

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [6.17]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 6.18 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 10th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions: Education—1, Schools, East Perth and Merredin; 2, Scholarships not availed of; 3, New schools erected, cost	73
Betting, police action on racecourses	73
National Insurance Act, relief workers and men on sustenance	74
Sales by Auction Act, application to wool	74
Sewerage, West Subiaco treatment works	74
Committees for the Session	74
Newspapers in the Chamber	74
Questions and Motions for returns	74
Chairmen (temporary) of Committees	75
Personal explanation, Mr. Wilson and a newspaper report	75
Order of business	75
Address-in-reply, third day	75
Committees for the Session, Council's Message	101
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,500,000, returned	101

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

QUESTIONS (3)—EDUCATION.

Schools, East Perth and Merredin.

Mr. **BOYLE** asked the Minister for Education: 1, What is the cost, to date, of the new Girls' State School at East Perth for—(a) land; (b) buildings; (c) tennis courts and playing fields; (d) furniture; (e) maintenance of building since erection? What is the average number of children attending? 2, What is the cost, to date, of the State School at Merredin for—(a) land; (b) buildings; (c) tennis courts and playing fields; (d) furniture. (e) maintenance of buildings for the two-year period ended 30th June, 1937? What is the average number of children attending?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS** (for the Minister for Education) replied: 1, Cost, to date, of the new Girls' State School at East Perth:—(a) Land and (b) buildings, £73,607; (c) tennis courts and playing fields, £76; (d) furniture, £4,816; (e) cost of maintenance of building since erection, £11 7s. Average number of children attending, 669. 2, Cost, to date, of the State School at Merredin:—(a) Land and (b) buildings, £3,829; (c) tennis courts and playing fields, nil—privately constructed; (d) furniture, £290; (e) cost of maintenance of buildings for the two years' period ending 30th June, 1937, £105 12s. Average number of children attending, 252.

Scholarships not availed of.

Mr. **SEWARD** asked the Minister for Education: 1, Were all the secondary school scholarships offered at the end of 1937 awarded, and were they all taken advantage of by the winners? 2, If any were not so awarded, what was the reason? 3, As regards the ten reserved for country children, were any winners prevented from taking advantage of them? 4, If so, how many, and to whom were they awarded?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS** (for the Minister for Education) replied: 1, All were offered, one was declined, and re-awarded to the next best candidate. 2, The parents declining as above did so because they wished to send their child to a college which is not registered as one at which secondary school scholarships are tenable. 3, Eleven went to country children, and all were accepted. 4, Answered by No. 3.

New Schools erected, cost.

Mr. **SEWARD** asked the Minister for Education: What new school buildings were erected during the years ended 30th June, 1936, 1937, 1938, and what was the cost of each building?

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS** (for the Minister for Education) replied: A statement setting out the information requested will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—BETTING.

Police action on racecourses.

Mr. **MARSHALL** asked the Minister for Justice: Is it intended to issue instructions to the Commissioner of Police to take

immediate action to prosecute bookmakers operating on racecourses in the metropolitan area in the same way as bookmakers found operating in shops are punished?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: No.

QUESTION—NATIONAL INSURANCE ACT.

Relief Workers and Men on Sustenance.

Mrs. CARDELL-OLIVER asked the Premier: 1, What, if any, arrangement has been made to secure to the relief worker the benefits of the National Insurance Act? Further, what arrangements, if any, have been made for payments on behalf of these men during their stand-down periods? 2, What arrangements have been made to include the sustenance men in the above Act? Further, what arrangements, if any, will be made for payment of contributions to the insurance fund on behalf of sustenance men who are unable to make payments themselves?

The PREMIER replied: 1 and 2, The Act referred to has been passed by the Commonwealth Parliament. Its application to the employees of the State is being examined in its many different phases.

QUESTION—SALES BY AUCTION ACT.

Application to Wool.

Mr. WATTS asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Has the Government decided to extend the operation of the Sales by Auction Act, 1937, to include wool as provided by Section 7 of the Act? 2, If not, will consideration be given to such extension in the near future either—(a) by proclaiming the extension to wool in Western Australia alone, or (b) by approaching the other States of the Commonwealth to pass similar legislation where none exists, or to bring into operation already-existing legislation with a view to its general application? 3, If the answers to paragraphs (a) and (b) of Question 2 are in the negative, will he inform the House of the reasons giving rise to such answers?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Agriculture) replied: 1, No. 2, Consideration will be given to the matters mentioned. 3, Answered by No. 2.

QUESTION—SEWERAGE.

West Subiaco Treatment Works.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Water Supplies: 1, Has he received any complaints of an offensive smell attributed to the West Subiaco sewerage treatment works? 2, Are these works functioning satisfactorily?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1, Complaints have been received, and the source is the subject of investigation. 2, Yes.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

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

Library.—Mr. Speaker, Miss Holman, and Mr. Patriek.

Standing Orders.—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Doney, Mr. Withers, and Mr. North.

House.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lambert, Mr. McLarty, Mr. Stubbs, and Mr. Wilson.

Printing.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sampson, and Mr. Styants.

NEWSPAPERS IN THE CHAMBER.

MR. SPEAKER [4.38]: Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish to mention a small weakness which has crept in of members bringing newspapers into the Chamber for the purpose of reading them. I desire to appeal to hon. members to assist me in maintaining the usual practice with regard to newspapers.

QUESTIONS, AND MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

MR. SPEAKER [4.39]: There is one other matter I wish to mention. I am afraid a practice is growing up of using questions as a means of obtaining returns. The practice can become a grave danger, in the sense that in the case of questions Ministers have not the opportunity of stating any objection there may be to furnishing a return, say on account of the cost of preparing it. If the matter is raised by notice of motion, a Minister is often able so to modify the desire of the member requiring information in the nature of a return as to supply the hon. member more economically with information which will be just as useful to

him. To-day a Minister stated that the reply to a question took the form of a return. That incident drew my attention to the fact that we are getting a little bit loose in that respect, and I hope hon. members will assist me to maintain the practice of asking questions only on such matters as can reasonably be the subject of questions. Where information in the nature of a return is desired, notice of motion should be given.

CHAIRMEN (TEMPORARY) OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to announce that I have appointed Mr. Withers, Mr. Hegney and Mr. Sampson to be temporary Chairmen of Committees for the session.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. Wilson and a newspaper report.

MR. WILSON (Collie) [4.41]: I wish to make a personal explanation. In the "West Australian" of this morning I am reported to have said, by way of interjection to Mr. Latham, the Leader of the Opposition, that "the President of the Arbitration Court advised the men to take this course." I desire to state that my reference was to the appointment of an industrial reference board by the Court of Arbitration, and not to the appointment of a Commissioner.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. F. C. L. Smith—Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [4.42]: I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the notices of motion appearing on the notice paper are to be dealt with at this stage or whether the Orders of the Day will be taken first.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders direct that only formal motions may be proceeded with before the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willcock—Geraldton) [4.43]: I desire at the outset to congratulate the new members that are

with us in the House to-day, namely Mr. Leahy and Mr. Willmott. I know that they have come here with the best of intentions, and that they want to do the utmost they can in the interests of the State, and all I can wish them during their sojourn in the House is that they may have a successful term as representatives of their respective constituencies. The usual procedure in Parliament after the opening is that opportunity is taken by the Leader of the Opposition, by means of the Address-in-reply debate, to criticise the Government for what he, or his party, thinks have been mistakes either of omission or commission made by the Government during the recess. The criticism we heard last night was not of a very serious nature, and I do not think I shall have any great difficulty in replying satisfactorily to the main points of the hon. member's speech, which was delivered in his usual temperate manner. It seems that the Leader of the Opposition was rather disappointed that the Government had done so well, and that he had therefore so little serious criticism to offer. I regret, however, that the Leader of the Opposition painted a very doleful picture of the State and of its future prospects. The State has made much progress even under adverse conditions, in comparison with the other States of the Commonwealth. I do not want to dwell on our difficulties, except to say that, from the climatic standpoint, the State has not been very fortunate during the last few years. Drought conditions have affected a large portion of the State, particularly the outer agricultural areas and the pastoral districts. Another factor that has helped to hinder development to some extent—and this has been a rather serious difficulty—has been the steadily diminishing amount of Loan Funds available to the Government, and not only to this Government but to the Governments of the other States of Australia. Not that we have any complaint on the score that this State has had its Loan Funds reduced in greater ratio than any other State. As a matter of fact, I think this State has received, as a result of representations made at the various Loan Council meetings, a little more consideration than have the other States, and we have received a greater ratio of the loan money available than they. The fact remains, however, that there is

a distinct diminution of the Loan Funds made available through the Loan Council to the State Governments, and that, of course, means that much less developmental work can be undertaken. If we compare the present position with that which obtained eight or ten years ago, we will find that the State this year will have approximately only one-third of the loan money that was available in the years prior to 1930. Notwithstanding that we have had those conditions to contend with, we have been able to contribute to the progress of the State and have provided increased employment for our people. In spite of the pessimism of the Leader of the Opposition, or rather his lack of optimism, the fact remains that the national income is increasing, and has been increasing at a greater ratio than the increase in population. That is not a very doleful situation.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I said it could not be continued this year with the low prices offering for the commodities that we export.

The PREMIER: I am pointing out what has occurred during the last few years, and anything that I have to say concerns the administration of the Government since it took office in 1933. The national income is increasing and it is increasing at a greater rate than is the population. The savings of the people have increased. The Savings Bank returns show that there has been a comparatively greater amount of money put into the Savings Bank, and both the aggregate amount and the amount to the credit of each depositor are increasing. The bank clearing house returns of the cheque-paying banks published weekly in the Press also reveal a considerable improvement, indicating that a greater volume of business has been done in the commercial fields of the State. The gold mining industry is on a solid basis with an increase in production that is continuing steadily. So in every direction, except where climatic conditions have been adverse, the State has made sound and solid progress. It is impossible for one who studies the conditions, and makes a comparison of the position of the State to-day with that which existed four or five years ago, to take a very doleful view of the future of the State. The production of butter, timber, fat lambs and other commodities is increasing. Our industries are becoming more diversified,

and this is all to the advantage of the people of the State. The building trade has been brisk, and this is an indication of the confidence of investors in the future of the State. The Leader of the Opposition said that he would like to be optimistic, but could not. There is every reason for looking ahead with confidence, and I cannot agree with the viewpoint expressed by the Leader of the Opposition during his remarks last evening. It does harm to a State when a responsible political leader, for any reason at all, paints a doleful picture which is not warranted by the facts. I would not hide the truth of any situation which may face us; but, when everything points to solid, steady and sure progress, no good can be served by saying we must look ahead with serious misgiving.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That may be a habit of leaders of Oppositions. I quoted what Mr. Curtin said.

The PREMIER: That may be so. However, as I say, I think the habit is not a good one, because people are apt to accept what a responsible person, like the Leader of the Opposition, may say. People would take his utterances much more seriously than perhaps he might have intended they should.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Mr. Curtin was quite serious.

The PREMIER: Perhaps he had occasion to be. However, I have shown the progress the State has made during the past four or five years and that progress should cause us to take an optimistic view of the future.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Only time will prove that.

The PREMIER: I am prepared to excuse my friend, because I am afraid his very close association with the agricultural industry has rather warped his judgment. I admit that that industry is not in an extraordinarily buoyant position. Droughts have seriously affected it; but last year our climatic conditions were much better and I think wheat production was 60 per cent. greater last year than it was in the previous year.

Mr. Doney: Why should all that warp a man's judgment?

The PREMIER: The view expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the future of the State was somewhat warped because of his close association with an industry that has not been enjoying a great amount of prosperity.

