

the most unpopular department in the State. The local authorities complained of its expensive methods, and we were assured that the money could have been much more effectively and economically expended by the local authorities.

Mr. Patrick: They have learnt a lot since then.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: With the advance of time and the realisation that there are only two classes of road of any use to modern motor traffic, the natural road or a complete hard-surfaced road, the local authorities have come to appreciate our work. Our main road policy involved the adoption of a perfect foundation for main roads; otherwise good surfacing would have been ineffective. The Commissioner and his engineers have made a special study of the matter and I am satisfied that they now have the confidence of all the local authorities. Wherever I go I find that the Commissioner of Main Roads is the most popular man in the State with the local authorities. I sometimes wonder whether the people realise what a revolution has taken place through the speeding up of transport. If time is money, it means that the advent of the main roads scheme has livened up traffic and enabled it to move at an incredible speed as compared with the speed in old days. We can congratulate ourselves on having evolved a scheme that meant more to this State than to any other State, because of the great distances in Western Australia. Some people may be under the impression that a lot of money is being expended, but when we appreciate the system introduced into roadmaking here, we shall realise that surfaced roads are being provided for our main routes that will eliminate the high cost of maintenance, and attention can then be given, as so many members have advocated, to the extension of the list of roads declared to be main roads. This measure is the authorisation for the setting up of the board and the necessary machinery for the continuance of the Main Roads Act. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Doney, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th August, 1937.

	PAGE
Deputy President, election of Hon. J. Cornell	259
Bills: Factories and Shops Act Amendment, 1A.	259
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1A.	259
Motion: State Transport Co-ordination Act, to disallow amendment to regulations	259
Address-in-reply, eighth day	260

DEPUTY PRESIDENT—ELECTION OF HON. J. CORNELL.

The ACTING CLERK (Mr. L. L. Leake): It is my duty to announce that the President is absent from Perth on public business. It is necessary therefore for members to elect one of their number to fill the office, perform the duties, and exercise the authority of the President during such absence.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson) [4.31]: I move—

That Hon. J. Cornell be elected to fill the office, perform the duties, and exercise the authority of the President during the absence of the President, Sir John Kirwan.

Question put and passed.

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Factories and Shops Act Amendment.
- 2, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary.

MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT.

To Disallow Amendment to Regulations.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.35]: I move—

That the amendment to the Regulations made under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933, as published in the "Government Gazette" on 18th June, 1937, and laid on the Table of the House on 10th August, 1937, be and is hereby disallowed.

I have gone carefully into these regulations. At first glance there appears to be very little difference between them and the old regulations. I find, however, on a close analysis that they seek to give greater authority to

the Transport Board, and to make the position more difficult for those who come under its jurisdiction. To afford the board an opportunity to submit their reasons for amending these apparently innocuous regulations, I have moved that they be disallowed. Perhaps after the explanation the Chief Secretary will give, I may withdraw the motion. If members will turn to the regulations in question, they will find a little tightening up here and there and evidence that things are made a little more difficult for those who apply for licenses. My first reference would be to Form No. 1. I will quote some of the conditions inserted therein. It may be argued by the board that these provisions are already in the regulations. The following questions have to be answered:—

1. What is the exact route over which the service will operate?

If it is desired to operate within a certain area, that area must be accurately defined. The applicant must not deviate half a mile from one side or the other. Surely a little latitude should be shown. In form No. 4 we find other questions.

6. For what purpose would the goods carried by you be used? (State also whether they are intended for sale by yourself or any other person).

Fancy asking a man to answer that question!

7. For what purpose (if any) will the vehicle be used in addition to the foregoing?

In question No. 14 the applicant is asked—

What other transport facilities (either road or rail) are there in, or near, the district you propose to serve? (State also their distance from the route or area you propose to serve.)

15. Are there other facilities unable to cater adequately for transport of the goods you wish to carry? (If so, state in what manner they are inadequate).

Near the bottom of the form the following appears:—

I certify that the information contained herein is true and correct in every particular, and agree that, in the event of same or any portion thereof proving to be false, the board may cancel any license issued as the result of this application.

In the case of temporary licenses, it should be deemed sufficient if a man says he proposes to take a load of produce, that the bulk of it represents so much, and that he wants a temporary permit. It is, however, laid down in the regulations that each item of goods (or the name of the party) shall

be specified, as well as the quantity of each item of goods, and the total weight. In Form 9 it is stated that if a temporary license is granted, the permit is solely for the purpose of transporting particular goods. I will not at this juncture go further into detail, but will content myself with the motion I have already moved.

HON. C. H. WITTENOOM (South-East) [4.42]: I formally second the motion.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Eighth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [4.43]: The Address-in-reply debate serves a very useful purpose provided it is not taken advantage of and members do not make marathon speeches, introducing into them details about things which would not matter very much if left unsaid. I do not intend to go into the merits or demerits of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. That has already been dealt with by other members. I intend to deal briefly with some of the remarks made by Mr. Fraser when moving the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply. That hon. member made certain threats concerning what would happen to us in this House, particularly with respect to those provinces which have mixed representation. Perhaps the tables may be turned. Take the occasion of the last election in the case of at least three of the provinces which have mixed representation. The Country Party candidate in one province won by 900 votes, and the Independent or National candidate in the South Province won by 450 votes, and the National candidate in the Metropolitan-Suburban Province won by 2,000 votes. Threats such as those made by the hon. member do not carry very much weight. Even so, I do not think it makes any difference to what is likely to happen if members supported the Government in the Bills that were brought down. I would point to the case of the North-East Province, where determined efforts are being made to unseat Mr. Elliott. That hon. member supported the Government on every occasion but one last session. There has been a considerable amount of propaganda in another place and outside concerning the so-called scant consideration

this Chamber has given to certain Government measures. People have used the expressions "No consideration at all," "Booted out of the window," and so on. I will point briefly to the other side of the question. Although many of the Bills did not reach the Committee stage, they did receive a certain amount of consideration by this House. Take the Factories and Shops Act Amendment Bill. That measure was debated here for nearly three weeks. As the legislation appeared to be undesirable to a majority of members who were opposed to its provisions, it did not pass the second reading stage. That was practically the only Bill that was defeated on a vote almost wholly comprising those of Government members. Even then, the voting for it was not a hundred per cent. Then there was the State Government Insurance Office Bill. That received a lot of consideration before it was finally rejected. The Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill was not agreed to because most of us considered that the objective of that legislation represented a function of the Arbitration Court, and that opinion was amply justified shortly afterwards when the miners were given a working week of 40 hours. I do not think any member of this House begrudges them that concession. As a matter of fact, at the time the Bill was being debated in this House the members of the Arbitration Court were sitting at Kalgoorlie listening to expert evidence on the spot. Surely the members of the Arbitration Court were the best judges as to the merits or demerits of the application lodged by the miners. The only Bill that did receive scant consideration in this House was the Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment Bill. I do not desire any thin-skinned or super-sensitive Labour member either here or in the Legislative Assembly, to take my remarks as personal. I think it only right to point out that that Bill was either deliberately held up in the Legislative Assembly or its consideration was mis-managed. It was introduced into the lower House on the 22nd September and passed the second reading stage on the 15th October. Then it was forgotten for nearly a month before it was taken through the Committee stage on the 14th November. It was reported on the 3rd December, and did not reach this House until the 8th December, in the last week of the session. I do not think that the representatives of Trades Hall and other Labour supporters are at all justified in the mud-slinging at the Legislative Council that has been indulged in during the last

six months. In the course of his speech, Mr. Miles said we should not take too seriously the remarks of Mr. Fraser, who moved the motion under discussion. If I am fortunate enough to be a member of this House as long as Mr. Miles, I will perhaps become hardened to such remarks as those indulged in by Mr. Fraser, but I thought it was my duty as a younger member of this House to reply to some of the statements he made. I was sorry to hear Mr. Parker say he hoped the Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act would not be re-enacted. I am glad that it is to be re-enacted.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: Or altered.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The affairs of the State are not in the position that the opinions expressed by Mr. Parker and his city friends would suggest. If the Act were not to be retained on the statute-book, a state of chaos only would result. The time is not ripe for that legislation to be set aside. I believe that in New South Wales the intention is to re-enact a similar measure for a period of two or three years.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: It is the opposite way there.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I know. Neglect to re-enact the legislation in this State would be terrible to contemplate. Many city people, including Mr. Parker, may think that the position is all right, but it certainly is not by any means satisfactory. I was rather surprised at the optimistic note struck in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech regarding the seasonal conditions in the country. I can assure the House that had it not been for the rain last week, the position in the country would have been serious. Even to-day the position is not as satisfactory as it might be.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It will not be satisfactory unless we get more rain.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Quite so, and certainly the farmers do not desire any more disabilities along the lines suggested by Mr. Parker.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: I do not desire that, either.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Perhaps the hon. member was not told what to say. The agricultural community has received much assistance from the Rural Relief Fund, but the rehabilitation of farmers as a whole will not be achieved until secured creditors are brought within the provisions of

