

have this legislation at all. There were those people who said it was another form of s.p. betting and that the churches were against such legislation. The fact remains, however, that over the years we have seen useful contributions made to charitable and other institutions by a means which is much more pleasant than the ordinary form of taxation.

In fact, I remember the day when a certain member of the Upper House was so keen on this method of collecting money that he advocated a form of premium bonds which is practised on the Continent, whereby everything was pleasant in that all the money that was paid in might be on a winner. This form of taxation should collect about £1,000,000 annually; this year it expects to contribute £400,000 to charities.

It is not only a form of taxation that is pleasant but it serves those people who pay subscriptions and who dislike to have their names in the papers. There are some who like to be anonymous donors and they can go in week after week and plug in their money and their names will never appear in the Press. Even if their names do not appear in the Press they have the satisfaction of knowing that they are helping various institutions.

Let us see what these charitable purposes are. They are public hospitals, any free ward at any private hospital, the relief of former sailors, soldiers, airmen or nurses, blind, deaf or dumb institutions, any orphanage or foundling home, homes or institutions for the reception of dying or incurable persons, any body which distributes relief to the sick and infirm, and those bodies whose activities include voluntary aid or medical or nursing advice to expectant mothers, nursing mothers and children under the age of 16 years, and any object which, in the opinion of the Minister, may be fairly classed as charitable.

I should have thought the last provision would have covered the amendment which the member for North Perth has on the notice paper, but since he is asking for it, he will certainly achieve his object if his proposal is agreed to. I think the Minister will accept it. The Bill is a consolidation measure. What is required more than anything else is the consolidation of legislation. A consolidated Act saves lawyers a great deal of trouble in having to go through amendment after amendment to find out the law.

Then again there is the other advantage sought to be achieved by the Bill in that salaries will no longer be fixed, as they are at present, under a precarious system. There will be a proper method of assessing the salaries for the members of the commission, and now that the measure will be continued for many years, some stability will be maintained. I agree with the point

raised by the member for Toodyay that Mr Kenneally has income other than his salary as chairman of the commission.

As stated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the legislation will fix for many years ahead the method of assessing the salaries of the present chairman and his successors. There is not much more to be said. The Lotteries Commission was first started as an experimental method to raise money. As an organisation it has run the gauntlet for many years, and has finally succeeded. Under the proposed measure, it will be consolidated for many years to come. I support the second reading.

On motion by Mr. McCulloch, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.42 p.m.

Legislative Council

Thursday, 26th August, 1954.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Trainee nurses, as to examination results and training	1281
Wokalup Research Station, as to imported cattle, costs and records	1282
Salt water, as to experiments on conversion	1282
Narrows bridge, as to construction	1283
Answers to questions, as to initialling by Premier	1283
Resolution : North-West, as to Commonwealth financial assistance	1289
Bills : State Housing Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1283
Government Railways Act Amendment, 3r., passed	1284
Criminal Code Amendment, 2r.	1284
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 2r.	1286
Adjournment, special	1294

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

QUESTIONS.

TRAINEE NURSES.

As to Examination Results and Training.

Hon. J. G. HISLOP asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) In view of the unnecessary severity and the complete unsuitability of certain questions in the anatomy-physiology and

hygiene papers in the first-year professional examination for trainee nurses and the possibility that numerous failures may result at a time when the services of nurses are in growing demand, will the Minister for Health prevent the publication tomorrow of any results of this examination until these papers and the necessity for and practicability of this examination has been made the subject of review?

(2) In view of the fact that a trainee nurse failed by such an examination would, by practical training, become an efficient basic nurse, whereas now her services may be lost to nursing, will the Minister institute a committee of inquiry into the possibility of reorganising nursing training in accordance with the views recently expressed by Professor Robson of Adelaide and outlined in the report submitted by me to the previous Government in 1947?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1) Questions in the anatomy-physiology and hygiene papers were in accordance with the curriculum set by the Nurses' Registration Board and are considered suitable. The hygiene papers were well answered, and only three candidates out of 88 failed. The anatomy-physiology paper may be considered rather stiff, but due regard is given to this in the marking. All examiners' reports are reviewed by the board before publication.