Mr. Doney: That should not warp his judgment.

The PREMIER: If one is associated with a particular industry which has fallen on evil times, his outlook on life generally is apt to become changed. The industry with which the Leader of the Opposition is associated is very important from his own standpoint, and when he knows that it is not progressing in the manner in which he and everyone else would like to see it progress, he is likely to become pessimistic.

Mr. Doney: The Leader of the Opposition has many other interests to keep his mind broad.

The PREMIER: I am merely excusing him. I do not think he was warranted in making the statement I have referred to. I am aware he has a broad outlook. The increased wheat production to which I have referred will have a beneficial effect upon the national income, and I hope the yield will be at least an average one. The national income will not be affected to any great extent even if the prices are somewhat low. The Leader of the Opposition may have some cause for his pessimistic outlook, because during the last month or two the prices of the commodity about which he was speaking have been falling.

Hon. C. G. Latham: There is the difficulty of getting a market.

The PREMIER: I quite agree with the hon. member. I am well aware of the effect of low prices upon primary producers and upon the prosperity of the State. I have repeatedly said that there can be no real prosperity when the prices of our primary products are unremunerative. Fortunately, our industries are more diversified than when practically our main economy was being built up on the production of wheat. The Leader of the Opposition complained about what he termed the Government's lack of policy. Our policy is very simply expressed in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. I would draw the attention of the House to the following paragraph in the Speech:—

In recognition of the fact that the prosperity of the State is dependent on the stimulation of industry, both primary and secondary, my Government has rendered financial assistance to projects which will beneficially affect the development of the State.

That is the Government's policy, to stimulate industry and to stimulate production, so that everybody may share in the benefits to be

derived from industry and production. We can cater effectively for our own requirements; and, having done that, we have a fair measure of products available for export to other countries of the world. If industry is stimulated, and if we can produce a large portion of the commodities we require, and can maintain an exportable surplus, there will be remunerative work for the people and our living conditions will improve. That is what the Government has done and will continue to do. That is, precisely and concisely, the policy of the Government to-day. Industrial and social conditions, whether relating to health, education or assistance to those in adversity, the raising of the standard of living, housing, recreation and comfort, all are dependent on the national income, to which the Government is giving much attention, so that it might be increased.

Mr. Marshall: Can you say what the national income is based on?

The PREMIER: On production and services rendered to the people.

Mr. Marshall: We should have full and plenty of everything on that basis.

The PREMIER: If we continue to employ our people in the production of commodities that we can profitably export, we shall be better off as the years go by. The Bureau of Industry and Economic Research which the Government proposes to establish will be no part-time concern. Every endeavour will be made to secure the services of a permanent officer, with the right outlook and outstanding qualifications for the post of director. The work of the bureau will not be entrusted to an honorary committee. Notwithstanding the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition regarding secondary industries, the figures I will quote will show the improvement that has taken place in employment in these industries during the past four or five years. The figures relate to the activities other than mining, which engage four or more hands and/or employ motive power:—

		No. of Men.	No. of Establishments.
1928-1929	..	20,913	1,469
1932-1933	..	14,810	1,499
1933-1934	..	16,154	1,606
1934-1935	..	17,769	1,658
1935-1936	..	20,972	1,946
1936-1937	..	22,712	2,032

Thus in 1936-37 we left well behind the figures of the peak period of 1928-29, and

we find by the latest return that there were over 22,000 engaged in secondary industries and that there were 2,032 separate establishments as against 1,469 in the boom or prosperous period to which members like to refer, or look back upon. Each of these years shows a steady but solid increase, and progressively each year we have been employing people at the rate of an extra thousand or more in the secondary industries of the State. Some people would naturally like greater progress to be made, but it cannot be denied that there has been a sure and certain advance in regard to the various aspects of our industrial life. The Government policy of rendering assistance to industry covers a very wide field, and despite what the Leader of the Opposition has said, we have done a vast amount for both the agricultural and mining industries. I may be permitted to quote what has been done with regard to the mining industry. The Leader of the Opposition was inclined to waive aside the various aspects of Governmental activity, and tell the House that the price of gold was responsible for the progress that has been made. Even with the enhanced price of gold, if the Government had not been anxious to render assistance and stimulate industries in the way that has been done, the progress that has resulted would not have been made. Let me give members some particulars of what has been done for the mining industry—I will deal with the other matters later. I have here a statement of expenditure on major works in connection with primary production for the five years ended the 30th June, 1938—

Goldfields Water Supply.

	£
Main conduit renovations ..	1,001,935
Branch mains renovations ..	32,763
Enlargements of mines main ..	13,592
Extension to Norseman ..	172,731
Extension to Ora Banda ..	23,484
Bullfinch new main ..	17,781
Marvel Loch Extension—improvements ..	40,425
4in. main to Yellowline ..	6,314
Additions to reservoirs and summit tanks ..	20,380
Total ..	£1,329,405

It will be seen that the Government has spent considerably over a million pounds in providing water for the goldfields so that the industry and the people may prosper. Without this expenditure the increased produc-

tion that has followed could not have taken place. In the one item alone—the provision of water supplies—we have spent over a million to great advantage. The Leader of the Opposition attributes the progress to the increased price of gold, but how could the goldfields have prospered even with that increased price, if the assistance to which I have referred had not been rendered? On the subject of hydraulic undertakings, I can quote additional interesting figures—

	£
Barbalin Link with Goldfields Water Supply ..	65,420
Collie Water Supply—Mungallup scheme ..	55,694
Geraldton Water Supply—relaying gravitation main ..	46,415
Geraldton Water Supply—roofing Wieherina and service reservoirs ..	45,487
Drainage and irrigation works ..	1,058,533
Total ..	£1,271,549

Next with regard to the bulk handling of wheat, we have provided facilities at Bunbury at a cost of £63,798, making a grand total expenditure under the three headings of £2,664,752. Everyone will agree that bulk handling has assisted the agricultural industry to some extent. At any rate, bulk handling has always been championed as an economical factor from the marketing point of view. But to return to the goldmining industry—which members believe to be the only industry that matters, that is, according to the Leader of the Opposition—the Government constructed a railway line to Big Bell at a cost of £52,000. Of course the Government could have said to the company concerned, “The price of gold is all right, go on and work your mine; there is no need for the railway.”

Mr. Marshall: Quite a number of people were sceptical about the success of the mining operations at Big Bell when you built the railway.

The PREMIER: The Government's desire was to render every possible assistance to a company that had invested so much money in that particular district, and it was also desired to increase the national income so that all would share to some extent in the prosperity that might follow. Thus we committed the State to the expenditure of £52,000 on that railway. Now we have in that centre a gold mine that is well estab-

lished—I do not know the details of its production—and we know that the expenditure incurred was quite justified. I understand that the company in question does not intend to confine its operations to that one particular mine; it has extended its activities to other districts and is still on the lookout for payable propositions elsewhere.

Mr. Marshall: It is the only bona fide company operating in the State inasmuch as it does not parade its shares on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member interjecting desires to make a speech he must rise in his place, otherwise he is out of order.

The PREMIER: With regard to geological and geophysical surveys, the Government has spent £42,500 in the last four or five years, and activities have in consequence been increased, particularly in the Pilbara, Kimberley and West Kimberley districts. Everyone realises the importance of the work that has been done in this direction. A feature of the work that has been carried out is that people have diverted their enterprise towards centres where they have the opportunity at least of being more successful. This has resulted in the prevention of money being wasted in places where investigations showed there was no chance of success.

Hon. C. G. Latham: What about the prospects of finding oil in the Kimberleys?

The PREMIER: We are rendering assistance to enable the Freney Oil Company to determine the site of a bore in a locality where it is expected there will be a reasonable prospect of success. The Government has agreed to advance the Freney Oil Company an amount of £20,000, and the Commonwealth is also providing a similar sum on the understanding that the company will also find a like amount. The money available will then enable the company to put down a bore on a site selected by Dr. Wade. Again, assistance has been rendered to Tindal's Goldmining Company, the Government having guaranteed the sum of £30,000 on the understanding that the company will raise a similar amount, and the total will be devoted to the erection of a plant on the property which will treat 5,000 tons of ore per month, and will be the means of eventually employing a couple of hundred men. The prospecting scheme has been responsible for an average number of 500 men per

month being at work, and for the production of a considerable quantity of gold, and the opening up of many new finds. The Government believed that there was an opportunity for the successful exploitation of mining fields which had not been prospected thoroughly, and agreed to find the money to send these men out. The result has been that a considerable quantity of gold has been produced by them. All this has materially helped to increase the gold yield. But the Leader of the Opposition will have it that the price of gold is wholly responsible for the advancement of the mining industry. It will be agreed that the work the Government has done in rendering assistance in every possible way has largely been responsible for the present position of the industry, and the increase in gold production. I can say at this stage that had it not been for the expansion of the goldmining industry, to which the Government rendered every possible assistance, the State would have been in a parlous condition. The industry is employing 12,000 or 13,000 additional men as compared with four or five years ago. It cannot be denied that that has been to a large extent responsible for the progress made by the State. With regard to the agricultural industry, —I have no wish at this stage to detail everything that has been done by the Government—we have been very sympathetic in our administration. What was dragging most of the people engaged in the industry towards bankruptcy was the heavy burden of debt they were carrying and from which they saw no prospect of relief. They could see nothing before them except having to pay off their debts and being left without anything for themselves. By passing the Agricultural Bank Act, the Government provided power to write down debts. The debts have been written off between the 1st April, 1935, and the 30th June, 1938. as follows:—

	£
Agricultural Bank	1,552,000
Soldier Settlement Scheme ..	803,000
Industries Assistance Board ..	1,157,000
Group Settlement	1,842,000
	<hr/>
	£5,354,000

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: It was not worth eighteenpence.

The PREMIER: That is a very cheap jibe. The figures I have quoted give an idea of the outlook of the agricultural in-

dustry five or six years ago when that heavy burden of debt rested on the shoulders of the farmers. Even when better times came and better prices ruled, the load being carried was so enormous that it would have been impossible for those engaged in the industry to carry on without assistance. That was their outlook. The Government said, "At least we will remove that depressed position by wiping out, or taking off, a considerable portion of the burden under which the farmers were suffering, and shift the load from the industry to the people of the State generally." That is what was done, and it must be of great advantage to the agricultural industry. No one could have gone on under those conditions unless something had been done. A sum of £5,000,000 has been written off the indebtedness of, say, 10,000 farmers, and spread among the 450,000 people of the State, which has to find the interest and sinking fund on the money expended until the debt is redeemed.

Mr. Doney: Despite your explanation, you never would have had the money.

The PREMIER: We need not have done this if we had been foolish, and had not exercised a wise discretion in doing what we thought was right in the interests of the State. Had we not done what we did, the industry would have been down and out. At least we have done something for which those who are engaged in the agricultural industry are thankful.

Mr. Doney: It is largely a matter of writing off bad debts.

The PREMIER: People in the agricultural industry would pay their debts if they could, but in the future, in respect to these particular debts, they will not have to pay. With regard to the pastoral industry, we have written off, under the amended Land Act, £93,000 in rents. That is not very much perhaps, for people whose flocks have in some cases dwindled from 50,000 to 5,000. Collectively a sum of between £90,000 and £100,000 has been written off in land rents. This may not appear a large amount, but people do like to be helped when they are in trouble. Assistance of this kind gives them a better outlook on life, and the will to go on under adverse conditions. These reductions in rent have been highly appreciated by the pastoralists concerned, and have been of great benefit to them. They, too, as with those engaged in the agricultural industry, are faced with a load of debt. If £100,000 less debt has to be faced, that is something

which people will appreciate when starting out again on production. Whilst the agricultural industry was suffering from the grasshopper and other pests, the Government did not neglect the possibilities of helping those concerned, although perhaps we did not do as much as some people wanted us to do.