the applicable legislation. I hope the Government will in due course make representations to the Federal authorities to bring secured creditors under the Rural Relief Act's provisions. It is all very well to talk about the "sanctity of contracts." I believe every debt is sacred. The fact remains that some storekeepers, who have been required to accept only 2s. in the £, have been placed in a very serious position. I fail to see that the mere fact that they have no legal security should have deprived them of further assistance. In my opinion, if money is owing all concerned should share alike. That should apply to storekeepers, traders and everyone else in that position.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you interfere with the rights of secured creditors, you will ruin the credit of the country.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I expected to hear something like that. The fact remains that the rural industries will not be rehabilitated until all such persons are brought under the provisions of the legislation. Many farmers are loaded with debts representing unpaid interest over a period of six or seven years. What possible chance have they of liquidating such an indebtedness? They are being asked to pay compound interest on money they have never had. I emphasise the fact that the farming community represent the backbone of the country, and in that respect those associated with the pastoral industry are equally important to the State. I hope that the Government will see fit to introduce a Bill this session to deal with the marketing of commodities. No mention of such an intention appears in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, but I trust the Government will take action along those lines so that egg producers and others engaged in the smaller primary industries may take advantage of its provisions. Action in that direction is highly desirable. Many of those producers are adversely affected in their operations because of the fluctuation of prices. I do not think the consumers need worry about the position, because I fail to see that any such course will result in putting up the prices of commodities to any appreciable degree. If legislation were introduced along those lines, it would enable small producers to market their commodities at a more even price throughout the year. With reference to repurchased estates, I desire to refer par-

ticularly to the Avondale Estate in the Beverley district. The settlers there have never benefited by any writing down, as have those placed on some of the other repurchased estates. The land at Avondale is merely good sheep country, and it has not the productive value that characterises holdings in the safer wheat areas. The settlers at Avondale have to pay interest on from £4 to £5 an acre plus, of course, many other expenses, and they have little chance of emerging from their present difficulties while the existing capital value attaches to their holdings.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do you know what the Government paid for that estate?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not; but that has nothing to do with the point.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I was merely seeking information.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not know what was paid for it, though I think the amount was £7 per acre, nor do I know which Government took over the estate. The point I make is that I fail to see why returned soldier settlers and others on the Avondale Estate should be saddled throughout their lives with the results of mistakes made by the Government of the day. They are entitled to the benefits of writing down as enjoyed by settlers elsewhere. With regard to the operations under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, I agree with Mr. Thomson. I believe the members of the board are desirous of assisting the farmers in many directions. My experience has indicated that they are doing their best in view of the difficulty of administering a very harsh Act. I will cite two instances to indicate what I mean. We are not allowed to cart clarified honey, although crude honey may be carted. I cannot see why that should be because clarified honey is not a manufactured article in any way and it should certainly be included in the schedule as a perishable article. Then again fresh rabbits can be carted by road but frozen rabbits cannot. That is an extraordinary position. I believe the chairman of the Transport Board is out to help the producers as much as he can, and I hope that any amendments to regulations that may come before this Chamber will receive favourable consideration. Dealing with water supplies, I agree with Mr. Fraser that previous Labour Governments have been instrumental in providing most of the water supplies in the country areas, and we are very

grateful to them for their action. I refer particularly to the more recent linking up of the Barbalin area with the Mundaring water scheme. I would remind Mr. Fraser, who displayed such exuberance in his desire to extol the Labour Governments of to-day and past years, that he must not forget the giants of the past who, when the State had a very small population, established the great Goldfields Water Supply Scheme. Most of the subsidiary schemes installed by Labour Governments are absolutely dependent on the Mundaring reservoir.

Hon. G. Fraser: The big Barbalin scheme was independent of that source of supply.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: The original scheme was, but I have referred more particularly to the scheme recently installed by the present Minister for Works. In dry years Barbalin was found to be unsatisfactory and the catchment did not fill it up. In consequence, the scheme there was linked up with the Mundaring reservoir so as to take advantage of the overflow periods. We desire to give the present Government every credit for what they have done. Unfortunately Mundaring Weir will probably not overflow this year, and we will not have the usual benefit from that source of supply. I merely mention these points because I do not want members to think that past Labour Governments have been responsible for all the water schemes that have been installed in the interests of country areas. Nevertheless we are not unmindful of the work that those Governments have carried out. With regard to our betting laws, the time is overdue for the maladministration that is evident in that respect to receive attention. The present state of affairs is a disgrace to the State. I do not advocate the curtailment of betting nor its increase. It is strange that at a recent sports meeting at York the bookmakers were kicked off the grounds and next day were fined £10 or £15. Yet in the streets of most country towns people are able to bet to their hearts' content. At the Subiaco Oval at about the time I have in mind, bookmakers, were allowed to operate. It is all very confusing to the people. Mr. Williams referred to the growling indulged in by parsons, but I can assure him that the people generally are becoming restless and are wondering why these varying actions are allowed to continue. The same situation arises with regard to the liquor trade. Drink is easily procurable in some hotels, whereas in

others it is impossible to get liquor. I fail to see why a person can secure drink almost at any time at a hotel in the goldfields areas whereas the hotelkeepers at Merredin are restricted regarding the hours when they may serve drink. People arrive at Merredin at all hours by train, and travellers also reach there after trading hours. I know that there is provision in the Act dealing with travellers, but I would instance the position regarding harvest hands. They knock off at 7 o'clock and reach the town at 8.30. By the time they have got their hair cut and have attended to one or two other requirements, the hotels are closed and the men have to go round to the back and get beer handed out to them in bottles through the back door. That is not right. In some city hotels, drink can be obtained at any time desired. I am not much of a drinking man but I was in one hotel from 9 p.m. till midnight. I was talking with some friends and I saw people walking in and out of the premises just as they liked, and the stewards did not put any questions to them. I hope the position will be clarified. If it is advisable to appoint a select committee to investigate the situation, let us have one. An old familiar question with country members, one that Mr. Hall mentioned last night, is that of educational facilities in country districts. In such districts those facilities are not by any means all that they should be. The Education Department is very sympathetic and is doing all it can, but I hope that more money will be made available to that department to enable it to do still more for those schools in country districts, particularly the small schools. Mr. Hall said that the cost of carrying out certain improvements would not be very much, but I am afraid it means a lot of money. However, now that everything is all right in the city, surely to goodness we can have something more in the country. Regarding the Tender Board and the new forms, I have been wondering what is going to happen when the Agricultural Bank goes out to buy chaff. Unfortunately a lot of chaff may be required this season. Whatever the rainfall may be, a considerable quantity of chaff will have to be bought in the Avon Valley and along the Great Southern for the back country.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That trouble about the forms has been explained.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I hope the trouble will be entirely removed; otherwise the drought stricken farmers will not be able to get any chaff at all.

HON. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [5.2]: I should like to say a few words on the Address-in-reply. With other members, I think it is a very good thing that we should have this opportunity from time to time to speak to matters affecting us all. In my view it would be unfortunate if we were to lose the privilege of so expressing ourselves. On many occasions this discussion has resulted in a great deal of good by bringing before the notice of members in other districts than our own what are the requirements of our districts; while of course we all know that the debate has a tendency to bring up matters that may have been lost sight of by the Government of the day. Amongst those measures that are to come before us this session are some that may not be wholly welcome, whilst other measures that one might have expected to see in the list are absent from that list. I do not know whether it was arranged by the Government or whether it was merely an oversight, but on the concluding page of the printed report of His Excellency's Speech there are just 13 Bills, proposed legislation for the session. We all know that the number 13 is often regarded as an unlucky one, and I dare say the Government themselves realise that that 13 may prove to be unlucky to some of the measures included in the list. Mr. Wood before sitting down referred to the tender forms that have gone out. I look upon it as a direct abuse that the Government of the day should be a party to any transaction of that nature, in which there could be what we might term a plundering of the exchequer for their supporters. If that attitude is likely to be adopted by the Government from time to time it will undoubtedly be a case of spoils to the victors. Then we shall have new parties springing up perhaps, to see which of them could get on to the Treasury Benches and there flout the rest of the community by taking public funds and utilising those funds for their own particular ends. I feel sure the whole of the community places implicit trust in successive Governments, fully believing that the good sense of the majority of the people would choose only those who are likely to deal out even-handed justice and fairplay to all shades of opinion, and that everybody will be allowed to hold his private opinion and not be dragooned