(2) Nurses failing in an examination are not lost to nursing. They may retake the examination; and, if consistently unable to attain to the required standard for trained nurses, may continue nursing as nursing assistants, or undergo training as nursing aides. The Nurses' Registration Board has the curriculum for the training of nurses constantly under review, and I see no need for any committee of inquiry.

WOKALUP RESEARCH STATION.

As to Imported Cattle, Costs and Records.

Hon. C. H. HENNING asked the Minister for the North-West:

(1) How many Jersey stud cattle were imported by the Department of Agriculture for the Wokalup Research Station during 1951-52?

(2) What was the landed cost of the bull?

(3) What is the production record, without age allowances, of the bull's dam?

(4) What was the average landed cost of the females?

(5) Have the females been tested for production?

(6) If so, what are the individual production records?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Five females and one male.

(2) £1,804 4s. 10d.

(3) Production record without age allowance of bull's dam, as follows:—

Test Butterfat		lb.	Days	Age
Milk	%			
9,588	5.8	560	361	Mat.
11,041	5.7	639	305	Mat.
11,308	5.5	628	305	Mat.
12,706	5.6	715	361	Mat.

(4) £501 12s. 10½d.

(5) Yes.

(6) Full details of the production record for the five imported cows are as follows:—

Name.	Age Class.	Milk.	Test.	Butterfat.	Days Under Test.	Standard lb. Butterfat.
La Becquet- terrie Jolie	Junior 2	4,185	5.4	225	273	230
	Junior 3	5,724	5.2	296	273	270
Oxfordia Calinthia	Junior 2	5,146	6.3	327	273	230
	Junior 3	6,507	5.9	389	273	270
Hautroyal Calinthia	Junior 2	5,421	5.1	275	273	230
	Junior 3	6,318	5.3	333	273	270
Seymour Victorious Blossom	Junior 2	5,380	5.8	311	273	230
	Junior 3	6,576	5.7	375	273	270
Jester's Marie	Junior 2	4,825	5.5	265	273	230
	Junior 3	5,632	5.0	281	273	270

Note.—In view of the fact that the animals were two months in transit to this State, it is considered that they were not in the best condition for first year's lactation.

SALT WATER.

As to Experiments on Conversion.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Chief Secretary:

In view of the fact that, when recently speaking to a meeting of members of the Real Estate Institute, Professor Stephenson, in answering a question, stated that the conservation of water would not be a problem to Western Australia with ever-increasing numbers of population, due to the fact that the experimental work on the conversion of salt water was well under way, will the Government inform the House as to the stage that such experimental work has reached?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

I am advised that Professor Stephenson's statement was, in fact, slightly different, in that he said that water supply was unlikely to be a limiting factor as far as population was concerned in the metropolitan region in the next 50 years. Beyond that period, he considered that other means would probably be found to deal with the problem of water and he did not feel that this would limit further population expansion.

He instanced other cities of the world which had already outgrown their originally estimated limit of water supply, and referred to the well-advanced American experiments into the economical conversion of salt water to fresh. Research

into the economical production of fresh water from sea water is at present being carried out in the U.S.A., but no final results have been reached. The Public Works Department is in direct touch with the C.S.I.R.O. on the matter, and is keeping available information under review.

NARROWS BRIDGE.

As to Construction.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH asked the Chief Secretary:

Is it intended that the proposed Narrows bridge shall be constructed—

(a) by the Public Works Department; or

(b) by private enterprise?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

By whichever method is considered to be the more suitable at the time when the decision is to be made.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

As to Initialling by Premier.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH (without notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

(1) Does the Chief Secretary recollect that the replies to two questions I asked on the 11th and 17th of this month regarding the visit of the Minister for Education to the Guildford-Midland electorate, were initialled by the Premier?

(2) If he does not recollect that they were initialled by the Premier, will he have another look at them to see that they were?

(3) In view of the fact that they were initialled by the Premier, does he think that the answer he gave me yesterday to the effect that the answers were not initialled by the Premier was justified?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

(1), (2) and (3) I have a bad memory. I do not remember whether or not they were initialled.

Hon. A. F. Griffith: I am telling you that they were.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The question that the hon. member asked, as I recollect it, was: "Has the Premier to approve of all answers submitted?" The answer to that was, "No."