Mr. Warner: Not as much as might have been done in the early stages.

The PREMIER: But more than might have been done by people who were not in sympathy with the production of wealth.

The Minister for Works: And we did not receive much co-operation from certain quarters.

The PREMIER: I do not know what the position is this year. It may be that if we get further generous rains during the next two or three weeks the grasshopper may not be such a menace as it has been in the last two or three years. If this menace does recur, the Government will be anxious to help those who may suffer as a result of it. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the home price of wheat. This matter has been satisfactorily dealt with by the Commonwealth Government whenever anything has been done in this direction. That Government possesses all the necessary power to do so again. Unfortunately for the agriculturists of Australia, the Commonwealth Government says it is politically inexpedient to do this again. It was the only way successfully to tackle the position during the last two or three years, when the industry was in a parlous condition. If the Commonwealth Government will not undertake to do so again, it is possible that, with the co-operation of the States, we, in this State, may be able to do something in the matter. We are prepared to co-operate in that regard. The Minister for Lands will be going to the Eastern States during the next week or so to participate in a conference that will deal with the subject.

Mr. Stubbs: Will he go to the conference?

The PREMIER: Yes. If our production of wheat this year is 40,000,000 bushels, a bonus on wheat production of even 1s. would cost this State £2,000,000. If the price comes down at all, we may have to find more than 1s. per bushel. Even at 1s., this State could not find the £2,000,000 involved, but we can co-operate, and will be pleased to co-operate, with the other States in placing this industry on a sound basis. I hoped last

year, when the price rose, that there would be no necessity for this kind of thing, but apparently there will be some necessity for dealing with the matter. So far as this State can assist, within the measure of its capacity to do so, it is prepared to co-operate and see whether something cannot be done to assist the industry in its present parlous condition. Another industry to which we have rendered great assistance is that connected with the export of fat lambs. Expert officers of the Agricultural Department are devoting all their time to advising the people concerned as to the best type of lambs for export, and the best method to adopt to breed them. People cannot carry on without money. The Government has not been averse to advancing money to those who desire to assist in carrying on this industry. The W.A. Meat Exports Co. Ltd., received considerable financial assistance from the Government. Now that the company has an opportunity profitably to enter into the fat lamb export industry the company found itself unable to raise the necessary finance to provide the full facilities. The Government said, "You are doing a national work which will assist in building up the national income, and this will enable everyone to share in the increased wealth that will be produced." The Government had no hesitation in making available to the company concerned another £30,000, although the company is already indebted to the Government to the extent of over £100,000, representing capital and arrears of interest. It became necessary to increase the facilities for handling fat lambs at Albany, so that those concerned might successfully cope with the increased trade that it was anticipated would occur this year. Again the Government did not hesitate to render financial assistance in that direction. We have made every possible effort to assist industry generally along these lines. We are always anxious to build up the national income to assist in increasing the export trade which is so important to us. A few months ago, according to the fruitgrowers, their position was absolutely jeopardised because of the outbreak of fruit-fly in this State. Countries which had not that menace to cope with would not deal with this State in which the fruit-fly was prevalent. They threatened to impose an embargo. Our fruitgrowers, who had built up this trade over a number of years, were

almost demoralised in their outlook because of this threatened embargo. The Government realised what it would mean not only to the growers but to the people of the State generally, and had no hesitation in arranging for the Minister for Agriculture, with his expert knowledge, thoroughly to discuss the whole question from every standpoint and supply all the information as to what we could do to minimise any possible infection from the fruit-fly. I have not the full particulars yet, but I have sufficient information to be able to say that the threatened embargo will not be imposed, and that arrangements will be made, by restrictions and precautions, so that the trade, which has been built up over so many years, and upon which so many of our growers are entirely dependent, will be carried on successfully and profitably in the future.

Mr. Stubbs: It is important that you yourself should attend the conference.

The PREMIER: I am talking about what has been done with regard to the export of fruit to Ceylon, Malaya and Java. A similar position with respect to our timber trade in Ceylon has arisen. Because of certain circumstances and the prejudices fostered by competing countries, the timber from Western Australia was said in Ceylon not to be suitable for use there. We ascertained what the position was, and it did look very serious. It appeared that we would get no more timber orders from Ceylon. The Minister for Agriculture made a preliminary investigation. He was assisted by the Conservator of Forests, a very efficient and good officer, who thoroughly understands his subject. He was able, with the aid of another professional officer, Mr. Gregson, to make investigations, and completely to satisfy the railway people of Ceylon that our timber was all right, and thoroughly serviceable. Because of the action that was taken directly by the Government to conserve the interests of the producers in this State, we obtained for Western Australia an order for 100,000 sleepers from the Ceylon Government, at a time when it looked as if we had no hope of receiving any order at all. The Leader of the Opposition twits us with not having a policy. Our policy is to do all we can to assist people in building up the national income. The instances I have quoted could be multiplied ten-fold to show how we have

conducted to the well-being and prosperity of the State. We are also prepared to assist people who are ready to spend their own money in looking for oil in this State. I think already over £100,000 of private capital has been spent in Western Australia in the search for oil. Those people have now come to the end of their resources. According to expert opinion they have a fair prospect of success, which has appealed to both the Commonwealth and the State Governments. The area in question has been reported upon by a world-acknowledged authority on oil production, Dr. Wade, backed by our own Government Geologist, Mr. Forman. Having in view the extreme importance it would be to Western Australia if oil in payable quantities were discovered, we did not hesitate to risk a little of the people's money in the endeavour to establish the industry. The discovery of oil within our borders would make a tremendous difference to the people of the State. I do not know of anything that would be of more importance to Australia than the discovery of oil in payable quantities. The Leader of the Opposition complained that the Government had made no reduction in the number of men engaged on relief work. The policy of the Government to assist industry has certainly reduced to a minimum the number of men who are relying upon the State. Because of the loan works which have been carried out in this State over the last 40 years we have developed a class of people who specially undertake this kind of work. There has grown up in our midst a number of people who cater for the public works requirements of the State. They have served so long at it that this has become their mode of employment. We shall have to continue giving them employment in the occupations they have been following for a number of years, and in which they have done so much towards the development of the State. Their number has been reduced considerably compared with what it was some time ago, but, at any rate, on the construction of roads alone we are employing nearly 2,000 men and that is practically permanent employment. They will be employed on road construction work for at least 10 years during the currency of the agreement with the Commonwealth Government. It is quite possible that the number of men engaged on that

work will increase to about 3,000, and for the next 10 years about that number will be engaged on improving our road system. Those are some of the men who are being employed on public works in this State. We cannot put such men behind counters or into clerical jobs; they are particularly suitable for work of the nature in which they are engaged, and so we employ them on work that will be of the greatest advantage to the State. What is of importance, too, is that the number of men dependent on the Government for employment has been reduced to about 6,500, whereas the number was 18,000 not so many years ago, and at present 94 per cent. of them are receiving work instead of 36 per cent. on Government relief operations five or six years ago. Moreover, the work they are being given is on a vastly more generous scale and each successive year we endeavour to improve their conditions. Those with three children or more now receive full-time work for the duration of the job.

Mrs. Cardell-Oliver: Unfortunately, in most instances those jobs do not last for a long time.

The PREMIER: But some of them do last for a long time. In some cases these people are practically given continuous employment. Turning now to the question of youth employment, this problem has been tackled energetically. It was exhaustively examined by a Royal Commissioner and his report has received the attention of the Government. Parliament will be asked to deal with legislation relating to that aspect of our industrial life. In answer to a question that was asked in another place yesterday, the Minister informed members of that Chamber that over 500 boys had applied to the Employment Department since it took over that phase of the work, and now only 25 of those remain to be placed. Particular attention is constantly being given to improving technical and manual training of all descriptions, as a means of preparing boys and girls for life vocations.

Something was said by the Leader of the Opposition regarding cheap homes. I was very pleased to receive his assurance that he is in favour of such a policy. My only hope is that he will be able to exert sufficient influence on members of his party who may occupy seats in the Legislative Council, to ensure that they will adopt a much more sympathetic view of legislation that we propose to submit to them than they displayed

last year on the Loan Bill and on other legislation. The hon. member referred to workers' homes in the metropolitan area and in the country districts respectively. The number of those homes in country centres is 660, and in the metropolitan-suburban area 1,104. Building approvals during the last two years totalled 41 in the country districts and 150 in the metropolitan-suburban areas. On the goldfields the number of houses already erected in Kalgoorlie and Boulder as the result of operations during the past two years is 40, the number in course of erection is five, while an additional eight homes have received approval for the work to proceed immediately. This makes a total of 53 homes under the policy that was initiated by the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) when Treasurer. That is what is actually going on, but that does not mean that that is all we would desire to do if more finance were available. Nevertheless, even this effort has done much to relieve the position on the fields. In country towns where the security is considered satisfactory, the Workers' Homes Board gives every attention to applications received, and a proportion of the money available is always allocated to country centres. I may add that, in arriving at decisions regarding approvals, people in receipt of low wages and having two or three children dependent upon them, receive preference over other applicants better circumstanced.

In the course of his speech, the Leader of the Opposition referred to the position of the Collie coal miners.

Mr. Sleeman: He did not know much about that.

The PREMIER: The whole position regarding that matter arose because of the congestion of work in the Arbitration Court. If the court could have dealt with the matter in the first instance, it would have been determined and finished. That would have been the end of it. But a board was created, presided over by a responsible officer—the resident magistrate for the district—and the whole position was exhaustively considered. The two parties concerned were represented on the board. They all knew the finding of the board. They expected that effect would be given to that finding. In the circumstances, it can be quite imagined what grave dissatisfaction must have arisen because of the non-observance of the finding of the board. There was grave dissatisfaction. I

suppose every man engaged in the industry, and the employers too, considered that when the magistrate, who had presided over a responsible board, had delivered the finding, that decision would have been applied throughout the industry. It was expected that the decision would have held good, but apparently it did not. When it became obvious that there would be an industrial dispute, with all its attendant losses and inconveniences, the Minister, as was his duty, examined the position exhaustively, including the legal aspect. That was his duty as a Minister of the Crown. Everyone desires that everything possible shall be done to avoid industrial disputes. In Western Australia we have been singularly fortunate in that we have not had any serious industrial disputes of any magnitude for a considerable time, and we certainly do not want any. If anyone in a responsible position can prevent a dispute arising, it is his duty to take such steps as he can with that end in view. He must do that in the interests of the community, in order to avoid the threatened industrial upheaval. In consequence, the Minister in charge of the situation examined the whole matter in all its phases, including the legal aspect. Provision exists in Section 169 of the Industrial Arbitration Act for conciliation commissioners to be appointed, and the appointment in this instance was legally made. There can be no possible doubt about the appointment by the Minister. That was the beginning and end of the function of the Government. When this appointment was made, and after the natural corollary involved in another section of the Act followed, in consequence of which an award was made under conditions that were strictly legal in every way, the Government decided to accept and honour the basis of settlement. Had the Government not been directly concerned, the whole conduct of the industry would have been carried on under the terms of the finding of the Commissioner, and there would have been no necessity for any action by anybody.

Mr. Seward: But the Arbitration Court refused to ratify the finding of the Commissioner.

The PREMIER: But if the employers and the employees get together and settle their differences of opinion, and agree to accept the finding, there should be no necessity for anything else to occur.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know why the employers accepted the finding. They passed the charge on to the Government.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Will you say they did not know it would be passed on?