into joining sections that have robbed the till to which all the rest of the community have contributed. I trust that the whole of the community when we have another election will know how to deal with those who do take advantage of such an action as has been put before the community in regard to these tender forms. An opportunity should be made to test the case and find out really who are supporting and backing the Government in carrying out their intention that those who are tendering for public works or public services shall see to it that only one section of the community shall be considered. Apart from those who fill in tender forms, there are many others directly concerned. We know that when the Day Baking Bill was before this Chamber many master bakers were of the opinion that control should be exercised over the whole of the baking industry in this State. Others opposed that on the ground that everybody taking up the baking trade should be allowed to please himself and should not be dragooned by the master bakers. By those critics it was held that if a man wanted to run a bakery or set up a bread business, if he felt inclined to do it he should be allowed to compete against the master bakers. But where a number of unionists are employed I can quite conceive that they object to an individual coming in and running a business on his own account, and they are induced by their employers to enter into a scheme of this nature and support the action of the Government. That applies, not merely to any particular industry, but to many industries and forms of business. Many already embarked in industry are anxious to get into the combine. We know that if the Government will lend themselves to that kind of thing we shall soon find the whole State tied up into a tangle; it will become a country that independent individuals will be glad to get out of. Many have already embarked in industry and have their interests here, and so it is not so easy for them to get out of the State. But it is dreadful that we should have to say to them that unless they conform to rules laid down by this or that section of the community, they will not be allowed to operate here. When you are using public funds to benefit your particular party it is a sorry thing for the country, for it means spoils to the victors. Besides, we have to realise that in the upshot the Government are really reducing the number of people who would be competing with one another and putting

in tenders at prices lower and more favourable to the Government, because what has been done must seriously reduce the number who will tender for the requirements of the Government. It seems to me wrong to say that all tenderers should have to employ exclusively union labour, and I do not think that they should have to do it. We see in the daily Press references to the iron ore deposits at Yampi Sound. When I was in the Eastern States some months ago I there saw that the Federal Government had been approached in regard to the operations of a company dealing with the iron deposits at Yampi, and that the Federal Government had replied that they were keeping their eye on us! The next thing was that they had given an assurance to the company about to operate at Yampi that they would be on perfectly safe ground in continuing their operations and embarking upon the production of iron ore, because no objections would be raised. It was even said that the British Government had declared that there was no reason to object to the operations at Yampi Sound, and that indeed they would welcome those developments. But later we find that in spite of those assurances to the company the Federal Government are still inclined to interfere. That is a very serious matter, because we know there was a Queensland company that began to get a little jealous of the operations at Yampi Sound, and they were trying to float a company to operate on similar lines; and we know that the Federal Government gave very great support indeed to other people to work up iron ore throughout Australia. So I hope the interests of our Government will serve to secure still further assurances from the Federal Government—if assurances are worth having from them, since despite the assurances already given it is again necessary to seek such guarantees—that no interference will be attempted. I would be sorry to see the Federal Government do anything to hamper the work that has been commenced in that part of the State. There is a grand opportunity now of doing something towards opening up the port of Yampi. The absence of export trade in that part of the State has been one of the big troubles that settlers there have experienced in the past. Therefore anything that can be done to encourage export from that part of the State will certainly be in the best interests of Western Australia. The

community of this State have been taxed ever a period of years for the protection of our coastal industries. Mr. Holmes last night referred to the fact that it was becoming more difficult for the pearlers to make a living on our North-West coast because of the depredations of foreign luggers that are operating there. The matter has been brought under the notice of the Federal Government, but they simply seem to view it from the aspect that their duty lies only in protecting their own coastline. That is what I have gathered from the Press. Apparently it is the business of the State to look after its own coastline for the protection of the industry of fishing for the pearl oyster.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Where did you get that impression?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That is the impression I have gained from what I have seen in the Press.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The Federal Government say that they cannot control the coastline of the State unless at the request and with the permission of the State.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: What I believe to be the case is that up to the present time the Federal Government have left our coast unprotected.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Because they cannot do anything without the consent and permission of the State.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Many of us have been paying taxes, and the excuse for their imposition is that the revenue was required for the protection of Australia. That of course is only right, but it seems to me that the naval vessels are utilised well and truly on the eastern coast of Australia. We see very little of the vessels on our side of the continent, and certainly they have not afforded any protection for the pearling industry. Those foreigners who have been engaged in illicit pearling have had quite an open go. If we are to leave the protection of our coastline to the State we will find ourselves in a sorry position. This, in the opinion of some, may once again give rise to the question of secession.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The position is quite simple; the Commonwealth cannot do anything without the permission of the State.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: I think that the Federal Government expect us to make application for the protection of our coast.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I hope the Minister will be able to assure us that the Government have made that request to the Commonwealth. I should be sorry to learn that it had not been made a considerable time ago, if that was all that was standing in the way of the protection of our coastline. Another matter to which I wish to refer, and to which reference was made in the Speech, is the question of education, and particularly manual training. In my opinion not sufficient money has been spent in this direction: there has been too great a tendency to equip students for clerical posts. In the country the training given to children should be of a sounder type, because of the necessity for constantly bringing in fresh blood and sending the younger people inland with the object of giving them a country mind and encouraging them to remain there. The education that is given to the children in the larger centres does not fit them for life in the country. There has been a dearth of money for manual training, and consequently the education of many children in that respect has been neglected. Domestic science is another branch which in my opinion has been neglected. This should be taught in all the schools in the inland areas. To an extent, the teaching of domestic science in the metropolitan area is of little avail if the students are to apply to country centres the knowledge they acquire, because in the country centres there is no electrical equipment. Wherever manual training has been taught in the country there has been a great shortage of equipment, and in many places a greater variety of wood to work up would have been of great advantage. I suppose this is all due to the scarcity of money that has been available for manual training. A sum of at least £100,000 would be required to help the children in the centres far removed from Perth. The expenditure of this money would encourage teachers to do a great deal more, and they would also have a better opportunity of carrying out their work. Many children benefit by that form of education, and there are a number who today are holding important positions due, they say, to the practical knowledge they acquired at school when young, and when the training they received was of real value to them. This country has to depend mainly on production from the soil,

and therefore it is all-important that our children should receive that education which will properly fit them for their future if it should be in that direction. Another subject on which I wish to touch is the reference that is occasionally made in the Press to the fact that there are too many Parliaments in Australia. My reply is, if we have too many, we must set about to reduce the number, and then the question arises, which is to go first? My idea is that the last formed should be the first to go, and that is the Federal Parliament. I dare say that many who supported secession in this State would agree with me in that respect. Let us see what is taking place to-day. Western Australia is being flooded with produce of various kinds coming from the Eastern States and competing with what is grown in Western Australia. We all have to meet competition, which means better prices for the community; but I do not know that when entering into Federation we dreamed that the Federal Government would run, in direct competition with our State service, a concern on which there must be considerable losses. That competition throws on our railway officials the onus of putting their house in order and formulating some scheme for competing successfully against the Commonwealth. The trouble of the officials would be that they have not available for such a form of competition the funds supplied to the Commonwealth by the States. The matter is most serious. There are so many duplicated services, and the control of them costs the States and the Commonwealth a great deal of money. The cost of government is a phase to which we should give serious consideration. It is up to all of us to see in what directions we can curtail that cost. We should also endeavour to curtail some of the services which the various Governments, including our own, are maintaining. Next, we should try to encourage private enterprise. The Federal Prime Minister, before and since his recent visit to the Homeland, has repeatedly stressed the point that we should do more to encourage new settlement and new industries by private enterprise. There is a wonderful field. When I visited the Eastern States, it appeared to me that very few of the people there knew much about Western Australia. This State is so far away from the East. I was rather

struck with the idea of the Commonwealth to encourage people to settle in Canberra. Special encouragements are being offered to that end. Great interest is also being taken in the tourist trade in each of the Eastern States. Particular attention is being given to the tourist traffic by the railways. Western Australia probably misses a fair amount of that trade by not advertising it more freely.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Did not you get that pamphlet from the State Shipping Service?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I did, and it is quite an interesting pamphlet. Mr. Nicholson mentions one pamphlet, but there should be dozens of them.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What about the State Tourist Bureau's pamphlets advertising the beautiful caves and so forth?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In connection with the caves, the Government have not yet put up respectable accommodation to replace that which was burnt. I believe the Government collected the insurance money and then omitted to put up another building. Large numbers of people visit that beautiful place, Yallingup. There are the marvellous caves, and many other attractions; but when people are on holiday they like to have good accommodation. It is well known that the original accommodation at Yallingup was heavily taxed; frequently people were turned away for lack of room. There are many things that could be done to attract tourists to the caves. On the eve of his departure for England and the Coronation ceremony, the Premier of Tasmania said that the people of that State had done a great deal, but must do more, to attract the tourist trade. He quoted authentic figures showing that the tourist trade had brought into Tasmania as much money as the whole of the wool production of the island. We ourselves have done a little in two or three directions, but much remains to be done. If we could obtain as much revenue from tourists as from our wool clip, it would be a wonderful benefit to the State. There are numerous avenues in which the State Tourist Bureau can operate. Not only that bureau, but all other State services, and the railways in particular, should throw themselves into the task of encouraging tourists. I have heard of two or three instances where tourists have bumped up against little troubles. Such things are not encouraging. When those people go

away, they do not give a good name to the State. On the other hand, many tourists when going away say they will extol the beauties of the country and be the means of sending many other tourists to our shores. I hope the Government will give prompt attention to the tourist trade. One subject which I am sure will appeal to all hon. members is the curses we have in our midst. Coming from the country, I know that there are any number of pests. However, I shall not weary the House with our little troubles.