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Why does he initial them?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not know.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: It has been the case for Premiers in the past to initial answers.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the Clerk of the Council will provide me with the answers that have been given to questions this afternoon, I will see whether the same thing is operating, and whether my answer was correct or otherwise. The answer given by the Minister for the North-West

to the question asked by Mr. Henning has on it only the initials "E. H. H." which are those of the Minister for Agriculture. There is nothing there from the Premier. Here is one that I answered today which has some foreign initials—"G.F."—on it.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Is not one copy of it initialled?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes, a copy underneath is initialled by the Premier; but the other one is not initialled.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: He initials one copy only; he does not initial the lot.

The PRESIDENT: The Chief Secretary is replying to a question asked by Mr. Griffith.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have mentioned two questions that I have with me and one of them is not initialled. That shows that my answer was correct—that all answers do not have to be approved by the Premier.

BILL—STATE HOUSING ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [2.31]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [2.32]: I desire to take this opportunity of saying a few words, because the Chief Secretary, in his reply to the second reading debate yesterday afternoon, gave me a prominent part in his speech. I wish to thank him for the fact that he complimented me upon my demeanour, and I can understand that my demeanour would please him, because if the Government brings down a Bill with which I agree, I do not mind saying so. Where any member thinks that a Bill is a good one, he should have no hesitation in expressing his satisfaction; but I still hold the right, if I consider fit, to criticise any measure the Government introduces.

During the debate, I took the opportunity of asking the Chief Secretary whether the Housing Commission was worried about the question of maintenance on Commonwealth-State rental homes. The Chief Secretary agreed that the commission was not free of worry in this regard; I also tried to get from him the fact that the economic rent was one which was calculated to include in the weekly rental of dwellings the amount of maintenance. The Chief Secretary disagreed with me on that point, and I would like to express the opinion now that the amount of maintenance is included in the economic rent. I think, after private conversation with him, that we were mixed in our ideas of the economic rent and what he referred to as the ordinary rent.

When he used that term "ordinary rent" he meant the economic rent, which is one calculated to give relief to a man who is employed on, say, the basic wage. A figure of not more than one-fifth of the basic wage, in such an instance, is charged in rent, because the agreement provides that the economic rent will not be more than one-fifth of the basic wage. If the Chief Secretary refers to Section 10 of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, he will see that it reads as follows:—

The weekly rent of dwellings shall be calculated in manner provided in the First Schedule to this agreement. The amount so calculated is in this agreement referred to as the "economic rent."

So it is quite clear what is meant by the economic rent of premises under the State Housing Agreement.

I wanted to put this question clearly to the Chief Secretary, because, as a member of another place, I had considerable pressure put upon me in regard to the matter. The Government I supported in another House was accused, in the 1953 elections, of arbitrarily altering the economic rent under the State Housing Agreement. The question was the subject of a vicious pamphlet put out in opposition to the then Minister for Housing—Mr. Wild—and myself.

As I said once before in this House, the present Minister for Housing found himself confronted by a deputation which asked him to keep the promise he had made in regard to the lowering of the rents of Commonwealth-State rental homes. Because the Minister was bound by this agreement, entered into by the Wise and Chifley Governments in 1945, he found himself unable to reduce those rents other than by paying subsidies from Consolidated Revenue, which in the last few weeks he has seen fit to do.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West—in reply [2.36]: I do not intend to prolong the debate. The only difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself is that the hon. member has given me the definition of "economic rent" from the Act, and I was giving the definition of what we always term the economic rent when we are dealing with cases at the Housing Commission. On many occasions we have asked that particular cases be dealt with from the economic rent angle, and they have always been accepted. However, only a small point was involved, and it proves that when one introduces Bills, one should not say any more than one is compelled to; because, otherwise, one makes oneself liable for bites.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West) [2.40] in moving the second reading said: Since the Criminal Code was consolidated in 1913 it has been amended on a number of occasions, and the need for consolidation has risen again. In addition, the legal officers of the Crown Law Department have drawn attention to a number of further amendments which are considered necessary. The Bill now before the House contains these amendments; and, once it is passed and assented to, immediate steps will be taken to have the Code reprinted. When this is done the Code will be up to date and easy to follow.