The PREMIER: No, I do not say anything of the kind. The Leader of the Opposition wants to read the minds of the employers in the coal mining industry. I do not know what they thought, neither does the hon. member.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I know they would not have agreed to it had the cost not been passed on to the Government.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has no right to say that. He cannot have known that, and does not know it now. No one has any right to make an assertion as to what other people may have thought.

The Minister for Employment: They knew the decision of the Commissioner was just.

The PREMIER: Irrespective of whether the decision was or was not just, the matter was legally carried out in accordance with the law, and the Government was advised by Mr. Walker, the highest legal authority at the disposal of Ministers, and not by Mr. Dunphy.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know you could have settled the dispute without the Commissioner.

The PREMIER: You know that?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You have accepted the additional cost. They had to bring the Government in.

The PREMIER: That is another surmise on the part of the hon. member.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Yes, they had to bring the Government in to shoulder the additional cost.

The PREMIER: Another surmise! Because the hon. member has come to a certain conclusion, that does not mean that his conclusion is correct as regards the attitude of others.

Mr. Seward: They interfered with the award.

The PREMIER: They did not interfere with the award.

Mr. Seward: Of course they did.

The PREMIER: I will read the section of the Act.

Mr. Seward: It is not a matter of what is contained in the Act.

The PREMIER: It is.

Mr. Seward: There are other considerations.

The PREMIER: And there are other things in the Act, too. As everything had been carried out in a strictly legal manner in accordance with the Act, the Government decided to abide by the terms of the award. What else could be done? The Government appointed the Commissioner under the provisions of the Act after legal advice had been taken, and the parties did everything that was necessary under the Act. Would we at that stage have been justified, when the determination had been delivered, in repudiating something that had been done by the Government, the Commissioner and all the parties to the dispute, all having acted in good faith and, as everyone believed, in a perfectly legal manner? Up to the present, no one has been able to say that the appointment was not legally made. The fact that it has since transpired that some people consider that no steps, or else that other steps might have been taken, does not affect the position, and cannot do so until such time as the action taken is proved to have been wrong. So far as we know, everything was done in a proper and legal manner. While I am not going to enter upon legal technicalities, I will point out what Section 169 of the Industrial Arbitration Act contains.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No one disputes the right of the Government to appoint a conciliation commissioner.

The PREMIER: Someone has said that the Government was not right in doing so.

Hon. C. G. Latham: No, not that it was not right, but that the section should not have been used for this purpose.

The Minister for Employment: The "West Australian" said it was wrong.

The PREMIER: It was said that, notwithstanding the statutory authority, we should have ignored it.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The "West Australian" said you should not have appointed a conciliation commissioner to override an award of the Arbitration Court.

The PREMIER: Very well, let me read Section 169, and then we shall see where we stand. Subsection (1) reads:—

In this section the term "industrial dispute" includes any threatened or impending or probable industrial dispute.

Then we find in Subsection (2) the following:—

The Minister may appoint Commissioners for the purpose of preventing or settling any industrial dispute, and notwithstanding that any lockout or strike may exist.

Under that interpretation, even though there should be a lock-out or a strike existing, we may avail ourselves of that provision. Strikes and lock-outs are illegal, yet the Minister has authority to appoint a Commissioner, even though something illegal has happened, something that has a detrimental effect upon the industries of the State. The section gives the Minister authority to appoint, and that is all that has been done.

Mr. Seward: Oh, no!

The PREMIER: Wait a moment.

Mr. Hegney: The Premier is not reading the leading article.

The PREMIER: I am not dealing with the leading article.

Mr. Marshall: The misleading article.

The PREMIER: Subsection 12 of Section 169 provides that the Minister may appoint one commissioner. That is all the Minister did and that is all he could do. Now let me refer to Section 170. This is what the Act says the commissioner may do and this is what was done:—

Where a conference has been held under Section 168 or 169 of this Act and an agreement as to the whole or part of the matters in dispute is not reached, but all parties to the dispute consent in writing to the dispute or the matters in difference being heard and determined by the President or the commissioners, as the case may be, the President or the commissioners shall have all the jurisdiction and powers of the court to hear and determine the dispute, and the award of the President or commissioners shall have the effect of an award of the court.

That is what the Act provides.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It does not say that a commissioner may interfere with an award made by the court.

The PREMIER: It says exactly what I have stated, namely that parties to an industrial dispute must consent in writing to the dispute being so determined. All that was done, and the Act provides that when the parties have complied with those conditions, the finding of the commissioner shall have the effect of an award.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I shall quote another section for your information.

The PREMIER: I do not want any other section.

Hon. C. G. Latham: Of course not.

The PREMIER: I am concerned about the legality and the right to do what has been done. It was our duty to take action in this way. We acted on the advice of the highest legal authority in the Government service, namely, the Solicitor General. His advice was implicitly followed in all things.

The Minister for Mines: It is a matter of two authorities disagreeing.

The PREMIER: Some people consider that those sections should not be in the Act, or, being in the Act, should be ignored. We do not pass legislation merely to have it treated in that manner. The authority is provided in the Act and is intended to be exercised when circumstances arise necessitating its being used. Probably everybody would prefer that there should be no congestion of the business, but that the court should be able to deal with everything. That, however, is impossible.

Hon. C. G. Latham: The court had just dealt with the matter.

The PREMIER: The court had made an award on certain information, but had not dealt with the matter. We have an Act of Parliament which empowers and, I think, implies that in certain circumstances the Minister shall undertake the responsibility for doing certain things. That is what happened on this occasion. As I remarked, some people would prefer that those sections were not in the Act or would ignore them, but those sections have been provided to be used, and they were used, very successfully, I consider, in the interests of the people of the State.

The Leader of the Opposition implied that action had been taken on the advice received from the newly appointed Crown Solicitor. That was not so. The Government consulted its senior legal adviser and his advice was implicitly followed. While dealing with this subject, the Leader of the Opposition voiced criticism of the appointment of Mr. Dunphy, because he had had some association with the Labour movement. As I said by way of interjection when the statement was made, the Government does not consider participation in civic or political affairs to be a bar to

appointment in the Public Service. If a man possesses the necessary qualifications, as does Mr. Dunphy, this Government will give him all possible consideration, irrespective of what his political views may be. We do not subscribe to the opinion held by some people that because a person holds political views somewhat similar to those of the Government, there should be an absolute embargo against his attaining any office under the Crown.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That was not the reason for my objecting. I objected to his going to the Trades Hall and making that speech.

The PREMIER: I am not stating that the hon. member voiced that view; I said some people seemed to think that way. Some people really do believe that when the Labour Party is in power, it is a sin of commission if a person associated with the Labour movement is appointed to a position under the Crown.

The Minister for Lands: One hon. gentleman was an Agricultural Bank inspector.

Hon. C. G. Latham: And you did your best to prevent him from standing, just as you attempted to prevent a member of this House from voting on one occasion.

The PREMIER: I do not want to discuss the merits of past actions or to discuss appointments considered to have been made because of the political opinions of the appointees. This Government does not stand for preference to or victimisation of anybody simply on the ground of his political views. Mr. Dunphy is qualified for the position. The Government took steps to acquaint itself thoroughly of his qualifications; information was secured from men holding high and responsible legal positions. Even though we may be criticised for our attitude, we are not going to debar people who may have some association with the Labour movement from appointment to positions under the Crown, provided they have the requisite qualifications. I do not infer that we shall debar anyone else from securing such positions, but we shall certainly not debar anyone because he may have had some association with the Labour movement. Some people would say, "Oh, it was a political appointment," as if to infer that a man holding Labour views could not possess professional ability. There appears to be an accepted belief that because certain people can afford to

educate their children for the legal profession—people holding views politically opposed to those of the Government—such positions should be reserved for them only. We do not accept that view and never will accept it.

The Minister for Works: It should not be a disqualification. One man was made a judge of the High Court.

The PREMIER: Yes, and I think that was done in the same way as we have acted in this instance.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But he did not say where he stood politically and what he would do in future.

The Minister for Works: We do not object to that.

The PREMIER: A few other matters dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition last evening call for comment. The Leader of the Opposition said it had been suggested in some quarters that encouragement should be given to a new migration policy. That might be the point of view of the Federal Government, but this Government emphatically declines to adopt it. We are entirely unfavourable to a resumption of immigration, except to continue the policy that has been operating over the years, namely, the migration of children under the auspices of institutions such as the Fairbridge Farm, which institutions are prepared to look after them. We will not assist people to come here from other countries at the expense of this State to engage in activities in the State, probably to the detriment of our own people for whom we wish to find employment. To do otherwise would not be sound policy. Our object, as I have stated previously, is to make this State prosperous, to raise the standard, socially, industrially, and in every other way, so that, as in the nineties, thousands of people will desire to come to Western Australia. That is what we want to do; that is all we are going to do. If, as a result of such action, we can make the State prosperous so that people will come of their own free will, they will be welcome, but we shall not bring people here at the expense of the State.

The Leader of the Opposition voiced criticism of some of the regulations under the Native Administration Act. The regulations have to be tabled and thus an opportunity will be afforded to discuss them. Everybody recognises that the administration of native affairs is a very difficult mat-

ter. Two or three years ago the Government had the courage to present to Parliament an amendment of the Aborigines Act, as it was then known. Whatever has since been done as a matter of policy has been done under the powers conferred by the Act. The measure was thoroughly debated and approved by both Houses of Parliament. Possibly, under the administration, some regulation will work out differently from what was expected, but some of the criticism that has been indulged in during the last two or three weeks would be recognised as being ill-founded if the whole of the circumstances were known. Information along those lines will be given to the House in the near future. I say, however, that we did at least propose legislation on this very difficult subject, and that the measure was approved after a debate that extended over weeks. Although the law might contain some defect, the revised legislation certainly has led to an improvement in the condition of the natives.

The Leader of the Opposition said that in giving the Civil Service the five-day week, the Government had offered something for which the service never asked, something which was only an election bait, and something for which the public would have to pay. The hon member was quite wrong on every count. The Civil Service Association and the Railway Officers' Union combined in a deputation two or three months ago asking for the five-day week, and the Public Service Commissioner has recommended it in his annual report. Sufficient staff will be kept on duty to cope with public requirements. As to extra cost, there will be none. Officers will work the same hours as before, spread over five days instead of six days. I believe that more work will be done under the new spread of hours than was done before. The system cannot be a bad one from the point of view of private employers when so many organisations are adopting it.

Member: What about the Federal Government?

The PREMIER: The Governments of the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Tasmania have already adopted it. I do not know that the granting of the five-day week can be regarded as a bait to the electors.

Hon. C. G. Latham: It is strange that this is the one time that it should have been put up. You could have proposed it at any time in the last five years. There was just as much necessity for it five years ago.

The PREMIER: No, not at all.

Mr. Cross: Is the Leader of the Opposition opposed to the granting of the five-day week?

Hon. C. G. Latham: They ought to be working the same hours with the Saturday morning off as they are working now, if you want to know what I think about it.

The PREMIER: Not many Government employees are working a 48-hour week. Private employers such as the oil companies and insurance companies and many legal offices do very little work indeed on Saturday morning.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But they have their staffs there on Saturday morning.

The PREMIER: Not the whole staff. The Shell Company and the Vacuum Oil Company have very small staffs in attendance on Saturday morning.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I do not know anything about that; I do not visit those places.

The PREMIER: The system is established in New South Wales and Tasmania. I repeat that it is already established in many private businesses in Western Australia.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I say those men should have the same hours working the five-day week as they have now.