Hon. T. Moore: Don't run over the lot!

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Mr. Wood mentioned some troubles about netting, and about the laws being abused. Whilst we all have to conform to certain rules and bylaws applying to motor cars and vehicles of various descriptions, I sometimes wonder whether the violinist who was appearing in His Majesty's Theatre and ceased playing until the horrible noises from the street stopped has not done this country a great service. Certainly he will have done a very great service indeed if he has been able to impress upon the authorities what a curse the noise of the motor bikes has been for some time past.

Hon. G. B. Wood: And the noise of the tramcars.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The tramcars we have always with us. The Government certainly should do something to mitigate those curses. The fellow on the motor bike does not seem happy unless he is making the biggest noise possible. He is a perfect pest. I feel sorry for any person feeling seedy, for patients in hospital, and for people trying to get young children to sleep, when such fellows come along with that beastly pest the motor bike. If it is possible for motor cars to have silencers, surely it is possible for motor bicycles to have them. If that is impossible, the use of motor bikes should be stopped. I for one should be sorry to see them forbidden, but why do not those whose duty is to police the streets take some notice of the motor bike nuisance and try to obtain improvement in that direction? I listened to Mr. Wittenoom speaking of the cattle on the groups, of 11 cows giving 4 gallons of milk per day between them. Following Mr. Wittenoom, Mr. Piesse extolled the wonderfully rich country in his group settlement areas. It will not do for me, coming from another district, to allow those hon. members to get away with their statements without

my saying that there is good country in my province also. One of my people the other day told me that he had a cow that gave him 14 lbs. of butter per week, in addition to feeding a calf. If cows of that type could be sent to the groups and put on the wonderful land which we are told exists there, the settlers would have a much better tale to tell. I was glad to hear one hon. member refer to the promised measure with regard to road boards, by which the existing legislation as to rating is to be amended. The amendment is long overdue. Not in one district but in many districts the Government own a tremendous area of land, upon which they have houses and from which they derive revenue, and the local governing bodies are unable to collect any rates. People are utilising those properties in open competition with other people who have to be highly rated so that the streets and water supplies may be maintained in those centres. This is unfair competition. Those occupying Government properties should pay the same rates as others do. Mr. Parker referred to the Fremantle bridge. He expressed the hope that timber would not be utilised in the construction of the new bridge. For many years we in Western Australia have proclaimed the great advantage of our local timbers, and it is my opinion that we should at least support our own industry. When that new bridge is built, it should be constructed of either wandoo or a combination of wandoo and jarrah, to show people that we appreciate the value of our own commodity. The present structure has stood for a very considerable period. It has been a fine bridge indeed, but was not originally built to carry the present-day type of traffic. While I believe that we should re-build it with wood, I consider that the Government should be careful about the time of year during which the timber is cut. The necessity for this seems to have been overlooked in the case of a great many structures built in the past, both by private individuals and by Governments. There is one time of the year to cut timber, and one time to leave it alone. The timber must be cut when fully developed, and not when the sap is flowing so freely that it is like an open sponge. When the timber is cut under favourable conditions, it is effective. We certainly should encourage the use of local timbers as much as possible. Possibly Mr.

Parker would like to see another Sydney harbour bridge construction. He would like us to have a structure like the great monument they have built in Sydney.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: The Fremantle wharves have cement piles.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: This country would be in a rather serious condition if we put up an expensive structure like the Sydney harbour bridge. I do not wish to take up the time of hon. members any further. I am glad to have had an opportunity of making these few remarks, and I support the motion.

HON. E. M. HEENAN (North-East) [5.50]: I have listened attentively to the remarks of hon. members in this debate, and although I do not agree with a lot of what has been said, I must admit that a wide range of subjects has been covered, and that the pros and cons of matters relating to the welfare of the State have been comprehensively dealt with. In spite of what some hon. members have said to the contrary, I consider that the record of the Government since the last session is one for which they may take a good deal of credit. We all realise that conditions generally are still far from being satisfactory. The evil of unemployment is still in our midst and its existence is brought home to us in many ways in almost every corner of the State. It is pleasing, however, to note from a perusal of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech that the position has improved considerably. The Speech discloses that at the present time the total number of men depending on the Government for assistance or relief work has been reduced to 6,400 compared with 13,800 four years ago. That is something we can all feel pleased about and although the improvement might not be due entirely to the efforts of the Government I think we can pay some tribute to them. I hope this improvement will be maintained and that the time is not far distant when full-time employment will be found for all. It should not be beyond the capacity of the Government of Western Australia and the various Governments of the Commonwealth to solve this problem, although it is admittedly a world-wide problem. We must not develop a complex about the matter and say that it does not admit of a solution, because I am certain that it does; and every member of this House should try to realise that and make it his aim to contribute his little quota

to the solution of what is the most vital problem of the day. The Government are to be commended for the assistance they have given to the movement aiming at the extension of the State's industries. This movement should have the whole-hearted support of every man, woman and child of Western Australia, and I trust it will continue to force its legitimate claims. Last year I had an opportunity of visiting the exhibitions held in Perth and at Kalgoorlie and I was very proud of the high standard of the exhibits. Our first duty as West Australians is undoubtedly to ourselves and the public must be roused to the realisation of the fact that by supporting local goods they are supporting themselves and doing something to solve many of the problems that are troubling the State at the present time.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Educate your own constituents of the goldfields. They are the worst offenders.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: There might be some virtue in the interjection of the hon. member, but this is the point that I am making: that this campaign must be sponsored and supported and the publicity campaign that is being carried on must receive the backing of all public men. Admittedly the goldfields import a number of commodities from the Eastern States; but to give credit to the population of the goldfields, they are very good Western Australians, as they have proved in many respects right throughout their history. I am quite confident they will not be found wanting in the future in this respect. The producers themselves have probably been partly to blame in the past. The goldfields are a very good market, and of course they have to be catered for, and the Western Australian producers must submit their products and bring them under the proper notice of the purchasers. In the past I do not think this has been done to an adequate extent, and in some degree at any rate that has been the reason why a number of commodities have been purchased from the Eastern States. Touching on the pastoral industry, I am very pleased that during recent days we have had general rain throughout the State, and that prospects have greatly improved. I am sorry to have to say that pastoralists in certain areas of the North-East Province have had a very bad time in recent years, and this year there seems to be no improvement. I have one complaint to make against the Government, and it is one that has already been voiced by

Mr. Elliott. It has to do with the matter of rebate of rents. I do not think the generous policy has been pursued which hon. members intended should be pursued when they passed that Bill last year. These men are not prone to make complaints or throw themselves on the Government for assistance, but in the course of my travels through the province, quite a number of cases have been brought under my notice in respect of which I consider the Minister in charge, or the department dealing with the problem, should have given more general assistance. I hope that in the future a more generous policy will be pursued in this respect. No words of mine are needed to assure members that the mining industry is proceeding satisfactorily and figures bear eloquent testimony to that remark. Last year the total output of gold in Western Australia reached the remarkable figures of 846,208 fine ounces valued at £7,373,539 (Australian), which represented an increase of £1,500,000 over the figures for the previous year. The value of the industry to the State can be further gauged by the fact that the number of men employed last year reached the high level of 16,652, an increase of 1,095 on the total for the previous year. The indications, I am pleased to say, are that a further increase will be recorded this year. A number of mines are just about reaching the production stage, and this, of course, will mean an increased output. The figures for the East Coolgardie district are so interesting that I will quote them. For the first six months of this year 577,706 tons of ore have been treated for a return of 206,266 fine ounces of gold. In June 106,084 tons of ore were treated for 37,195 fine ounces—the highest monthly figures for many years. At the 30th June 4,258 men were employed in the mining industry on the East Coolgardie goldfields. In passing it is worthy of mention that Tindals mine at Coolgardie has put off men, but reports indicate that their dismissal is only temporary and that a large number will be employed later in the year. Coolgardie revived its race meetings today. The old racing club went out of existence in 1924.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Forty years ago the club had its first meeting.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I have given these figures to emphasise the sound position of the mining industry and the import-