Taking the amendments in the order in which they appear in the Bill, the first seeks to extend the definition of "fraudulent conversion," so that it will be an offence fraudulently to convert any property irrespective of whether that property is capable of being stolen or not. At present it would appear that under Section 371 of the Code it is not an offence fraudulently to convert property which is not capable of being stolen, such as bank accounts, etc. This is not a desirable state of affairs; and to rectify the position and to clarify the intention of the case, it is proposed to extend the definition of "fraudulent conversion" in the direction indicated.

A citable instance would be that of a land agent, who, after receiving a cheque from a client for the purpose of completing a deal in land, converts the proceeds of the cheque to his own use. In the hypothetical case I am referring to, the agent lawfully receives the cheque and, in the correct manner, pays it into his own trust account for collection. Subsequently, however, this imaginary land agent draws cheques against the account and uses them for purposes not connected with his client's affairs.

In effect, this is a theft from the trust account; but as the definition of "stealing" in Section 371 refers only to the theft or fraudulent conversion of anything capable of being stolen, the Crown Law officers doubt whether action under that section could be taken against our hypothetical land agent. To overcome the position, the Bill seeks to include in the Code a definition of "property" which is similar to that used in the Larceny Act, 1916, of England, under which action for fraudulent conversion is taken. This definition provides a comprehensive description of the forms of property which can be fraudulently converted, including real and personal property, money, debts, bank credits, legacies, deeds relating to the title or right to any property, etc.

The next amendment proposes to extend the offence of receiving stolen property so that it will be an offence to receive not only whatever was stolen, but also to receive any proceeds of the theft. As the law stands now, it appears that if a person received stolen property and converted that property into money, and another person received the money well knowing it to be the proceeds of a theft, the person receiving the money would not be liable for the offence of receiving. An actual case can be quoted in which a girl stole some stamps, sold them and gave part of the money to another person who was well aware of the circumstances. As this second person did not receive any of the actual articles that were stolen he could not be prosecuted. The amendment would rectify the position.

Under Section 486 of the Code a person who knowingly makes a false statement in connection with the registration of a birth, a death or a marriage is liable to two years' imprisonment and a fine of £200. As this provision is only in the Criminal Code, offenders may be dealt with only on indictment—that is, before a judge and jury. Many offences in this connection are of a social rather than a criminal nature and do not warrant the punishment provided in the Code.

I have no doubt there have been, and will be, instances where a false statement is made deliberately and with intention to defraud somebody of something valuable. Such cases should be prosecuted on indictment before a jury. Where, however, false statements are of a trivial nature, perhaps to protect someone's reputation and with no intent to defraud, it is considered that it would be sufficient to deal summarily with the offender.

The Bill, therefore, seeks to give justices the power, where they consider a case trivial, to allow the offender the option of being dealt with summarily or by a jury. If summarily, the penalty would be a fine of up to £100. Serious cases, of course, would be referred to a jury. The Commissioner of Police considers this amendment to be advisable.

The next amendment seeks to regularise and simplify the procedure concerning ex-officio indictments and to clarify the appropriate provision in the Code. To understand the proposal it must be remembered that there is a distinction between ordinary and ex-officio indictments. As members are aware, an accused person is brought to trial before a jury by the presentation of an information or charge called an indictment, which is signed by the Minister. Where an accused person has been committed for trial by justices or by a coroner, and is to be tried for the offence with which he is charged, the Minister presents what is called an indictment. This is the ordinary indictment,

concerning which there is no legal difficulty in regard to procedure. In the usual manner a jury is empanelled, and the trial takes place.

Frequently however, an accused person is indicted for an offence other than that for which he is committed for trial. Sometimes he is indicted without having been committed. For example, a coroner may have returned an open verdict, but the Crown may consider that there should be a trial for some offence disclosed by the evidence taken before the coroner.

Even more frequently, it is found, on a close study of the evidence taken before the lower court, that it is more appropriate to present an indictment for an offence which has been disclosed by the evidence, and which differs from that for which the accused person has been committed for trial. The reason for this may be that there was a defect in the original charge against the accused, or the evidence actually given in the committal proceedings may differ somewhat from that which the police had been led to expect. The indictment presented in such a case is usually called an ex-officio indictment.