The PREMIER: It is no use to start that bidding. The hon. member interjecting can promise all sorts of things for the next election, because he knows he will not be able to carry them out.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We will do something.

The PREMIER: We on this side are not going to do a lot of promising.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You started early enough.

The PREMIER: Let me give the House some information as to what the chairman of the Public Service Board of New South Wales has said on this subject—

An exhaustive search and careful examination of the reports was made to ascertain if the records would supply sufficient data to enable me to give you comparative figures indicating the result of the change. This has taken considerable time, but unfortunately there is insufficient material upon which to base any mathematical conclusion, although the reports clearly indicate that the five-day working week tends to greater efficiency, as well as having a beneficial effect from a recuperative point of view. In other departments the adoption of the five-day week has resulted in a reduction of overtime.

Officers too are more contented by reason of the elimination of Saturday morning work.

No statistics are available to indicate the effect on sick leave of officers, but, in the board's opinion—

This is what the chairman of the Public Service Board of New South Wales has said.

—the recuperative benefits resulting from the allowance of two full days free from duty at the end of each week tend towards greater efficiency and an increased output, as well as including the general well-being of officers.

A letter from the Public Service Office of Tasmania states—

The officers of the legal profession in Hobart have adopted recently the five-day week, and solicitors' offices are closed on Saturday mornings. The five-day week also applies to business places and shops in the city, except places such as cafes; but places such as butchers' shops are not exempted, and are closed also. So far as the closing of Government offices on Saturday mornings is concerned, no complaint has emanated from the public or from any direction.

If the system were disadvantageous to the public, surely someone would have complained.

Mr. Cross: The Federal offices close on Saturday morning.

Hon. C. G. Latham: We on this side go further, and say that the offices should, under that system, work only the same daily hours as they work now.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition last night suggested getting into an auction at which he on behalf of the Opposition and I on behalf of the Government could bid for public support by promising many things. I do not think this party has made extravagant promises. I do not want to talk about "Work for all" or that kind of thing. The responsible leaders of this party have never made any such promises. We have continued to do what we consider best in the interests of the people, giving effect to our policy as circumstances permit. Our policy includes many things which we desire to do, but circumstances are not always favourable. We cannot always do such things at once. However, as circumstances permit we will carry out our policy and do what is right in the interests of the people of the State. We will not make extravagant promises. If we had wanted to use this arrangement as an election bait we would have said, "Return the present Government and you will get the five-day week." That would be a bait. But we say, "We be-

lieve in this, and are prepared to do it now." The same remark applies to superannuation.

Mr. Patrick: You expect your reward.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are out seeking the reward now, or you will be early next year.

The PREMIER: Cannot we merely say that this is a matter of industrial justice which should be brought in whenever circumstances permit? Circumstances have worked out so that it can be done, and therefore it has been done. The new arrangement does not apply only to the administrative staff. A lot of line repairers and others have had the arrangement for ten years. Is there anything wrong in the principle?

Hon. C. G. Latham: We do not say there is anything wrong. We say you might as well make the change worth while by not imposing additional time on the five days.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member mean to promise that in the improbable event of his being returned to power he will reduce the hours of the service? Is that the bid he is making for support—that he will reduce the hours of the Public Service? We are not going to do that. We are going to stick to the arrangement of the five-day week with additional time to be worked. If the hon. member wants to buy the electors by making promises, he can have those tactics on his own. I tell the members of the Public Service now that they are not going to get what the hon. member suggests.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But all they have to do is to create a dispute and get a commissioner from the Minister for Labour!

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition bemoans the fact that the Arbitration Court's action in raising the standard of living has increased costs a little.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I never said anything of the sort. After 14 years the President of the Arbitration Court has just adopted a new formula. I do not say whether it is right or is wrong.

The PREMIER: We decline to adopt the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that we should not do anything for anybody because in eight or nine months' time there may be a general election. Anything that we think will benefit the people of the State we will do now, or as soon as we possibly can.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You do it at a very convenient time.

The PREMIER: We are not going to wait until after an election, nor are we go-

ing to promise something before an election and then not carry it out. If we think a thing is right, we will do it now, if we can. As regards any little thing that may be of benefit to the people of the State, we are not going to say, "This is not the time to do it, because some persons will say we are electioneering." We are justified in believing that we shall be in charge of the government of Western Australia for another four or five years.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You are not justified.

The PREMIER: Yes. Should the Government say, "There may be an election in four or five months' time, and so we will not do anything until we see whether we get through that election"? If a thing is right for the people of the State, we will do it irrespective of whether there is going to be an election.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You know that £100,000 that was promised to the farmers. Will you place it on the Estimates?

The PREMIER: Now I think we are getting out of order. I do not wish to take up more time. In conclusion let me say that while, naturally, everyone is not satisfied with what the Government has done, we do not agree with the Leader of the Opposition in taking that doleful outlook to which I have referred. Most people will agree that steady and solid progress has been made by the State during the present Government's term of office. That has been particularly evident during the last four or five years. The Government intends to pursue its policy, feeling perfectly confident that the State will maintain the progress which has been so apparent during the past two or three years, and that we shall continue to be in charge of the affairs of Western Australia because during our term of office such solid and sound progress has been achieved.

MR. NEEDHAM (Perth) [6.13]: I desire in the first place to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to a very high office. I feel sure, Sir, that you will faithfully carry out all its duties, following the example of your illustrious predecessors in holding the scales of justice evenly between all members of this Legislative Assembly. I desire also to offer my congratulations to the member for Hannans (Mr. Leahy) on his very able maiden speech here—a speech which promises that we shall hear more of him during the remainder of this Parliament. I wish to express my re-

gret that the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) has found that the physical disability from which he suffers compels him to relinquish the leadership of the party on my right, the National Party. At the same time I offer my congratulations to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) on his elevation to the responsible position of leader of that party. From what we know of that hon. member I feel sure that he will, while leader, carry out the duties of the position with the same courtesy and the same spirit of fair play that have characterised him as a private member of the Chamber.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. NEEDHAM: At the tea suspension I had offered my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your accession to your high office and to the member for Hannans (Mr. Leahy) who had moved the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, as well as to the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) on his attaining the leadership of the National Party. In ordinary circumstances I would have offered my congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. C. G. Latham) on his speech on the Address-in-reply, but on this occasion I cannot do so because he was far from being his usual happy self when addressing himself to his subject yesterday. Particularly was he very much away from his usual self when dealing with industrial matters. He showed that he was entirely ignorant in that respect so far as such problems are determined in the Arbitration Court. The further he went in pursuing that line of argument, the more he displayed his ignorance of the subject he was dealing with. In the first place he complained about the appointment of Mr. Wolff, K.C., to his position as a puisne judge of the Supreme Court. He then went on to connect that act of the Government with the Arbitration Court and in the course of his remarks stated that there had been no congestion in that particular court.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not. I said there was no congestion in the ordinary courts, not the Arbitration Court.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I do not want to misrepresent what the hon. member said, but I understood him to say there had been no congestion in the Arbitration Court and that there had been no need to appoint Mr.

Justice Wolff as Deputy President of the Arbitration Court. If the Leader of the Opposition had paid any attention at all to Arbitration Court matters, he must have realised that there has been considerable congestion in the work of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. C. G. Latham: You can go ahead with that subject as long as you like, but I did not say it.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Well, I tell the hon. member there is, and has been, congestion.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say there was not.

Mr. Styants: That was the impression you gave us.

Hon. C. G. Latham: That is not my fault.

Mr. Styants: You could not help it?

Hon. C. G. Latham: I could not make it clear to you!

Mr. NEEDHAM: I understood the hon. member to make that remark, and, at any rate, many members who were listening to him gained the impression that he said there was no congestion regarding the work of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Well, he did not say there was.

Mr. NEEDHAM: I think the Leader of the Opposition has thought better of what he said and is now under the impression that he did not say it.

Mr. Cross: But that is what he did say.

Mr. Patrick: No, he did not.

Mr. NEEDHAM: From the time Mr. President Dwyer returned from his 12 months' holiday, there was a considerable easing up of the position. That was quite natural. Then in addition to Mr. Justice Wolff being appointed as Deputy President of the court, industrial boards were created and they also relieved the congestion that undoubtedly did exist. I merely wish to clear the mind of the Leader of the Opposition regarding a state of affairs that unquestionably did exist. There were many tense moments in industrial circles during that period. Union secretaries experienced considerable difficulty in their efforts to preserve industrial peace because many organisations had been waiting for months to have their applications dealt with by the Arbitration Court. That there has not been trouble is due to the patience of the men who were waiting for their awards from the court and also to the ability of their leaders to pacify them because of the long delays.

The Leader of the Opposition complained of the appointment of Mr. Dunphy to the position of Crown Solicitor and he suggested that the Government had acted wrongfully in making that appointment. In order to justify his complaint, he referred to the speech made by Mr. Dunphy at the Trades Hall. It requires an extraordinary stretch of imagination to arrive at the conclusion he indicated respecting the words he quoted from the speech delivered by Mr. Dunphy. There can be no doubt about Mr. Dunphy's ability or efficiency and no one need be afraid regarding the attitude he will adopt in carrying out his duties as Crown Solicitor. The whole intention of the Leader of the Opposition was to infer that the Government had made a political appointment. Mr. Dunphy had taken part in political matters and because he had done that—so the hon. member inferred—he had been appointed to the position of Crown Solicitor. One would have thought from the hon. member's speech that no one who held strong political views on either side had ever been appointed to a high position, judicial or otherwise.

Hon. C. G. Latham: I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Then what did the hon. member say?

Hon. C. G. Latham: You should have been here.

Mr. NEEDHAM: Of course it is not altogether what the hon. member said.

Hon. C. G. Latham: But what I ought to have said.

Mr. NEEDHAM: No, what the hon. member did say. The inference surely is there. We can remember that there was an Attorney General who was promoted to the position of President of the Arbitration Court in this State, and in the Federal arena Senator Drake-Brockman who had held the position of Government Whip was placed on the Federal Arbitration Court bench. No man—not even the Leader of the Opposition—could deny that those two gentlemen were strict partisans; but I do not know that either of them, since he has been appointed to his present position, has done anything other than hold the scales of justice evenly. In the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, mention is made of a proposed amalgamation of the income and financial emergency taxes. I had hoped that so far as the financial emergency tax was concerned, some relief would have

been obtained from that particular impost at least as from the end of this calendar year, in the interregnum between the 1st January and the 30th June, 1939; because there is no doubt that the economic conditions have improved and that the state of emergency that led to the imposition of the tax does not now exist to the same extent as in 1931. I realise that the Government of the day has still to provide for a large number of men. It is incumbent upon the Government to make provision to keep at least 6,500 men in employment, and I realise that there is a vast difference in the position that obtains to-day and that which existed prior to the depression. In the years previous to the depression, whenever there was any Governmental work, the men were employed on that work. When that work was finished, those men had to find other employment, but during recent years it has been incumbent upon this Government—and indeed upon the other Governments throughout Australia—to provide work for the unemployed all the time. Although I said that economic conditions had considerably improved, I realise that the Government must still provide work for these men. But even though I recognise that fact, the improved economic conditions should have warranted, and I hope will be considered to warrant, a release from the emergency taxation at least from the beginning of January, 1939, and then we can hope for the other benefits that would accrue from the amalgamation of the income and financial emergency taxes as proposed in the Speech. Of course, that relief, when it does come at the beginning of the next financial year, will naturally embrace the man on the lower rung of the income ladder and the income that is being derived from taxation as it stands to-day must necessarily come from those on the higher rungs of the wage or salary ladder. In other words, the incidence of that taxation will be altered. The sooner that relief is given to the lower-paid man, the better; because, after all, during the depression years, the man on the lowest rate, even under the system adopted by this Government has had to carry a load far heavier than he should reasonably be expected to bear.