ance of fostering it. I feel confident that the Government, who have done so much to foster the industry, will continue to do so. I should like to add to the remarks of Mr. Elliott regarding prospectors. We all recognise that the prospectors are a body of men deserving of all possible consideration. They are men who venture into the back blocks and waterless stretches; they are men who in the past found mines that in the course of 40 years have produced so much prosperity for this State. I feel sure that the Government are prepared to show the prospectors every consideration. At the same time, it might be as well for me to second the remarks of Mr. Elliott that the prospectors, especially those in the North-East Province, have a number of grievances. The principal ones are against the new cartage subsidy, which has the effect of penalising the prospector who is working at a long distance from a battery. The new subsidy is satisfactory to the prospector who is located close to a battery, but the man who has gone further afield to work a low grade show is penalised. I am sure it is not the policy of the Government to penalise such men and that the grievance will be rectified. The prospectors also seem to have a legitimate complaint about the price charged for the re-treatment of tailings, and it seems to me there is merit in their request that lease rents should be reduced. However, these are matters to which I hope the Minister for Mines will pay due regard. Knowing as I do how sympathetic he is to the industry, I feel confident he will give them every consideration. I desire to touch briefly on the question of roads in my district. This matter is repeatedly being brought under my notice by road board authorities at Laverton, Menzies and Kalgoorlie and also by the Chamber of Commerce, Kalgoorlie. I realise how easy it is for us to talk about these things, and I know the Government realise that the question of providing a country like Western Australia with good roads in the outback areas is one of the utmost importance. Money, of course, is necessary. It seems to me and to other people who visit the capital city of Perth that more money should be spent in the outlying districts. The road between Kalgoorlie and Perth is one of the most important arteries in the State. Having travelled over it recently, I assure members

that the condition of the road between Coolgardie and Southern Cross is appalling. A road should not be permitted to exist in such a state in an up-to-date place like Western Australia. Not only is it inconvenient for persons using it; it is definitely dangerous.

Hon. G. B. Wood: It should be declared a main road.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I hope something will be done in that direction. Another very important road in my district is the one from Laverton passing through Morgans, Malcolm and Leonora. It carries a vast amount of traffic and I, as well as other members representing the North-East Province, am constantly being approached to get something done. I have also travelled over parts of that road recently and can say that it is in a very bad state. I have a long letter on the subject from the secretary of the Mt. Margaret Road Board, but I do not think any useful purpose would be served by dealing with the matter at further length here. I want to mention the questions of fair rents legislation and housing. I am induced to do so by an article in to-day's "West Australian" dealing with the subjects discussed at the Medical Congress at present being held in Adelaide. Members should acquaint themselves with some of the views expressed at such an important conference on a very vital topic—the birth rate of Australia. The article reads—

Australia's declining birth-rate was the subject of concern by doctors who attended the public health section of the Medical Congress this afternoon. Professor Harvey Sutton (New South Wales), who introduced the topic in his presidential address, said that the two most important steps for social progress were the resuscitation of family life and the reconstruction of the home, on one hand, and the development of mental hygiene on the other.

Mental health should be based on the principle of inter-dependence of mind and body, including physical training, education for leisure, and the cultivation of character and personality, as well as intellect, he said. Since the war there had been a veritable "land-slide" in births and, if the present trend persisted, the population would cease to increase about 1945 or thereabouts. Unless present conditions changed there would be insufficient mothers and children in the next generation, and our numbers must decrease. It was becoming hereditary not to have children, and the solution was to discover the family and the home.

Dr. Dale (Melbourne City Health Officer) said that, given reasonable conditions, young

men and women would find a home and have children. To an increasing extent that aim was becoming absent because of the aimlessness and frustration of modern civilisation. The insecurity of modern life was a reason why people did not have children. The natural desire for children and the natural love of home might yet lead towards a solution.

Dr. F. Scholes, of Melbourne, said he was pessimistic about the whole thing and could not see much for the future. The position was caused by economic stress and fear of the future and the rush of life to find some relief from stress and strain. Too much money was spent by rich and poor on amusement, and people could not afford to be born in the home, or even die there, unless international relationships among people themselves showed a change. He could not see any prospects for improvement.

I do not propose to offer a solution of the problem, but I suggest that if we could raise the standard of living, provide employment for the people and ensure that they were decently housed, we should be making a step towards a solution of the problem.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I hope the Government, in their wisdom, will see fit to re-introduce some of their industrial legislation, particularly the Fair Rents Bill. I notice from a perusal of the Speech that this is not included in the measures to be submitted this session. I also express the further hope that the Bill when re-introduced will receive more sympathetic consideration at the hands of this House than it did last session. The rents problem is still a very vital one on the goldfields, not only in Kalgoorlie, but in other mining towns in the North-East Province, and as far south, I understand, as Norseman. There is ample evidence to prove that a great number of property holders are utilising the present state of affairs to extract rents from workers that are quite above what is just and equitable. A married man with children working on the goldfields, where the cost of living is very high, has to provide for a holiday once a year at the coast, but very few of them have ever reached the happy position of being able to save up and build a home of their own. I should like to see the operations of the Workers' Homes Board extended. Kalgoorlie at any rate has proved that its existence is stable, and the old bogey that the goldfields were likely to collapse at any time has been dissipated. The housing problem is very acute on the goldfields, and a remedy,

one way or the other, is urgently needed. I find myself on the side of members who have expressed the view that this House should give more consideration to the industrial measures that are submitted to it. I refer especially to the State Insurance Office Bill. I earnestly hope we shall be able to get that measure placed on the statute book this year in some shape or form. Innumerable cases have come before me of men who have been employed by mining companies or individuals who have not insured. Those men have met with accidents, and although they had a good legal claim against the company or individual who employed them, the company or individual was not worth powder and shot, and the unfortunate people are left stranded.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How would a State Insurance Office overcome that difficulty?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: If the State Insurance Office were legalised the penalty section of the Act could be enforced. At present it cannot be enforced. If an individual does not insure his employees the penalty sections cannot be brought into operation against him.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cannot they be enforced against the other companies?

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: No.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why?

Hon. H. V. Piesse: They can be enforced now.

Hon. H. S. W. Parker: A company can be approved now if the Minister likes.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Yes. Another evil that should be rectified is in connection with motor car insurance. Many people are driving motor cars to-day who have taken out no third party policy. They are a definite menace to the community at large. No person should be allowed to drive a motor car unless he takes out a third party insurance policy. We often hear of cases similar to those I have quoted. People have been knocked down by motorists, and merely because the motorist has not insured they can recover no compensation. It is of no use going to court and getting judgment for £100 or £300 against a person who has no assets and is not insured. It is only throwing good money after bad to take proceedings. That state of affairs should not be allowed to continue. I wish to pay a tribute to the Licensing Court, which is very often attacked without justification. I travel through the North very extensively, and I can say that the hotels are well conducted, and that the spirit of the Act is carried out equally well.

The police are to be commended. They are dealing with conditions which members, in common with many other people, I am afraid, do not appreciate. It would be a good thing if members travelled more frequently to some of the far-flung mining centres, and witnessed the conditions under which men and women live. They would then take a more liberal view of the position, and I do not think Mr. Wood would make the remarks he did make.

Hon. G. B. Wood: You misunderstood me. I am opposed to the inconsistency of the thing.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: Many of us may be opposed to the inconsistencies, but I remind members that this state of affairs has been in existence for over 30 years.

Hon. G. B. Wood: That does not make it right.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: I do not say that is any reason why the state of affairs should not be remedied. In justice to the inspector and his police force on the goldfields I maintain that the spirit of the Licensing Act is enforced very equitably.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: They seem to consume spirits on the goldfields seven days a week.

