members of the Labour Party. I do not know if members opposite like the mention of the name of Dr. Evatt. It seems to upset them because he has proved himself to be an absolute communist sympathiser.

Mr. Lawrence: He is a lovable chap.

The Minister for Lands: You are talking tommyrot.

Hon. L. THORN: It is not tommyrot. He seems to be a pretty good friend of the hon. member and that is why he gets so annoyed. We know that Dr. Evatt and

Mr. Ward, the member for East Sydney, have caused a great upheaval in the Labour movement, and we know that loyal supporters of the Labour Party have proved themselves right down through the years, like the Federal members for Perth and Fremantle. Nothing gave me greater pleasure this evening than to hear about those two candidates getting Labour endorsement.

The Minister for Lands: But you would oppose them.

Hon. L. THORN: It is only natural that if candidates of our party are contesting the seats, we would endeavour to defeat the Labour candidates, but that does not detract from their loyalty to the Labour movement.

The Minister for Lands: What is the Labour movement? How long have you been interested in it?

Hon. L. THORN: The hon. member knows that what I am saying is right.

The Minister for Lands: I want to know where your interest lies.

Hon. L. THORN: I know that when the Minister sat on this side of the House he declared his attitude as a socialist.

The Minister for Lands: We can run our own party without your help.

Hon. L. THORN: The Minister seems to be the most exasperating member in this House and all he can say is "Rot" or shake his shoulders.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. L. THORN: This evening the metal trades strike was mentioned. When that strike was on I was Minister for Labour. Day after day the Premier of the day and I interviewed Mr. Chamberlain, the Trades Hall secretary, and Mr. Webb to try and terminate the strike. In one instance Mr. Monk, together with the secretary of the Metal Trades Federation, came over to this State. Along with Mr. Chamberlain, they appealed to us to do all we could to stop the strike, and we did. It was not the fault of the McLarty-Watts Government that that strike continued.

We know the leaders here were under instructions from the communists in Melbourne and Sydney to keep the strike moving. It was a pitiful state of affairs. Let us examine the cause of the strike. The real start was when two communists in the Midland Junction Workshops applied for sick leave which they used for organising the communists in this State to go out on strike. It is of no use for members on the opposite side of the House to get cross about this matter because I know that in their hearts they are very unhappy indeed with the present situation. I congratulate them on their tactics in keeping out of this fight, and they have done pretty well up to date.

The sad part about it is that, firstly, it is a published fact that men like Latter, Troy and Hird boast about being communists. The sad feature of it is that after the great work done by the industrial groups in getting numerous communists out of executive positions in the unions, we find today that they are getting back. Who is responsible for it? The Leader of the Federal Labour Party and those backing him up. There is not the slightest doubt about that. He has given the communists every encouragement. Without repeating what other members have said this evening, I say that, by his actions, he has proved himself to be an absolute communist sympathiser. So to the Premier and most of his Cabinet whom we highly respect—

Mr. Lawrence: You are putting up a very weak argument.

Hon. L. THORN: The hon. member appears to be a bit weak, and if he took his coat off we would probably find his South Fremantle guernsey on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. L. THORN: I conclude on this note: I know that the present Labour Government of this State would be very happy if all this trouble could be cleaned up and if it could eventually support the industrial groups. Those groups make up the backbone of the Labour movement; there is not the slightest doubt about it.

Mr. Lawrence: Why do you not join them?

Hon. L. THORN: If I were an industrialist receiving the protection of the unions and enjoying the benefits which the unions have brought about by their representations to the employers, I would be happy to join them. There was a stage when I was a unionist.

Mr. Lawrence: Come down to Fremantle and I shall enrol you.

The Minister for Lands: You are a capitalist now.

Hon. L. THORN: When I was on the land we had a wonderful organisation looking after the men working on the land. That was the primary producers' organisation, which I joined.

The Minister for Lands: And now you have allied yourself with the Liberal Party, of all people!

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: The Minister is an Evattite up to the back teeth.