Doubts have arisen whether the expression "ex-officio indictment" in Section 579 of the Code includes an indictment which, although not for the offence for which a person has been committed for trial, is nevertheless for an offence which is disclosed by the evidence taken before the committing justices or coroner. If these doubts are groundless, then the rather elaborate procedure prescribed in chapter 73 of the Code has to be followed.

This procedure is somewhat lengthy and cumbersome and was originally intended only when an information for an indictable offence was presented by a private person. Nowadays it is very seldom that any private person takes such action. However, the procedure still remains in the Code, and apparently is applicable where the Minister desires to present an indictment for an offence for which the person has not been committed for trial, or where it is considered a coroner has improperly failed to commit a person for trial. The practice has always been for the Minister to present these indictments, and generally speaking, for the indictment to be treated in the same expeditious manner as if the person concerned had been committed for trial. This practice, although fair to an accused, appears to be very doubtful; and to obviate any repercussions the Bill seeks to validate the practice.

The purpose of the next amendment is to permit several distinct indictable offences to be joined in the one indictment, if they form or are a part of a series of offences of the same or a similar character. This amendment is based on Rule 3 of the Indictments Act, 1951, Section 4, of the United Kingdom. Very often where a person is separately indicted for a number

of offences of the same character and pleads or is found guilty of one of the offences, a notice of nolle prosequi is usually entered in respect of the remaining indictments. This is done to avoid unnecessary expense and trouble to witnesses and to the Court. The result is that the offender's record discloses only the one offence.

It might be felt that an accused person could be prejudiced by being charged with several offences at the same time. This would not be so; because, even under the existing law, once evidence has been given against an accused person of one offence, evidence can be submitted of offences of the same or a similar character where such offences show the existence of any intention, knowledge, good or bad faith, malice or other state of mind, or of any state of body or bodily feeling, the existence of which is in issue or is relevant to the issue, or which tends to rebut a defence otherwise open to the accused. This power of joinder exists in all the other States of Australia, and also, as I have said, in the United Kingdom.

We then come to an amendment which is designed to allow a charge of receiving to be joined to one of breaking and entering. At the present time a charge of receiving can be added only to one of stealing. The amendment is considered to be most desirable, and it is based on the practice followed in England.

The purpose of the amendment in Clause 8 of the Bill is to allow the Crown the right to appeal against a sentence which it has been found cannot lawfully be passed on the convicted person. The court of appeal would thus be given the opportunity to substitute a valid sentence for an invalid one. In a recent case an invalid sentence was imposed by a chairman of a court of sessions. The accused did not appeal, and so there was no power for the Crown to have a valid sentence substituted. The accused person could, with impunity, have left or escaped from the form of custody imposed, although in the case concerned it was obvious her restraint was extremely desirable for her own protection.

As a result of amendments to the Supreme Court Rules, it has been found that two sections in the Code are now defective, and the Bill seeks to bring these sections into line with the Rules. The sections are defective in that they refer to an "appearance" as entered to a writ in civil action; whereas, about eighteen months ago, the Rules of the Supreme Court were altered to abolish appearance to such writs. Under the present practice in civil actions there is only a "defence" to such action.

It is proposed to make a similar amendment to another section which states that the accused person is required to enter

an appearance and file his plea in writing. The only value of entering an appearance in addition to filing a plea is to disclose the accused person's address for service of documents. The amendment is designed to delete the words "enter an appearance" and substitute a provision to the effect that a plea in writing shall contain an address for service of notices, etc. These amendments are purely procedural, and the judges have expressed their approval of the principle.

That is the sum total of the Bill. I trust my explanation of the various provisions have been satisfactory. As I have said, the amendments have all been suggested by the legal officers of the department; and they are designed to rectify anomalies and close loopholes, and to bring the Code up to date, so that when it is reprinted it will be an adequate piece of legislation.

In view of some of the explanations and reasons given for the amendments, it is little wonder that court cases and the legal business involve people in such high costs. After having seen some of the loopholes that the Bill will attempt to cover up, one is impressed by the fact that the English language is remarkable and can be got around in many different ways. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. L. A. Logan, debate adjourned.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 24th August.

HON. H. HEARN (Metropolitan) [2.53]: This Bill seeks to impose upon the State a system of compulsory adjustments to the basic wage each quarter by the State Arbitration Court in accordance with the variations of the statistician's figures on the "C" series index. Such a measure strikes at a vital feature of industrial relationship as we have known it, and seeks to obtain the political control of wages and effort.