Hon. E. M. HEENAN: That is correct, and I think it is correct of Perth and other parts of the State. I have travelled to Bunbury and Albany, and am frequently in Perth. Whenever I visit hotels I see a considerable amount of drinking going on, though it is not done as openly as it is on the goldfields. I pay this tribute to the police because they do confine the trading to certain hours, they do their utmost to cope with the situation in out-back places, and generally are doing their work well. Things are not as bad as some people who write to the Press would lead us to believe. They are certainly very much better than they have been during past years. I support the motion.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.43]: The opening paragraph of the Speech deals with an event in our national life and history of vital importance, because of the circumstances associated with it, namely, the coronation of Their Majesties King George VI. and Queen Elizabeth. We are glad that our State was represented at the ceremonies by the Premier. Reference to this great event served to recall the excitement and apprehension which arose in

the minds of many of us towards the end of last session. We all remember the relief experienced when it was ascertained that under the wise and capable guidance of the then Prime Minister of England, now Earl Baldwin, and his colleagues, the nation emerged triumphant from what can only be regarded as a very trying position. It is a satisfaction to be assured by His Excellency's Speech that the culminating step in this national ordeal was marked by widespread manifestations of loyal enthusiasm, and brought home to many millions evidence of the solidarity of the British Empire in a manner never before so forcibly realised. The sincere wish of every good citizen here is that the bonds which unite us with the Homeland, and with other countries forming portions of our great Empire, will grow in strength. We fully endorse the message of good wishes transmitted on that eventful occasion by His Excellency, and in the prayer that the coronation would be the prelude to a long and prosperous reign. I was pleased also to note from the Lieut-Governor's Speech that, despite the many engagements that the visiting delegates must have had in London during their comparatively short stay, the British Empire Parliamentary Association was able not only to arrange conferences but to organise an extensive programme of visits to industrial, commercial and other centres. This, I recognise, must have been the outcome of the thought of those members of the Association in the United Kingdom who are actively connected with that body, the chief official being Sir Howard D'Egville, who is so widely known throughout the length and breadth of the Empire and is held in most sincere regard and respect by persons of every shade of political opinion, who may have had the good fortune to come in contact with him. His name and that of Westminster seem to be linked together to be an assurance of uniform courtesy and kindness. I refer to this subject in the hope that it may impress our own members of Parliament with the great value and importance of the work of the Empire Parliamentary Association, and the advantages that members of Parliament may derive by becoming associated with our branch of the Association here. No one knows better than the President of our own Chamber, the great services rendered to the Empire through the medium of that Association and its real value to members individually. I feel sure also that the Pre-

mier must have been impressed, as I and other members who have visited the Homeland from time to time have been, with the advantages to be derived. I hope, therefore, that members of the Parliament of Western Australia who have not yet joined our branch, will consider the matter favourably and extend to that body their fullest support. Apart from references to the matters to which I have alluded, the Speech of His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor follows the customary course of providing certain information on various subjects and matters that fall within the purview of governmental control. Chief amongst the items mentioned is the record of the deficit of £371,205, in place of the small surplus anticipated in the Estimates for that financial year. Certain explanations are offered as to the net result, and the deficiency is mainly attributed to the reduction in the Commonwealth grant, representing an amount of £300,000, which has already been commented upon by Mr. Seddon on the Supply Bill and by Mr. Baxter and others when speaking on the motion now before us. I think there is a good deal to support the views expressed by those hon. members. The revenue for the year ended the 30th June last amounted to £10,185,433, and, as compared with the financial year ended the 30th June, 1936, showed an increase of £151,713. Against that the expenditure, which amounted to £10,556,638, showed an increase for the year of £611,294, as compared with the expenditure for the previous financial year. Those figures struck me in this way: If the Government had exercised proper care regarding expenditure, there would have been no need whatsoever for the unfortunate result announced in the accomplishment of a deficiency. Instead of the financial year ended the 30th June last showing a deficit, I contend that the Government could quite easily, by the exercise of wise and proper care, while still carrying out their ordinary functions, have shown a very handsome surplus. I suggest that could have been accomplished in a very simple way. If instead of having spent money so lavishly, as I consider they did—the Public Accounts show that undoubtedly the expenditure was fairly lavish—the Government had confined their expenditure to an amount equivalent to that of the preceding financial year, there would have been a surplus of £611,000 odd in lieu of the deficit. The amount expended in the preceding financial year was £9,945,343,

whereas the amount expended during the last financial year was £10,556,638, or a difference of £611,294. The Government could quite easily, I contend, have restricted their expenditure to the amount incurred during the preceding financial year without curtailing any of their ordinary functions or activities.

Hon. G. Fraser: How would you have cut down the expenditure? Name some items.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I leave that to the Minister in control. I say that the amount expended last year could have been cut down quite easily, but that is a matter that requires the careful attention of those in control of the finances. If that control is not exercised, then extravagance must follow.

Hon. G. Fraser: When you arrived at your conclusions, you must have had some reasons for so doing.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I will give the hon. member one single instance. In the Lieut.-Governor's Speech it is reported—

The improvement in employment figures referred to last year has been maintained. The total number of men now depending upon the Government for sustenance or relief work is 6,400. Four years ago it was 13,800.

I have not the figures before me, but last year the unemployed numbered more than they do this year. Consequently, there was not the same demand upon the Government for sustenance and assistance to meet the hardships and troubles that arose. While a certain amount of expenditure was incurred in various ways, I could say that the demand upon the Government in that respect was greater in the preceding year than during the recently ended financial year. If care had been exercised in each of the Government departments, a proper check kept in connection with expenditure, and every effort made to keep that expenditure within a figure that would not exceed that of the preceding financial year, then there would have been a surplus instead of the deficit.

The Chief Secretary: That is obvious to everyone.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: And that care was necessary.

The Chief Secretary: Do you suggest that care was not exercised?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I suggest that if proper restrictions had been imposed with regard to the limits within which expenditure could be incurred, while yet carrying on proper functions of Government—I do not suggest that there should have been a curtailment of the proper functions of Gov-

ernment—and care exercised as it ought to have been, just as is necessary in connection with private firms or companies, then undoubtedly the result would have been as I suggest.

The Chief Secretary: You suggest from your remarks that we should not have spent as much on the unemployed as we did.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I did not suggest that. Mr. Fraser interjected with a question, and I gave him one instance where the Government could have spent no more during the past financial year than during the preceding year.

The Chief Secretary: You might point to one item respecting which the Government did not exercise care.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is not for me to go into those matters, for they require a close investigation of the accounts of the department, and that would take a long time.

Hon. G. Fraser: You should have done that before you made charges of extravagance against the Government.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The hon. member could not have grasped what I said. I made a plain simple statement to the effect that if the Government had imposed restrictions regarding the expenditure, the result I have indicated could have been achieved.

The Chief Secretary: That is patent to everyone.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Then if that is so, I want the Minister to show me the necessity for the expenditure I have referred to. I have not the means of procuring the information: the Minister has. I want to get the information and his explanation. Until such time as I receive a proper explanation with regard to what I look upon as extravagance, I will await the desired information. The fact that last year's expenditure was £611,000 in excess of that of the preceding financial year is in itself an indication that there has been extravagance.

The Chief Secretary: You have not shown what the Government ought to have done.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is incumbent upon the Government to explain why that excess expenditure was incurred during the last financial year, so that everyone may appreciate the reason for the deficit.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I hope members will not provoke Mr. Nicholson into overstepping the bounds of Standing Order 397.

Hon. G. Fraser: Was not there additional expenditure, quite necessary, as against the previous year?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: There was a certain amount for drought relief, but there were certain other items on the other side that would more than counterbalance the expenditure on drought relief. Close examination of the accounts is necessary in order that a proper explanation might be given. I am asking for that explanation, and I shall not be fully satisfied until it is forthcoming; without it, we cannot wholly accept the plaudits that Mr. Fraser was pleased to confer on the Government when he was moving the motion now before us. Under the heading of "finance," one cannot pass the growth of our State indebtedness, amounting to nearly £90,000,000. We have often been told that the per capita indebtedness of this or any other country should not exceed £100, but now we have doubled this amount. I pointed out last year that one means of altering this position was by encouraging migration, and so increasing our population.

Hon. G. Fraser: We have already had enough trouble through our immigration policy.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I still consider the suggestions I made then are well worth further consideration. I was pleased to hear Mr. Heenan to-night draw attention to what took place at the medical congress in Adelaide, and to the fact that the medical men found it necessary to draw the attention of the people of Australia to the fall in the birthrate. I hope that Mr. Heenan will do his duty in that respect and try to avoid, as far as possible, any complaints on the part of the medical congress. But, all joking apart, I admit it is a very serious feature in our life, and that the sooner we can get an increase in our population—

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I hope the honourable member will address the Chair, not Mr. Heenan.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Certainly, Sir. The sooner we can get the population of Australia increased, the better will it be for us, from many points of view. The position in regard to our indebtedness is more than serious, and I venture to think that a very thorough investigation and a revision of our financial methods are necessary, so that the drift which is evident

may be arrested. We cannot continue adding to that indebtedness much longer, because there can only be one end. Under the heading of "employment," to which I have already referred in passing, one is able to note the improvement that has taken place. I think it will be admitted that that improved position is due mainly to private enterprise which shows the great value that private employers are to any Government in helping to absorb the unemployed, or to provide employment for those who may be unable to get work at other vocations, as well as being a source of revenue to the Government. In the paragraph dealing with this subject in His Excellency's Speech, the following words appear:—

The Government will continue to give every support to any movement aiming at the extension of the State's industries and the employment of those people.