I notice also that the Government intends to bring in a measure to provide superannuation for Government employees. That is a long-delayed measure, and one that I wel-

come. It is a much-needed reform. I would have been more pleased had the Government been able to bring in a measure of superannuation to embrace all, but we must take one step at a time, and the proposal to give superannuation to Government employees is well worth while. I suggest that when such a measure becomes law, the Government should give consideration to the decision of this House regarding superannuation for railway employees. So far the decision of the House, following the report of the select committee, has not been put into effect by the Government. I know that negotiations are not yet complete, and that information is still awaited as to the actual number of men concerned; but whatever the number of men proved to be entitled to superannuation payments under the 1871 Act, the responsibility of the Government in that regard will have eased when the proposed measure becomes law. I hope it will be possible for the Government to provide superannuation for those men that have actually retired but have so far not been recognised. Youth employment was also mentioned in the Speech. That is a question of far-reaching importance. I would say that it is one of the most serious economic problems that have to be faced by people responsible for the development of this country. We have before us the report of the Royal Commissioner on Youth Employment. I have not yet had a chance to read it all, because it is a voluminous document, but it does contain suggestions as to how the Government may grapple in a practical manner with this problem. The legislation foreshadowed will, if enacted, go a long way towards the solution of this all-important problem, the establishment of a council of industrial development, and a change in the system of apprenticeship being particularly helpful suggestions. One feature of the report well worthy of attention is that concerned with the unfortunate position of those youths that, because of the depression, did not have a chance to become apprenticed. The report points out, and very rightly, too, that if those boys who did not have that chance during the depression years are given an opportunity to-day by an alteration of the age of apprenticeship, the boys of to-day from 16 to 18 years of age who are seeking a similar opportunity will be excluded. A provision of that nature would be a two-edged sword. A perusal of the Royal Commissioner's report on Youth

Employment will indicate that the question has been handled by the Commissioner in a very capable manner, and I hope that the Government will be able successfully to give effect to his suggestions.

Amendments to the Industrial Arbitration Act are foreshadowed. I congratulate the Government on its decision to build a new hospital for Perth. For some considerable time the accommodation at the Perth Public Hospital has proved to be inadequate. Considerable agitation has taken place in an attempt to secure not only additional accommodation, but to provide a hospital for Perth that would be modern in the full sense of the term. Before the Government could decide to incur the responsibility of expending a little over £750,000 on a hospital, every inquiry had to be made, and I am glad to know the Government is now ready to commence the work. Before long, I expect to see a commencement made with the building itself.

I desire briefly to refer to some matters that are not mentioned in the Speech. I find no reference to the 40-hour week. The time has come when State and Commonwealth Governments should get together with a view to making a 40-hour week uniform throughout Australia. I am fully aware of the economic disadvantages that would ensue to a single State if it established a 40-hour week within its borders. It would be subjected to crushing competition from the neighbouring States. New Zealand has, however, at the expense of a very slight rise in the cost of living, introduced a 40-hour week, and New Zealand is our next-door neighbour. I see no reason, therefore, why we cannot have a 40-hour week in the Commonwealth. It would prove of great benefit to everyone. I hope the day is not far distant when the Premiers of the States will, in conference, agree to introduce the 40-hour week into each of the States, and thus set an example to the Commonwealth Government. The 40-hour week was introduced into New Zealand without disturbing a balanced budget; there was no question of a deficit.

Mr. Seward: What would be the advantage of the 40-hour week?

Mr. NEEDHAM: The advantages are apparent. The worker would enjoy more leisure than he does to-day. Industry is mechanised and, with the advent of the machine, surely the human being should get a little more rest from his labour. I

do not think anyone would suffer if the 40-hour week were introduced. Industry can afford it. All through the years, when any reform has been attempted, the cry has been, "Industry cannot afford it." I remember that as a boy 12 years old I worked in a coal mine for 60 hours a week; and, when an attempt was made to reduce the hours to 54 per week, the cry was raised that industry could not stand it. Times have changed. Boys do not work those hours in coal mines to-day. The same cry was raised when the hours of labour in the shipyards in the Old Country were reduced from 54 to 48 per week. Time has proved that the industry did not suffer; production reached higher levels by the use of the improved machinery and the mechanisation of the industry.

I now come to another matter not mentioned in the Speech, and that is the fear of war which is agitating the minds of our people to-day. The normal life of every person is being subordinated to the State because of the State's requirements in the event of a conflict. Were it not for the fear of war, perhaps we could enjoy the 40-hour week and other social advantages. This fear of war is cramping economic expansion. Money that could and should be spent on fighting sickness and preventing disease, lessening life's burdens and building up all that is good for man, is being spent in preparation for the destruction of human life. I find that in 1937 much more money was spent in preparation for war than was spent in 1913 for the same purpose. When the people ask for improvement in the social services of the nation, they are met with the threadbare reply that money is not available for that object. Money is not available to provide for a shorter working week, increased remuneration for labour, pensions for widows and orphans and better homes for toilers, or for greater comfort in old age. But money is being used for purposes other than the betterment of human life, its prolongation or enjoyment. The tocsin of war was sounded 24 years ago and the manhood and youth of the world responded to the call. I have looked up some figures relating to that cataclysm and they are astounding. The Allies called up 44,000,000 men, of whom nearly 20,000,000 were on the casualty list; nearly one-half of the 44,000,000 men mobilised

were casualties. The Central Powers mobilised over 22,000,000 men, of whom nearly 12,000,000 were on the casualty list. Altogether, 66,000,000 men were mobilised, of whom 32,000,000 were casualties. Yet, 24 years ago, that war was to end war.

What is happening to-day? Whilst we are paying the cost of the cataclysm of nearly a quarter of a century ago, the nations are still arming, and vying with one another as to which will spend the most money in munitions for the destruction of human life. To-day there are nearly 9,000,000 men under arms, and in 1937 there was spent £3,000,000,000 in preparations for war. This sum is twice the amount that was spent in armaments in 1936, three times that spent in 1932, and five times the amount spent in 1913. The Director of the International Labour Office, in a recent report, sums up the position as follows:—

The whole national life and the activity of every individual is being subordinated to the requirements of the State in the event of conflict. Every country which feels itself menaced and insecure is perforce driven along the same road. Individual freedom and economic expansion are more and more cramped and distorted by the overriding necessity of national preparedness. In such circumstances, vast sums which might otherwise have been profitably devoted to fighting sickness, to prolonging life, to sweetening old age, to adding a cubit to the knowledge and culture of mankind, are diverted to the destruction of what man has so painfully acquired, or created by the sweat of his brow and to the exaltation of death by the perfection of every method available for extinguishing human life with all the thoroughness and horror that science can devise.

That is a sweeping condemnation of our vaunted civilisation.

Mr. Marshall: Our boasted christianity!

Mr. NEEDHAM: It is a pitiful commentary on the government of the nations. One may ask what we can do to prevent this waste of money, from which there can be no real production. Even if war does not take place—God grant it may not—and we do not have a repetition of the horrors of 24 years ago, there must be some repercussion and some reaction that will end in disaster as the result of the spending of all this money. There is one way in which we might reach sanity, and that is to prevent the private manufacture of munitions of war, and remove the incentive to profit for those who make weapons of destruction. The private manufacturer of munitions of war is a

potent factor in perpetuating the forces that bring about war, with all its accompanying cost. If we were to abolish the private manufacture of arms and ammunition, we would go a long way towards preserving the peace of the world, and we would have the money at our disposal to make the lot of the people happier than it is to-day. I was reading the other day of the profit made by private manufacturers of munitions of war. The figures suggest that the profit has gone up from 48 per cent. in 1914 to 213 per cent. in 1938.

Mr. Doust: What about the conscription of wealth?

Mr. NEEDHAM: That is a pertinent interjection. At one time in my life I opposed the conscription of manhood for war, and I paid the penalty afterwards. If the occasion arose to-morrow I would take the same stand as I took 24 years ago, against the conscription of manhood for war. I made this condition at the time, and will do so again, that if there is to be conscription of manhood there must be conscription of wealth.

Mr. Doust: There would not be any war then.

Mr. NEEDHAM: No. If there was conscription of wealth there would be no need to conscript manhood.

Mr. Marshall: It is for wealth that countries war. Conscrip it, and you settle war.

Mr. NEEDHAM: In recent years we have had another kind of international conflict. Even if we do not have a repetition of the horrors of 1914 to 1918, in a military arena, something we devoutly hope can be avoided, we are likely to be involved in another kind of international warfare, such as that which had to be faced between 1930 and 1935, and from which we have not yet fully recovered. I refer to an economic war. That can be just as deadly as a military war. When a war is being waged there is plenty of money about. There was any amount of money available between 1914 and 1918. Since 1913, and even now, when it comes to a question of Governments improving the social lot of the people, we are told there is no money. If a military war started to-morrow, any amount of money would be forthcoming for it. Even without a world-wide war, I think there will still be reactions to the extraordinary expenditure of money on munitions, etc., money which has been spent without any prospect of a re-

turn from it. What shall we do? In my opinion both the State and Federal Governments should get together at once and devise some plan of public works of a reproductive nature, so that in the event of what is termed a recession, we shall be able to set in motion public works throughout all the States. I refer to works that it would be worth while carrying out. We would then not be compelled to do what we have been doing since 1930, namely, spending money merely to keep men in employment. We know the difficulties that have confronted the present Government and the previous Government, and Governments throughout Australia. They have been compelled under the present monetary system to spend money to keep men at work, irrespective of whether there is any return or not from such work. That is not an economic policy. Surely we must have gained some knowledge during our experience of the past six or seven years.

It is the duty of the State Governments to get together at once with the Commonwealth Government to see whether plans cannot be made ahead, so that when another depression or recession comes we shall be able to put those men into work of a profitable nature, yielding some return for the money expended. No great length of time should be permitted to elapse before that is done. Premiers' Conferences are frequently held about different things. I know our own Premier says he cannot attend a conference called shortly. In my opinion, many of these conferences are held about subjects less important than this one. I hope that before long there will be a conference of all Australian Governments with a view to arriving at some means of coping with a depression or recession that may come along.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [8.12]: May I begin, like other members, by congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, on attaining your high office. As a matter of fact, the hon. member to whose duties you succeeded has also achieved action worthy of comment: during the short time he has been a Minister, he appears to have laid his hand on three-quarters of a million pounds. The hon. gentleman is a highly effective Minister to have accomplished that. Before dealing with one or two aspects of the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech I wish at the outset to refer to a local matter in my district. It

relates to the Claremont State School. There is a real agitation in my electorate regarding the flooding of the main school-grounds. The children are walking through deep water there, and getting wet feet all day, and in consequence pneumonia and chills. It is not often that the Claremont electorate asks this House for anything out of the ordinary. In a case like this, the matter of keeping school-grounds drained and fit for use should receive attention. That applies no more in my district than anywhere else. I would rather see less money spent on roads than that any school should be in a condition which involves detriment to the health of the children.