To my mind, this is a dangerous Bill, made to lead the worker into thinking the Government is winning for him something he would not get from any other party. In one sense, that is right, because no other Government would let the worker be subjected to the industrial instability which could spring from the measures which this Bill seeks to enforce. The determination of an economic wage structure should not be a matter for Parliament and politics. The minimum national wage, and when and how much it should vary, is a matter for economic argument at law, where the full weight of proper evidence can be brought to apply with equity to the worker, to industry, and to the country.

The fact that wage bases are determined at law, and that political principles do not control the determination, is one of the greatest of our industrial and economic safeguards. It would be partly lost were this Bill allowed to become law. The present system keeps wages in balance with economic capacities. It allows the wage base to be changed only when the economic capacity permits it, thus keeping the capacity to pay, which is the key factor of an economy, as the controlling influence on wages. In this there is security for the worker; his wage stays in balance and can be prevented from straining the source from whence it comes. Thus, the worker can expect the source to continue in a position to pay him over the years with the least danger of a breakdown.

This Bill would reverse that vital balance and enforce an adjustment of the wage base every three months in parallel with any fluctuations in the statistical indicators of our economy. Under this system, the capacity of the economy becomes no longer the measure of the wage base, but wages must vary with every minor change in our terms of trade, even with the short-term changes that iron themselves out in a matter of weeks or months; and, with seasonal changes that give back in glut-time what has occurred in higher costs during times of scarcity. By every established rule, a system of compulsorily adjusting the basis of a wage structure at such frequent intervals is one of the most unsettling economic influences that can be brought into effect.

It militates directly against achievement of stability in economy; and it forces the pattern of costs, prices, and wages into a constant state of flux. An artificial cost-of-living index in which the conclusions are still in doubt dictates the standards, instead of the volume of production and trade doing so. With quarterly adjustments, the value of money can never be clearly predictable. What must be budgeted rarely falls into line with fact—whether the budget is for the nation, the community, or the business; or whether it is for the housewife trying to keep ahead of the ceaseless changes in price or income.

It is not normal price changes that indicate a healthy economic state, and that is the problem here. The problem is the vicious changes of instability, whether up or down. Yet how vital it is that such a thing as the value of money should be predictable for the sake of economic security or levels. When the economic climate is depressive, quarterly adjustments to the basic wage will force wages to follow the economic trend at a maximum rate. Prices will follow in pursuit, and the trend into depression thus becomes accelerated.

When the economic climate is inflationary—as in the past ten years or so—quarterly adjustments have an opposite,

though no less damaging, effect. Their trend of adjustment being ever upward, with wages and prices chasing each other, the inflationary spiral becomes more inflated. That has been the experience of the Commonwealth of Australia, as we have discovered recently, to our great cost. It has been the action of the Commonwealth and the State Arbitration Courts plus Commonwealth Government policy in finance and trade that has brought the inflationary process to a halt throughout this country.

If the process of correction is to be given a chance to succeed—to save Australia from economic self-destruction by costing itself right out of the world markets in which it is only just holding a place at present, then Western Australia must face up with the other States to the unpalatable medicine of correction.

Hon. R. J. Boylen: Who wrote that speech?

Hon. H. HEARN: It would be an unfortunate day, indeed, if we broke away from the national front merely because the Government sees votes in a policy of giving away more inflationary money. At present, the preservation of economic buoyancy in Australia depends principally upon its ability to secure and hold a competitive place in the markets overseas.

In our principal market—the United Kingdom—great changes are taking place which must have a major effect on Australia's income. The British market has passed over from Government buying to the prewar trader-to-trader basis after ten years or more of non-competitive Government-to-Government buying. That is going to have a far-reaching and drastic repercussion upon Australia's economy. At the same time, the United Kingdom has thrown open its market doors and invited all the world's nations to compete for her business.

This means that it will be the best producer and the cheapest seller that will win the day from now on in overseas trade. The era of secured, long-term international sales agreements between countries is closing. Even the fate of the international wheat agreement is in the balance, and members should bear in mind that wheat is one of Western Australia's main exports. The wheat industry of this State expects to sell only half of this season's crop, after which it will have one-and-a-half seasons' crops stacked away, unsold, in the stores and silos.