Those are encouraging words. But coincident with that statement has come the announcement, which has been referred to by other speakers, that the Government have done something which has the effect of directly negating that statement. I refer, of course, to the subject spoken of by almost every honourable member; that is, the introduction of those harmful conditions in the tender form. There are in the tender form two points: in the first place we find that the tenderer, when he lodges his tender, has to state whether or not his employees are financial members of a union; and again, if the tender be accepted there is a still more burdensome condition imported. Let me refresh the minds of honourable members with the wording of that clause, as follows:—

If such tenderer's tender be accepted, the tenderer must undertake as a condition precedent and going to the root of the contract that only persons who are financial members of a registered industrial union of workers in the industry to which the tenderer's business relates will be employed by the tenderer in or in connection with the supply, etc.

Here is something that is of vital importance to the whole of the contract; not content with making a tenderer first declare whether or not his men are financial members of a union, they accentuate the position and make it doubly hard for any tenderer, make the position more difficult, by stipulating that this will be a condition precedent, going to the root of the contract.

The Chief Secretary: May I refresh the hon. member's memory as to the explanation given in another place?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I did not see that explanation.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It was a very weak explanation—putting the blame on the Tender Board.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Very well; the Minister will be able to do that which is necessary. I have no desire to do any injustice to anyone, but if it is due to the action of the Tender Board, or of someone outside of an actual Minister, if it is due to somebody outside of that, then it does no harm to consider a matter like this; because it may occur on some other occasion. And what is mentioned on the present occasion may help to prevent a recurrence.

The Chief Secretary: I only wished to remind the hon. member that an explanation was given in another place.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I did not see the explanation.

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think there is a Standing Order which forbids any reference to debates in another place.

Hon. G. Fraser: Well, the hon. member overlooked that himself.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Such a condition as that in the tender form is harmful in many ways and is calculated to do very serious and grave injury to the introduction of capital here, which is badly wanted for the establishment of industries. Although I offer criticism regarding it, I feel sure that members of the Ministry are desirous of seeing industries established here, recognising, as they must do, the advantage to the State, and the advantage which is bound to be created by providing means of employment. Whilst I am offering this criticism, I do so having regard to what I have said, but I would point out this: Take the case, for example, of a firm that has tendered for and secured a large contract. In any large contract secured from the Government there is involved the making of heavy purchases and even the undertaking of heavy commitments on the part of the contractor or tenderer. He may have committed himself to the obligation to buy £10,000 worth of plant and material in order to fulfil the contract he may have undertaken, in the way of railway construction or some other big work. One can

recognise how any tenderer or contractor would be involved in heavy commitments to fulfil a big contract. It would be the simplest thing for any man who had contracted on the basis of those conditions to find his contract set aside because of the provision set out in the contract, and to be left with large commitments and no means of getting redress. Naturally, if that happened once, as it might easily do under such rigid conditions, it would reflect most seriously on any Government and it would do irreparable damage to the State as a whole. It is the damage done by importing conditions like these into our contracts and it is the harm it does to the State that we must consider. Moreover, we are setting back the hands of the clock and that no one desires to see. It might be contended that the condition referred to is also opposed to the principles of trade unionism itself. According to those principles I understand it is required that the ideal, one man for one job, be carried out. Here, however, we are going to place upon the contractor not only the job of carrying out his contract, but the duty of seeing that his employees are all financial members of a union. He has to do a double-barrelled job with the result, obviously, that the number of union officials necessary to carry out the duties associated with the various unions will gradually dwindle down, while some of them may lose their employment altogether.

Hon. G. Fraser: You have a wonderful imagination.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not think there is anything in the nature of a stretching of the imagination there, but there is still a more serious phase.

The Honorary Minister: You mean that the employer will be the union organiser.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: He will be the union policeman, or debt collector, because he will be required to see that the union fees are paid before a man is employed. That is what is specified.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: That would appeal to the Honorary Minister.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: So if every employee is a fully-fledged financial member there would not be the need for the same number of union officials to go round and see that the men were paying up and toeing the line as they should do.

The Chief Secretary: That ought to be a reason why you should support the proposal.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not desire to see the rules of trade unionism broken: I do not wish to impose a double job on any man. I want to be a good trade unionist.

The Chief Secretary: You would make a good one too.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It has been overlooked that no employer would have the right without statutory authority to demand to know whether a man he employs was or was not a financial member of the union, but in the tender form the employer must be sure as a condition precedent that the employee is a financial member of the union. If I were an inspector under the Factories and Shops Act I would have statutory authority to enter premises and inspect books and demand to see receipts and various other things. But I, as an employer, would have no power to demand or require an employee to produce his receipt to convince me that he was a financial member of his union. How could such a condition as that be enforced? It just shows the weakness and the crass stupidity of it. But the most serious point about it all is the effect that it will have on the welfare of the State and I hope sincerely that the Government will take steps to see that this objectionable clause is struck out from the tender forms. There is the question of youth employment which is a very important one and which I have discussed at various times on former occasions. I am glad to see that the matter is now being investigated by a Royal Commission and I am hopeful that there will emerge, as a result of the investigation, some solution of what is a great and difficult problem. I shall refrain from going into certain aspects in connection with the matter because I consider it is only right that the Commissioner should be given every possible help. He is a thoughtful man and I am convinced he will give his closest attention to the preparation of his report. My attention was drawn lately to an article in a newspaper dealing with what is called the Hayden Foundation in America. That Foundation was the result of a beneficent bequest by a wealthy banker named Charles Hayden of New York. He left an immense fortune, about £10,000,000, to establish a foundation or scheme for the benefit of the youth of his country. He died before attaining the age of 70 years and throughout his life he was interested in the welfare of boys and poor children whom he helped on many occasions.

He believed that the future of America and indeed of the world depended in no small degree on the youth of the country, and if they received proper training and were encouraged in the proper manner, he considered that a nobler race of people would be reared and that they would make better citizens to the lasting benefit of mankind. In his will he said: "It has been my long-cherished purpose that the bulk of my fortune shall be employed in the education of boys and young men." In view of the appointment of a Royal Commission in Western Australia to inquire into the question of youth employment I venture to suggest that it might be worth while to make some inquiries as to what steps are being taken in America in connection with the Charles Hayden Foundation to improve the condition of youth in that country. We all recognise that we here have not reached the stage of having citizens possessed of such colossal wealth, but it is worthy of note that a man so placed as Charles Hayden, recognised it as his duty to try to help others less fortunately circumstanced. We may get some suggestions which might be helpful in the disbursement of the welfare fund lately collected in this State. Ours of course is a very meagre fund as compared with that left by Charles Hayden, but I make these suggestions trusting that some notice will be taken of them. I desire now to refer to a subject with which I had some association a little while ago when I introduced a deputation to the Chief Secretary on the non-observance of the licensing laws on the goldfields. I was quite pleased to have had the opportunity of introducing that deputation and I do not wish the House to be under any misunderstanding of the position so far as I am concerned.

Hon. G. Fraser: It is just as well that the hon. Mr. Williams is not here.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Well, the hon. Mr. Fraser is here. The position briefly is this, that we have to recognise—and I believe the Chief Secretary will correct me if I am wrong—that the licensing laws are universal and uniform.

Hon. H. V. Piesse: The hotels keep open until 11 o'clock on the goldfields.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I mean as far as the trading hours are concerned—that those hours are prescribed in the Act and should be observed. The deputationists asked that those laws should be observed in the same way on the goldfields as they were required to be observed in other parts of the State.

Naturally, the inequality which exists in the non-observance of the law on the goldfields places the people there in a position entirely different, as regards rights, from people engaged in the same business elsewhere in the State. Mr. Wood suggested, why should not the same conditions prevail in his district as actually exist and are tolerated on the goldfields? It is a case of the law being observed in the breach of the law. That is the thing which the deputationists urged was wrong. There are other views too. When one shows any disparity in the enforcement of the laws in one part of the State and not permitted in another, that is wrong absolutely, because all are entitled to practically the same right. One should not get a right that another does not enjoy. But there is the other view, whether or not it can be contended that it is to the advantage of the people of the State that premises should be kept open for the sale of liquor on those days when they ought to be closed. Take Sunday, particularly. Surely Sunday should be made as nearly as possible a day of rest. Give people some opportunity to rest. I also look at the matter in this way: If those premises have to be kept open, it involves the engagement and employment of servants and others to provide and serve those customers who come to be served. Many persons, therefore, have to be employed to carry out the duties which are essential in keeping the premises open on a day when the employees should be enjoying a certain amount of rest or relaxation.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: They get double pay.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They may get double pay, but that is not the point. The question also arises, is this arrangement to the advantage of the youth of the country? There is a disposition or an inclination, unfortunately, on the part of youth not to take alcoholic liquor in moderation as some people do, but to over-indulge. It does them no good either from a physical point of view or from the aspect of work or business. The Government, and we as legislators, have a responsibility to the youth of Western Australia. If we think this disregard of the law will be detrimental to the youth of the country—

The Honorary Minister: The youths are not allowed to drink at all, anyhow.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: That is not the point. If we think this practice will prove detrimental to youth, we have a plain and manifest duty to shield them as far as we

can. The deputationists are not to blame. They brought before the Government a matter which has, I admit, been an obvious permission without legal authority given to hotel-keepers and others on the goldfields, and not enjoyed by people in other portions of the State. Therefore I consider the deputationists were perfectly justified in bringing the matter to the notice of the Government.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: What have you got to say regarding a custom or usage of 40 years' standing?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not know or care what the custom or usage may be. For many years conditions on the goldfields were very quiet. During that quiescent period, there was not the same inclination to patronise those establishments as exists to-day.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: How long is it since you were on the goldfields?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I was there about a couple of years ago.