Hon. L. THORN: Of course he is, and he is getting nasty! I congratulate the Premier and the other Ministers for maintaining decorum; but the Minister for Lands is getting angry. It has been pointed out by every speaker on this side, and I repeat it, that we have nothing against the unionist. He is entitled to have his organisation to protect himself, the same as everybody

else is. If I were receiving the benefits and protection of the unionist movement, I would be a loyal unionist. Do not make any mistake about that! I would not be supporting Dr. Evatt and his gang.

The Minister for Lands: You have sold the farmers out; that is what you have done!

MR. OLDFIELD (Maylands—on amendment on amendment) [10.21]: I can never recall any debate in which members on the Government side have shown such a marked reluctance to participate as they have done in connection with this one. There have been two speakers on the Government side on the matter before the House. First of all there was the Premier, who moved an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Leader of the Opposition; and I have never heard the Premier make such a shocking speech. In fact, his speech contained nothing of logic; and, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, all he contributed was arm-throwing, stamping and raving; and his whole attack, if I may borrow the words of the little doctor, was full of malicious and slanderous statements.

After one or two other speakers on this side, the Premier was followed by the Minister for Education, and I have never heard him labour along at such great length and contribute just nothing to the debate. At one time you, Sir, were compelled to bring him back to the matter before the House, and that flabbergasted the Minister for Education so much that he did not know what he was speaking on. He said he was speaking in support of the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, when he intended to say that he was speaking to the proposal to delete the words.

One of the questions that is exercising the minds of the electors of Western Australia today is: Just where is this Labour Government of ours going? They are aware of where the Cain Labour Government in Victoria is going.

Hon. Sir Ross McLarty: Has gone!

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes, has gone. They are aware of where the Cahill Government of New South Wales will go—

The Minister for Housing: You hope!

Mr. OLDFIELD: —after the elections which are about to take place.

The Minister for Housing: It may go where the Tasmanian Government went.

Mr. OLDFIELD: Some Eastern States Labour Governments have allied themselves irrevocably to the policy of Evattism which is setting out to destroy any group of individuals which sets itself up to oppose the communist march in Australia.

If we analyse the history of this fellow Dr. Evatt, who is leading the Labour Party to destruction, we find that throughout his

whole political career he has done his utmost to further the cause of communists at every turn. We remember that when he was first made Attorney General in the Curtin Government in 1941—

Mr. Lawrence: Tell us his history before that! You do not know it.

Mr. OLDFIELD:—one of his first actions was to release communists who had been imprisoned by direction of the previous Prime Minister, Mr. R. G. Menzies. We find that later on he appeared for the communists in the courts of Australia. At other times he appeared for communist-dominated unions in the courts, and he cost Australia hundreds of thousands of pounds by talking for days on end with a view to having declared invalid anti-communist legislation, going even to the extent of appearing before the Privy Council. We find again that in recent months he appeared before a Royal Commission in the role of protector of these people.

The Minister for Housing: Of his staff.

Mr. Lawrence: Who were they?

Mr. OLDFIELD: He appeared for communists who had been in his employ.

Mr. Lawrence: Who were they?

Mr. OLDFIELD: We find that, having been thwarted in his attempts before that Royal Commission, and having been chided and chastised, he seized upon this mythical business to defend himself and make a scapegoat of somebody else—anybody else so long as Dr. Evatt was not the person who was going to be charged with the responsibility of destroying the Labour Party! He went out and attacked the industrial groups. He set out to destroy them. There had to be some blood-letting, and it was either he or somebody else; so he seized on this unfortunate group of people, who had done a magnificent job in bringing peace into industrial relationships in this country.

The whole of Australia is aware of what is happening under Dr. Evatt's rule. We see what is occurring in Victoria today. Earlier, by way of interjection, our red-and-white fellow here asked what had happened to the people in Victoria who had decided to draw away from the doubtful leadership of Dr. Evatt. It was stated that they were defeated at the poll. As the Deputy Leader of my party said, they were defeated at the poll for the good reason that the people decided to vote by an absolute majority for the Liberal Party and the Country Party. What has happened in Victoria since the Victorian elections? The old Labour executive in Victoria has been unconstitutionally done away with. There is an article in a paper before me headed, "The Reds Win."

The Minister for Housing: What is the name of the paper?

The Minister for Lands: The "News Review."

Mr. OLDFIELD: Yes, the "News Review." Will the Minister deny the truth of the article in this paper?