An era of open competition, with no holds barred, is coming upon us, and we in Australia have to be prepared to face up to that competition. To meet it safely, Western Australia must be flexible, both in price and product, and we have no chance of becoming so if we allow a system of compulsory basic wage adjustments to come into operation.

We must realise that the President of the court, in giving his judgment, discussed the economic capacity of this State to pay what the Government was desirous of instituting. I shall quote part of the transcript notes of the court hearing—evidence given by Mr. Stannard on the 21st July last—as follows:—

The President: Well, what is the next step from there? You say we can take into consideration the matter referred to under Section 123 (3) (b), which is principally the economic capacity of industry. Now, do you say that the economic capacity of industry in Western Australia is such that it can support an increase in the basic wage of 13s. 8d?

Mr. Stannard: I have no evidence to bring in that regard.

The President: Before we get on to that, your principals say that the economic capacity of Western Australia can support an increase in the basic wage of 13s. 8d.

Mr. Stannard: They again voiced their desire that the increases in the basic wage as disclosed by the cost of living figures be passed on.

The President: I know they desire it, but do they say that the State can afford it?

Mr. Stannard: They say it will be their responsibility to finance that.

The President: No, it won't. They are not going to indemnify all the private employers that have to pay it.

Mr. Stannard: So far as the Government are concerned, as employers they say they will be able to meet it.

The President: They say they can find the money.

Mr. Stannard: Yes.

The President: Can the economy of the State generally afford it? Do the Government say that?

Mr. Stannard: I have not got a specific direction on that.

The President: Well, that is partly why we adjourned the case, to enable you to get instructions on that. Can't you get any instructions on that point?

Mr. Stannard: Well, the aspect of presenting evidence along those lines was submitted, but I had no further instructions about evidence other than to say the Government still voices the opinion that the increase should be passed on as disclosed by the statistician's statement.

The President: I do not want any hedging on this matter at all. I appreciate the difficulty in which you personally may be, and although I appreciate it, it has nothing to do with me. Now you come here and you

say that your principals are applying to this court to increase the basic wage by 13s. 8d. That is clear.

Mr. Stannard: Yes.

The President: You now agree that in exercising our discretion, we must take into consideration, among other things, the economic capacity of industry to pay that increase. You agree with that?

Mr. Stannard: Yes.

The President: Now, with those two things as the basis, surely if you ask us to increase it, you must be prepared to say to us that there is economic capacity to pay the increase! If you are not prepared to say that to us, I do not see how you can ask us to increase the basic wage, and apparently you have not got any instructions to say that.

Mr. Stannard: That is correct.

The President: That is clear. One final point: You say the Government or the Ministers you represent can afford to pay the 13s. 8d. themselves, apparently?

Mr. Stannard: That is a responsibility . . .

The President: Why don't they pay it?

Mr. Stannard: Well . . .

The President: Why don't they pay it to their own employees?

Mr. Stannard: There may be some factors which at this stage have not been considered by my principals in regard to that particular aspect; but I would not be able even to suggest what might be done, for instance, if the court did not in its discretion pass on those increases.

The President: Am I to take it that you cannot answer my question?

Mr. Stannard: That is always open to them at any time.

The President: They have not paid the amounts in the past three quarters, have they?

Mr. Stannard: No.

The President: They say that this court should increase the basic wage to all workers?

Mr. Stannard: Yes.

The President: Privately employed and employed by the Government?

Mr. Stannard: Yes.

The President: So far as Government employees are concerned, it is easy enough to pay them.

Mr. Stannard: They could. That is open to all employers.

The President: That is the point I mentioned at the last hearing. Have you any instructions on that?

Mr. Stannard: No, not at this stage. It has not been considered.

The President: That is one of the points I left with you to consider.

Mr. Stannard: Yes. It did come up during the discussion at the last hearing.

The cudgels were then taken up by Mr. Davies, who made the point that unless the court issued an order for the increase in the basic wage, the Government could not be reimbursed. The only point the Government has made is that it wants the increase to be passed on by the court in order that it may collect the equivalent from the Commonwealth Government, and never at any stage has it given any indication as to the economic capacity of private industry to pay.