As regards the general position in this State, in my humble opinion 1938 is a red-letter year in its history. The reason why I say that is that during these 12 months there has come over the economic viewpoint of political parties and of our leading newspaper, "The West Australian," a complete change. It has been said definitely in our leading organ that the people of Great Britain, including the big business men, are advocating the establishment in Australia, and the expansion there, of secondary industries. In the past pressure was being exerted to extend our primary industries, and to leave the secondary industries as far as possible to Great Britain. Now it appears that the people of Great Britain have seen fit to advocate a complete change of front, to advocate the expansion in this country of secondary industries without any detriment to themselves. The importance of the matter at this stage is great, because concurrently with that situation we have been informed and advised for some years now that the sale of our primary products can no longer be extended in the overseas market. That is to say, we have come somewhere near the limit of expansion for our primary exports. Our leading newspaper, "The West Australian," and also the Leader of the National Party, Mr. McDonald, have stressed that the time has now come when we must look to building up the future of Western Australia by expanding internally with our factories. This is a most important phase of our history, because reasoning previously went wrong in the attempt to fill up our so-called vacant spaces solely by extending our primary industries. After all, with the great efforts made by this country to date we have

succeeded in settling only about 10,000 farmers on about 10,000 farms.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Where did you get those figures?

Mr. NORTH: I am open to correction.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: There are more than 10,000 wheatgrowers in Western Australia.

Mr. NORTH: Those are the farmers I refer to, because other farmers are not extending much.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Oh!

Mr. NORTH: It is the wheat-growing farmer I am discussing.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: Ask the member for Sussex (Mr. Willmott).

Mr. NORTH: Although they are not all on the land now, I believe they will be back very soon. However, that is not the way to settle this country. It is too paltry a way. Suppose there were 50,000 farmers on our lands; that is not a sufficient population for the work it creates to fill this Western Australia of ours. In Eastern Australia now there are over 6,000,000 people, and we are trying to defend this country from Sydney and Melbourne. The day will come, if it has not come already, when it will be seen that the method to adopt is to exploit the secondary industries throughout the continent, including Western Australia, in order to provide the population necessary.

Mr. Doney: What about markets to absorb the production?

Mr. NORTH: The market will be the eating of our own products.

Mr. Doney: We will not make any money that way.

Mr. NORTH: I am indeed glad to find there is some slight interest taken in this well-worn suggestion. I began my remarks by saying that the people of Great Britain, including the leading business men of Great Britain, have realised that we cannot hold this country or develop it unless we extend the secondary industries and no longer imagine our future is to be secured by extending the primary. Some of the best people in this country have realised—as was shown in Mr. McDonald's speech—that the way to improve farming to-day is to improve the existing settled areas and not go out into new areas trying to make further extensions. I have, however, to get back to my main point. Difficulty comes when we argue about, say, the establishment of a boot factory, or some similar factory, in Western Australia, because it is then assumed that we are trying

to produce for a market only of the existing population. The flaw in the reasoning is in the fact that if we had all those industries together that will have to be established to stimulate our population now, we would be bringing in not a few thousands but hundreds of thousands. Each particular industry added to the others creates a market for itself. Not many more farmers are to be found in either Victoria or New South Wales—if my information is correct—than are to be found in Western Australia to-day. But in Victoria and New South Wales are to be found millions of hands not merely supplying the farmers but also supplying each other. There is a very good example of that sort of reasoning in a work by Bernard Shaw. It supports, by analogy, the argument I am trying to make. It describes a house in Park Lane where there are two beneficiaries, a man and his wife, and 35 servants. Bernard Shaw shows that the 35 servants are not waiting on the couple, but waiting on each other. The couple gets only a very small part of the service rendered. Similarly with secondary industries. If we are to fill Western Australia with people, they will not come to produce for the existing market. The assumption must be that they create a market for all their own produce—boots and clothes and all the other things together. If we want a parallel, we have only to take the Eastern States to see exactly how the thing works out. I may say on this subject that it is about time we broadcast to the world that the greatest iron deposits in any one State are to be found in Western Australia to-day. We should also broadcast the enormous deposits of coal there are in Western Australia. I was glad, therefore, to see the member for Collie (Mr. A. Wilson) once more reviving his long, hard-fought battle over the years for the Collie power scheme. It may be worth while to remind the House on this occasion that many years ago when I, on behalf of the people of Claremont, was trying in a very small way to assist the efforts of the member for Collie, the question was asked at that stage whether it would be economically wise to change over from the trucks of coal to a power wire which would serve the metropolitan area and the South-West. The reply was that a certain number of units would be required—anyhow, not more than a hundred million annual consumption. At that time we were told that it was necessary to reach the hun-

dred million unit mark. The years went by, and we reached that hundred million unit mark, and so once again on behalf of the people of Claremont, and in order to assist the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) in his battle, I asked the question: "We have reached the hundred million unit consumption as specified as the stage at which we should change over to the Collie power scheme, so what is the position now?" The answer to that was: "Since then there has been a change of policy, and we are now working with extensions to the Power House at East Perth, and we are operating with pulverised coal. That work has to go on, no matter how many units are consumed." That is the position, and so the fight has to start all over again. In the circumstances, I am indeed pleased to notice that the subject of secondary industries, and particularly the Collie power scheme, is being revived, because the whole subject has to be looked at from a new angle. When in the early days it was desired to increase the population of the South-West, not merely from the standpoint of growing products but from that of secondary industries with the aid of the power line, the project was then turned down on its engineering demerits in consequence of the adverse advice of the Government experts of the day.

Mr. Lambert: Are you opposed to the trolley buses to Swanbourne?

Mr. NORTH: I thank the hon. member for his interest in the subject, but for the moment I cannot linger on the trolley buses with the subject I am discussing. Nevertheless, I thank the hon. member for his interjection. I am sure he would not desire to side-track me at this stage. Incidentally, we have a new Speaker, and I warn my friend from Yilgarn-Coolgardie that you, Sir, may take action regarding interjections. This is just a friendly warning. To return to my subject: In the early days, the fight for the extension of the power scheme with the object of increasing our population and establishing industries in the State was opposed purely on its engineering phases. Since then, a new situation has confronted the world, which has forced British business interests to a realisation of the need for extensions in this direction. What with that phase and the pressure in Europe from foreign countries, and the awkward and searching questions as to why Australia is not being settled, the time is ripe for a renewal of

the probing of this problem. This House will do well indeed if, as, according to the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, it will be asked to do during the course of the session, it gives attention to the establishment of a Bureau of Industry and Economic Research.

Hon. C. G. Latham: A nice-sounding name!

Mr. NORTH: I trust the bureau will have a long and useful life. I welcome its establishment. Something of the sort has been suggested in this House on several occasions, and motions have been carried with such an object in view. Then again, the Leader of the National Party (Mr. McDonald), in his policy speech, has included a proposal to launch an economic research movement should his party be elected to power. If that economic research can be carried out, and the power scheme to which I have referred duly launched, it will be the beginning of the end of our troubles. Throughout the world to-day cheap power is a general quest. We have gradually extended the East Perth Power House to meet the requirements of housewives with their vacuum cleaners and other requisites, together with the necessities of a few industries, but we have not gone out of our way to provide a power wire through the territory of the South-West to enable us to establish settlements in all directions there. That is for the future. I trust that with the establishment of the Bureau of Industry and Economic Research we shall see extremely powerful action taken in that direction. Leaving that question, which is one I have referred to on previous occasions, I shall proceed to deal with other matters. I may say I do not desire to dwell at length on matters I have dealt with previously. In fact, I wish to deal with them briefly, for I have sympathy with other members because, like them, I have to listen to other speeches.

Mr. Cross: What about dealing with the trolley buses?

Mr. NORTH: No, not at this stage, beyond to say that they are doing very well, and there are no complaints. There is a very important question that may be dealt with aptly following on my remarks about the Bureau of Industry and Economic Research. It is a very live question. I refer to what are called "investigations." Last session the Minister for Railways was not extremely pleased when it was suggested

there should be an investigation into the affairs of his railways. He said we were always asking for inquiries into this and into that. As a matter of fact, at this stage of our history, when we are almost smothered by science and inventions from day to day, we should go in for more of these despised inquiries. I remember that when I was contesting my first election campaign in 1924, I was talking in what was somewhat of a dangerous spot in the constituency now represented by the member for North-East Fremantle. I refer more particularly to the North Fremantle end. A point was raised and I was advocating a solution, and said that if I were returned I would advocate the appointment of a Royal Commission. Unfortunately one of the hon. member's smart boys very quickly remarked, "Is it not a fact that the Government merely pigeon-hole the recommendations of Royal Commissions?" I was not very experienced at the time, and the question was rather difficult to answer, but I find that to-day that self-same question still arises. Nevertheless, I say that it will be necessary to have more and more of those inquiries, despite what the Minister for Railways said.

Mr. Hughes: I think he has been punished for that.

Mr. NORTH: There is still this question of pigeon-holing recommendations of Royal Commissions. If any attempts are made to carry out such recommendations someone squeals like a stuck pig. Every day we are hearing of new problems arising, and who is to try to solve them? We have a parallel case, and something to guide us, in the legal system. I do not like to speak of that matter in front of my learned friend, the Deputy Leader of the National Party (Hon. N. Keenan), who, I find, is listening, although I was hoping he was asleep. We are aware that although judges are made economically secure for life, and are provided with comparatively large salaries, and although we have great respect for their judgment and their decisions, yet we are all aware that, as a matter of legal practice, we can take the decisions of judges from court to court, and even to the Privy Council, if we have sufficient money, in order to challenge their decrees. In those circumstances we have three or four shots to fire at their decisions before finality is reached. That goes to prove that although we have the

greatest respect for the integrity and opinions of our judges, we provide the machinery to demonstrate that they may be wrong. We do not say they may be wrong once, but that they may be wrong from time to time.

Mr. Raphael: The poor lawyers must live! Give them a chance.

Mr. NORTH: It merely serves to show that we realise the possibility of mistakes in their judgments, despite the highly trained and respected judges who hold such positions. But in regard to the other inquiries, examinations and Royal Commissions what happens? The inquiry is set up, the finding issued and members have the option either of pigeon-holing it immediately or of indulging in a good deal of squealing, from which, however, nothing results, and the finding goes back to the pigeon-hole. If we are to obtain results from these inquiries being conducted on every subject under the sun—on wheat, banking, bread, and in fact everything that can be thought of—we must provide a scheme whereby appeals may be lodged against the findings of Royal Commissions to a higher authority and so on, until at last the offended party is prepared to confess, "I have had my say, and now am satisfied and will squeal no more." I consider that to be a very pertinent suggestion. We are living in an age when every single human activity is becoming the object of searching inquiry. We do not seem to know how to solve our problems. It will be a hopeless position if we arrange these inquiries and then, before the investigation commences, people declare that the Commission will be a white-washing one, that the report will be pigeon-holed, and that no action will be taken. We should set up a scheme under which the findings of such investigating bodies may be reviewed by a higher authority that will allow for human frailty and for mistakes in the findings as submitted to this Chamber. I have suggested that this is a red-letter year in the history of the State in view of the fact that we are going to launch out with the official support of the "West Australian" newspaper and the different parties, except the Country Party, though I hope its members will be with us.

Mr. Raphael: And trolley buses for Claremont.

Mr. NORTH: I know the hon. member means well, but I do not see the logic of his remark. In view of the situation I have outlined, it is going to be very necessary to arrange for a better system of investigation, but that is not the only thing. If I thought that the political programmes before this House provided the only solution for our modern problems, I would feel very sorry indeed. But we here are in a very happy position. The world has become very small; one can fly across it in two or three days.

Mr. Hegney: It all depends where you are.

Mr. NORTH: We are linked with other countries by telephone, and the result is that we are now one big human family, and the English-speaking people have, almost by Divine Providence, through their different elected bodies, devised a whole series of attempts to solve our common problems. Travel round the globe in imagination and we shall find that in the various English-speaking countries an extraordinary series of differing experiments have been undertaken. I would say that we in Australia are the most orthodox and old-fashioned people of the lot. We are the Tories of the community. The Federal Government is orthodox. I would not say that it is not daring. The present Ministry is thoroughly orthodox. But let us go to New Zealand, another English-speaking country, where there is a Labour Government.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you call it orthodox?