The Honorary Minister: You did not make a protest when your Government were in power.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: No; I did not make a protest.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We have never had a Government in power.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: The present Government have been in power so long.

Hon. E. M. Heenan: It is a custom of 40 years' standing.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I admit that; but the question is, is it a good custom?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Hon. members overlook the fact that we amended the Licensing Act to meet evils that were complained of 30 or 40 years ago.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: A sort of free leg was given. The eye that should have been supervising was closed to what was taking place. Let us take away the moral side altogether, and let us look at the matter from the simple standpoint of justice to others in other parts of the State. They should be given the same right.

Hon. G. Fraser: Would you support a proposal to do that?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have not said so. I am merely putting forward an argument. If it is the will of Parliament to allow a certain thing to take place, then the law should be equitably administered and enforced. There should be no evidence of favouritism, absolutely none. Here a distinct breach of the law is taking place.

I admit that it has been winked at all these years, but that does not legalise or justify it. We as members have a duty to the public. We have the welfare of the people to consider. If we pass legislation, then upon our shoulders rests the blame if we do that which is wrong.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: We can only pass legislation. If the Government will not enforce it we are helpless.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Precisely. Legislation was passed, and that is how the matter stands. Another matter I have to refer to is in connection with the railway men and the Superannuation Act of 1871. I had an invitation to attend a meeting of the railway men one Sunday afternoon a few weeks ago. There I was able to hear the men's side of the question. Quite interesting explanations were given. It appears, from what was stated at the meeting, that from time to time many representations have been made—I am not blaming any Government—for recognition of the rights of the railway men engaged outside, men with long and good service to their credit. They were not allowed to enjoy the benefits of the Superannuation Act which men engaged in inside work did enjoy. As we know, there is only a certain number of men alive to-day who would be entitled to those rights, and they are gradually dying out. I understand that the Premier has promised to receive a deputation from the outside men, so that they can further state their views. I hope the Premier will see his way to consider the claim that the question should be referred to a select committee or Royal Commission for investigation, and that if it should be found that the men are entitled to those rights under the Act, their claims will be duly met by the Government. Otherwise I hope the Government may be able to consider those claims by passing some legislation rendering it possible for the men to enjoy the rights to which they say they are entitled under the Act. I do not propose to comment on the subject as though it were here as a separate subject for adjustment. I merely refer to it in passing. Reference has been made to the Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act. Two views have been expressed—one from the metropolitan standpoint by Mr. Parker, and the other from the country aspect. I fully recognise the difficulty of the position in

which many country people would be placed if the Act ceased to operate. I recognise there would be a difficulty so far as they are concerned. But there is a great deal of justice in Mr. Parker's claim that the Act should no longer be enforced so far as his area is concerned, because, as he pointed out, all the deductions which were made from wages and so forth during the emergency period have ceased to operate. Full wages are now being paid. Why, therefore, should one class of people be penalised when others are not?

Hon. G. Fraser: His views are not 100 per cent. metropolitan views.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: Very well. He advanced an alternative, namely, that the position should be reversed, and that in place of the mortgagee being compelled to be the applicant to the court, the obligation should be placed on the mortgagor to apply to the court for relief. He put forward that other alternative. The matter requires very serious consideration. When the Bill comes up, it may be found necessary to suggest its reference to a select committee, so that the matter may be fully inquired into, the views of those vitally concerned obtained, and the best results arrived at. I noticed that it had been originally intended to restore the Municipal Corporations Act Amendment Bill to the Notice Paper at the stage which it had reached last session. I understand now that, instead of that Bill being restored, a new Bill, with other provisions inserted, will be brought forward. I hope that consideration will be given to the insertion of a clause which it was asked should be inserted in a Municipalities Act in former years, to the effect that the Government should make some allowance to local authorities in lieu of rates on property owned by them in various districts. The Road Boards Association has asked that something of that sort should be done. I consider that both road boards and municipalities have a just claim for consideration from the Government. It will be remembered that in earlier years Governments used to give local authorities certain subsidies, which have been withdrawn. Those subsidies really took the place, in a measure, of the rates that would otherwise have been payable on governmental property. There is, therefore, a good deal of justification for the claim of the local

authorities. A subsidy used to be given to those authorities.

The Chief Secretary: That was an entirely different proposition from what the road boards seek to-day.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I know. But it has to be recognised that roads have to be maintained and other services rendered in respect of Government-owned property equally with other property. On one side of the road is private property on which rates are paid and on the other side Government property on which no rates are paid. That is hardly a fair thing. The making of footpaths and roads has to be provided for, and it is not right that only one section should bear the cost. There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer, and that is the timely warning from Mr. Fraser when he was moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply. I am quite sure that the honourable member, in saying what he said, meant it in quite good part.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: He was talking to the gallery.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I have no doubt that he had quite good intentions. However, there is one aspect of this matter which must never be lost sight of, and that is that this House is a House of review, and the position in regard to this House is totally different, because of that, from the position of another place. No member has a right to say anything which will more or less cast a reflection on others in this Chamber, as did the words uttered by the honourable member on that particular day, when he could not be interrupted in view of the crowd of people present. No member has a right to utter words practically telling other members that they are not carrying out their duties.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He was trying to be humorous.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I know there is no member here—and I am sure Mr. Fraser would be the very first man to admit it—who shirks his duty. Every member is prepared to carry out the duties laid down for him. When Bills come forward and an opportunity is afforded for the proper consideration of them, that consideration is given. No member knows better than Mr. Fraser that if the Leader of the House asks members to do a certain thing, to make progress with the business before

the House, they will rally round him and help him to get through his work. They will do everything to assist him.

The Chief Secretary: Except pass the Bills!

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: They may not pass the Bill, but the one great benefit of this House which should be recognised is that some of us here are not bound by any party ties, and we exercise an entirely independent judgment. As a result of that independent judgment there is obtained the fullest possible consideration that could be given to any measure brought before the House, whether by a Liberal Government, a Labour Government, or any other kind of Government. The same consideration which I have always been prepared to give to measures brought before this Chamber I am prepared to give in the future.

Hon. G. Fraser: You will need to increase your consideration.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am prepared to give the same consideration, and no words of warning or anything else will make me depart one iota from the path I consider to be the path of duty. Subject to any criticism I have offered or reservations I have made, I support the motion.

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

House adjourned at 8.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 25th August, 1937.

	PAGE
Address-in-reply, presentation	280
Questions: Coal mining industry, nationalisation	280
Public Service, superannuation	281
Royal Commission on Banking	281
Bills: Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continu-	
ance, 1R.	281
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 1R.	281
Land Act Amendment, 1R.	281
Nurses' Registration Act Amendment, 1R.	281
Fair Rents, 1R.	281
Jury Act Amendment, 1R.	281
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 1R.	281
Grower's Charge, 1R.	281
Employment of Counsel (Regulation), 1R.	281
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, restored to	
Notice Paper	286
Sales by Auction, 2R.	300
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment, 2R.	300
Motions: Railway Service, superannuation, to in-	
quire by Select Committee	281
Delinquent youth	293
Railway property, power to rate	296

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

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Presentation.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to announce that in company with Mr. Hegney, the member for Middle Swan, and Mr. Rodoreda, the member for Roebourne, I attended upon His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor and presented the Address-in-reply to His Excellency's Speech. His Excellency replied in the following terms:—

I thank you for your expressions of loyalty to His Most Gracious Majesty the King and for your Address-in-reply to the Speech with which I opened Parliament.—(Signed) James Mitchell, Lieutenant-Governor.

QUESTION—COAL MINING INDUSTRY, NATIONALISATION.

Mr. WILSON asked the Premier: In regard to the following resolution which was advocated by a deputation to the Hon. M. F. Troy, the then Acting Premier, in Perth, on 8th July, 1937, and which was favourably commented upon by him in his reply—"That we, the citizens of Collie, believe the time is long overdue for the nationalisation of the coal mining industry, and the establishment of a national power scheme at Collie, and request the Government to appoint immediately a commission to inquire into (a) the practicability of both schemes, and (b) the estimated cost"—1, Was this question brought before Cabinet by the then Acting