The Minister for Housing: It is a Liberal Party rag.

Mr. OLDFIELD: The Minister cannot deny the truth of the statement I am about to read, because it has appeared in Eastern States papers.

The Minister for Housing: That does not make it true.

Mr. OLDFIELD: It has appeared in the Western Australian Press and has never been denied by the adherents of the little doctor. The article to which I refer reads as follows:—

REDS WIN.

The fight in Victoria for control of the Railways Union has resulted in a victory for the Communist ticket—aided by the Cain-Stout-Evatt Labour Party.

The Communists and their allies have 29 on the State Council of the union to 26 of the Industrial Groupers (Anti-Communist Labour Party).

The Communists now controlled the entire transport industry in Victoria, said the State Secretary of the Australian Railways Union, Mr. J. Neill.

Mr. Neill said the Reds controlled the Railways, Tramways, Waterside and Seamen's Unions.

He challenged the Evatt-Cain Labour Party to:

Answer why Cain Labour members stood on the ticket with Communists in the A.R.U. election, and appeared on the platform with Mr. J. J. Brown, a Communist, at campaign meetings.

Explain why these members were not expelled from the A.L.P. in conformity with the 1937 A.L.P. conference decision.

That is what is happening in Victoria today. The followers of Dr. Evatt within the Labour Party in Victoria are appearing on the platform and aligning themselves on "how-to-vote" tickets with communists in industrial union elections today.

It is only right that the people of Western Australia should be told exactly where they are being led. Is the Government aiming at preserving industrial peace? Is it aiming at a continuance of the industrial groups in order to check those people who would cause chaos and whose desire it is to overthrow constitutional Government? Or is it aiming at going along the line with Dr. Evatt? We have a right to be told; the electors have a right to be told, especially before the forthcoming elections.

The Leader of the Opposition, in moving his amendment, is only seeking to ascertain what we all have a right to know

and that is, where are we being led? If we are going to be led along the Evatt line—a line that must ultimately lead to communism—then the freedom-loving and democratically-minded people of this State will not hesitate to show what they think of the Government. I oppose the Premier's amendment and support the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition.

Amendment on amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	16

Majority for 2

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Graham	Mr. Moir
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Norton
Mr. Heal	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Kelly	Mr. Styants
Mr. Lawrence	Mr. May

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Hutchinson

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Andrew	Mr. North
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Ackland
Mr. O'Brien	Dame F. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Nalder

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

The PREMIER: I move an amendment—

That the following words be inserted in lieu of the words struck out:—"very much regrets that Liberal Party members in Parliament have been responsible for leaving the general public without any legal protection against profiteering, and with very little real protection against the imposition of unfair rentals."

Mr. SPEAKER: Before putting the amendment, I desire to refer to the question of relevancy which was raised earlier by the member for Mt. Lawley. When I gave my ruling, I was stating my own view of the matter. I now find that my view is upheld in "May's Parliamentary Practice," 15th Edition, at page 298 where it is stated—

Address-in-reply to the King's speech.—The address is one of the formal motions referred to above which is so comprehensive in its contents, that it is not unfair to regard the power to move amendments to it as the power to initiate separate subjects of debate.

The amendment now being moved by the Premier would not be allowed by me if it referred to any motion except the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. Finding myself supported by "May" I rule the amendment in order and will put it to the House.

Amendment on amendment (to insert words) put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	17
Noes	16

Majority for 1

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. Moir
Mr. Graham	Mr. Norton
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Heal	Mr. Rhatigan
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Sewell
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Styants
Mr. Kelly	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Lawrence	

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Sir Ross McLarty
Mr. Brand	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Oldfield
Mr. Court	Mr. Owen
Mr. Doney	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Hill	Mr. Watts
Mr. Mann	Mr. Yates
Mr. Manning	Mr. Hutchinson

(Teller.)

Pairs.

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Tonkin	Mr. Hearman
Mr. Andrew	Mr. North
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Ackland
Mr. O'Brien	Dame F. Cardell-Oliver
Mr. Lapham	Mr. Nalder
Mr. May	Mr. Wild

Amendment on amendment thus passed.

Amendment, as amended, put and passed.

On motion by Mr. Ross Hutchinson, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £17,000,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.