Mr. NORTH: No, I was making a contrast. I suggest that the New Zealand Government may make history. We do not read much about New Zealand in our newspapers, but I believe that a lot is happening there, right or wrong, that is most interesting. Again in the United States of America an extraordinary experiment is being undertaken. Mr. Roosevelt is spending thousands of millions of dollars. He is always getting into debt, and the unemployed number 14,000,000. In Great Britain, as I tried to show in a letter I wrote during the recess—one of my very few efforts—health is being put above economics, and the Minister for Health has taken over the Ministry for Employment. The point I want to make is that I have wearied members on other occasions with all kinds of new-fangled notions of which they did not entirely approve, al-

though they were polite enough to give me a hearing. But I do not need to worry them any more, because the people of Australia, as a community, both in the States and in the Federal sphere, clearly prefer to be comparatively orthodox. They are more Tory than are the people of Great Britain. They say, "We do not want these experiments, but we want to play our part as an orthodox base from which experiments may proceed in various directions in other countries. If they have to retrace their steps in the future they will find that Australia is as solid and old-fashioned as ever."

Mr. Hegney: You haven't got as far as Alberta.

Mr. NORTH: No, we haven't got that far yet. The hon. member left me on the way, but we went a long way around the world. All the experiments that are being conducted make the position extremely interesting. It would seem that English-speaking peoples have taken the bit between their teeth and said to themselves, "We are going to prevent these politicians from squabbling and each trying to beat the other fellow. We are going, each in our own spheres, to undertake a different experiment and see which is the best." On one occasion I approached my leader, the member for West Perth, and said to him, "Suppose one of these experiments should succeed, how would the National Party be placed?" Suppose it was found that a certain experiment had worked out successfully in some other country, could we apply it to Western Australia?" Being a very cautious lawyer, he replied, "Of course if it were tried and good results were obtained over a sufficiently long period to assure us that it was not just a temporary phase, the National Party could have no objection to adopting such a scheme."

Mr. Cross: They would steal it, as they have stolen other things.

Mr. NORTH: Many years have passed during which political factions have been at variance and each man has tried to beat the other fellow. How many speeches during this Address-in-reply debate will be delivered with malicious intent? How many members will rise and make remarks with their tongues in their cheeks and with the thought in their minds that they will make the other fellow look sick? The world has

men brought to the present pass, not by men who have waged war on each other, but by the simple and humble scientist and inventor. Why should we not take a leaf out of their book and adopt their scientific approach to our problems? They are the men who adopt the method of direct experiment and secure results by the system of trial and error. We have instances to-day across the Atlantic Ocean of men trying to cross the sea in machines of various types. Do you find a man in charge of one type of machine trying to smash the flying boat, or the four-engined standard aeroplane trying to smash the modern Hindenburg gas balloon? No, Sir; each one has a different system and is trying to achieve the same result. Nobody actually knows what each system is, yet one is not found throwing a spanner into the works of the other's machine. My firm belief is that, by some extraordinary overseeing power, the electors of the various countries have taken definite action to force us, whether we like it or not, to undertake a line of action on a straight and continuous course. I have proof of it. I ask members to consider this fact, that almost invariably the same Governments are being returned to power. The Lyons Government has been returned three times, and so has, I think, the Stevens Government. Our Government has had two chances and may or may not get a third. In other parts of the world there is a different situation altogether. New Zealand is in a powerful position.

Member: Do not forget Queensland.

Mr. NORTH: Is it therefore not up to this Chamber, from now on, to give these English-speaking peoples an opportunity to carry on as I have indicated? I do not feel inclined, if I ever did, to queer someone's pitch. I cannot see the sense of doing that. If a bureau of economics and research is to be established, why should it not be given a fair trial? Let it get to work and find out things. Let members bear in mind that more extreme views are being carried out not merely in New Zealand, but in other countries. The day may come when we shall be the only Government carrying on under what is called the old-fashioned system, that is, in relation to Russia, Germany, and Italy, and those other English-speaking countries to which I have already referred to-night. I think we must follow in the path of the scientist. He has

got us where we are. To-day let us use his methods to get out of our troubles.

MR. LAMBERT (Vilgarn-Coolgardie) [8.43]: I have listened to the member for Claremont (Mr. North) megaphoning his usual message to the moon, but without making the slightest practical suggestion for the solution of any of the problems with which the State is faced.

Mr. North: Now is the chance for you to do so.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes. He spoke a moment or two ago about the necessity for encouraging the consumption of Collie coal. He was, however, conspicuously silent about the utilisation of that coal for the extension of the trolley bus service to Claremont and Swanbourne.

Mr. North: In what way was I silent?

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member did not give the slightest indication whether he supported the Government in that policy, and it would be rather informative to know whether he subscribes to it or not. The utilisation of greater quantities of coal in this State can be effected only by a greater consumption of electrical power; and the time will come when this Government will not only extend the trolley-bus routes to Claremont and Swanbourne, about which the hon. member had nothing whatever to say, but will run trolley buses throughout the State for distances of 200 and 300 miles.

Mr. Cross: I think the people of South Perth want a trolley-bus service.

Mr. LAMBERT: I desire to address the House for a few minutes only. I notice that the Minister for Mines has concluded an arrangement with the Federal Government for a geophysical and geological survey of Northern Australia. While such a survey may be of advantage to the Commonwealth Government, I would suggest to the Minister for Mines that he might have such a survey made nearer home. Leaving out of account the valuable minerals of this State, it is absolutely impossible profitably to mine the heavy minerals, particularly those in Northern Australia. I regard this as a national matter, probably of very great importance, but at the same time it is not of immediate concern to Western Australia. I hope the Minister for Mines, who has recently returned from the Eastern States, will take this matter up again with the Federal authorities in order to ascertain

whether it is not possible for someone with a knowledge of the mineral wealth of this State to indicate a more profitable field for exploitation within the next few years. There may be great latent wealth in the middle portion of Australia; but it is not possible for a State like ours, with a small population, and starving for technical knowledge and geological direction, to spend its money on exploits of that description. There are portions of the State with which, no doubt, the officers of the Mines Department are conversant, and which I could indicate to the Minister, where money could be spent much more profitably than in the centre of Australia, particularly in the manner in which it is being spent to-day.

I would like to say a word or two about child welfare. The municipalities and road boards of Western Australia have built town halls which they let to American picture show companies. Our boys, however, are left to wander the streets. I think the time has arrived when we should revise the Municipal Corporations Act and the Road Districts Act by providing that these halls shall be made available for the educational and physical training of boys. Young boys should not be allowed to congregate in the streets. Ban the cheap Yankee picture shows and make the halls available for physical and vocational training. If we spent an entire session on that problem alone, it would be better than sending imaginary messages to the moon, a practice in which the member for Claremont (Mr. North) so frequently indulges. We set up boards to investigate this, that and the other problem. We know the problems. Of what use is it to delude ourselves by saying we do not know the problems of Western Australia? We are confronted by them every day; they have been known to us from our boyhood. We have land problems, water supply problems, and many other problems that could be enumerated.

Mr. Hegney: Including financial problems.

Mr. LAMBERT: Yes. Those problems are incapable of solution under our present monetary system. We cannot solve them without the aid of people possessing greater courage and knowledge who will lend force to a commonsense policy. It is of no use trying to make ourselves believe that the present economic system is the right one, when it is definitely wrong. The Prime Minister in Queensland yesterday said he

had no intention of calling up any of the surplus wealth of the established trading banks to fortify the financial position of Australia. That would be foreign to his present policy, although it was not foreign to his policy at one time. He and many associated with him declare they cannot make a departure from the orthodox, and the orthodox is something he accepted when he left the party with which he could today perhaps be more usefully associated.

Mr. Seward: As a fact, he did not say that at all.

Mr. LAMBERT: Those problems can only be solved in other countries by one method. I will not indicate to-night what that method is because if I did the member for East Perth (Mr. Hughes) would probably like to join in the fun. We have many problems of an outstanding nature in this State that can only be solved by the exercise of common sense. The problem of utilising many of our base minerals deserves every attention. Recently the Premier lodged a protest against the embargo upon the exportation of iron ore from Western Australia. That a country more closely allied with us did not see the commercial possibilities of these great deposits is to be regretted. Had that been the case the present position might not have arisen. It has been a significant policy of the country in question ever since the dawn of its history, and particularly since the advent of the machine age to get its ore supplies from that part of the world where it could buy most cheaply. That is one reason why Great Britain is not buying the products of her colonies as she did formerly. If she were doing so to-day we would be able, with our absorptive capacity, to buy more of the processed or manufactured articles of Great Britain than we are at present able to do. So long as Great Britain pursues that policy, which has been to our detriment for many years, so long shall we have to pursue ours.

I hope the Minister for Mines will give consideration in the way I have suggested to the expenditure of the money that is being laid out by the State and Commonwealth Governments upon geophysical and geological surveys. There are parts of Western Australia that are crying out for a practical investigation of this kind. This may well result in the expenditure of money by capable investors. Notwithstanding the belief of the member for East Perth (Mr.

Hughes) that manganese is of no use and that someone has stolen money from the Government for the exploitation of manganese, certain people are spending a quarter of a million of money to open up the deposits, so that the hon. member's views have evidently proved no deterrent to them. Many people on the Continent realise the almost unlimited latent wealth this State possesses, wealth that if developed would make for the social and economic strength not only of Western Australia, but of Australia as a whole.

On motion by Mr. Watts, debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying the personnel of sessional committees appointed by that House.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1), £2,500,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

House adjourned at 8.58 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th August, 1938.

	PAGE
Questions : Education, scholarships offered to country children	101
Licensing Act, six per cent. levy	101
Licenses Reduction Board	101
Public Service, total of employees	101
Canning bridge	102
Address-in-reply, fourth day	102

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

QUESTION—EDUCATION.

Scholarships offered to country children.

Mr. SEWARD asked the Minister for Education: As to the 50 scholarships offered

to country children—(a) from which schools were the winners chosen? (b) which High Schools did they elect to attend?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Minister for Education) replied: The winners of the 50 scholarships on the recommendations of district inspectors are taken almost entirely from one-teacher country schools and they may elect to attend any District High School in any part of the State, or the Narrogin School of Agriculture or Government Technical School. A statement setting out the information requested will be laid on the Table of the House.

QUESTION—LICENSING ACT.

Six per cent. levy.

Mr. NORTH asked the Treasurer: What amount was received by the Treasury from the 6 per cent. levy on liquor purchased by hotels for the year ended 30th June, 1938?

The TREASURER replied: No separate record is kept for hotels only, but an amount of £44,375 11s. 10d. was collected for the year ended 30th June, 1938, for fees on liquor purchases, covering the following licenses:—Publican's general, wayside house, gallon, hotel, Australian wine, Australian wine and beer, Australian wine bottle, railway refreshment rooms, packet, spirit merchants, brewers, temporary.

QUESTION—LICENSES REDUCTION BOARD.

Mr. NORTH asked the Minister for Justice: When was a hotel license last cancelled by the Licenses Reduction Board?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 31st December, 1930.

QUESTION—PUBLIC SERVICE.

Total of Employees.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Premier: What was the total number of males and females, of all ages, employed by the Government under the Public Service Act, 1904, on 30th June, 1938?

The PREMIER replied: Permanent staff—1,580 (1,302 males, 278 females); Temporary staff—195 (150 males, 45 females).