Hon. C. H. Simpson: That would be paid by the Grants Commission?

Hon. H. HEARN: Yes; in other words, by the Commonwealth. If that were followed out to the letter, it could say, "Whether you grant this money or not, we are going to pay it to our men."

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That would not be lawful.

Hon. H. HEARN: It is always lawful for private employers to pay more than the basic wage. The Government is trying to push right on to the court the responsibility for paying money that would ultimately be reimbursed by the Grants Commission, of course, out of Commonwealth money. Never at any stage during the hearing did the Government allow its representative to prove that private industry had the economic capacity to pay. So I say again that the Government is trying to be very generous with other people's money—the taxpayers' money—and finally will impose a burden on industry of £3,500,000 when it will be responsible for only £1,000,000, and private industry will be left to foot the rest of the bill.

This is a time when we must attempt, as the Commonwealth has done, to stabilise the economy. Even Queensland, although it has made some slight alteration, has at least endeavoured to keep within the spirit of the arrangement with and desire of the Commonwealth. Could Western Australia, with the highest basic wage in Australia, look forward with equanimity to what would undoubtedly happen if this Bill were passed? At present we are in a stabilising period; but within 12 or 18 months we could look forward to the accrued inflation being added to the wage structure; and on present indications, by the beginning of 1955, the basic wage would be £15 16s. a week.

What better scheme could be devised to get further electoral support than a proposal such as this? On the other hand, private enterprise would have to pay its bill if it wished to remain in business,

because it could not collect the increase from the taxpayers. At a time when we are trying to stabilise the economy, quite apart from the vicious principle of passing from arbitration court to political control in this matter—that is all it means—this Bill is quite wrong in principle. The workers know that it is better, in their own interests, to stabilise the economy than to have the inflationary spiral continuing.

If each member would read the judgment given by Mr. Justice Jackson in the Arbitration Court today, I believe he would agree that, notwithstanding the abnormal increases that have occurred in this State in two lines only—namely, rents and meat—the prosperity allowance has not by any means been absorbed. While the Commonwealth is doing its utmost to stabilise the economy, it would be very wrong of us, as a House of review, to allow the Government to get so far off the beaten track as to recommence the inflationary spiral. For these reasons, I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill.

On motion by Hon. C. H. Simpson, debate adjourned.

RESOLUTION—NORTH-WEST.

As to Commonwealth Financial Assistance.

Debate resumed from the previous day on the motion of Hon. A. R. Jones to concur in the Assembly's resolution as follows:—

That this House expresses its opinion that that portion of the State which lies north of the 26th parallel of latitude is incapable of being fully developed if wholly dependent upon such finance as is only obtainable from State sources.

It therefore requests—

(a) That the Government present a programme for the State development of that portion of the State to a committee consisting of the Premier (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke, M.L.A.), the Minister for the North-West (Hon. H. C. Strickland, M.L.C.), the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Sir Ross McLarty, K.B.E., M.L.A.), the Leader of the Country Party (Hon. A. F. Watts, C.M.G., M.L.A.) and the Speaker and Member for Pilbara (Hon. A. J. Rodoreda, M.L.A.).

(b) That this Committee consider the programme as presented to it by the Government and, if thought necessary, amend the programme.

(c) That the Committee submit such programme personally at Canberra to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer.

(d) That a special annual grant of an amount considered necessary for such developmental work be requested for a period of 10 years in order to carry out the programme.

HON. A. F. GRIFFITH (Suburban) [3.15]: Order of the day No. 5 on the notice paper transmits to this Chamber a message to the effect that the Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that it has agreed to a motion—the motion is set out—and asks for the concurrence of this House in it. At the outset I wish to say that I read the debate on this motion in another place and would recommend members here who have not read it to do so; because not only was the motion presented in the most able manner, but also some very informative speeches were made.

The debate was of a high standard until it came to the question of submitting the motion to the Legislative Council for its concurrence; and then, unfortunately, as we read in "Hansard", the speeches made by three or four members in another place—who, in keeping with the campaign against this Chamber, sought to belittle it and suggested that the motion should not be submitted to the Legislative Council for its concurrence—were such that I believe you, Mr. President, and members will agree that we are faced with an unsatisfactory state of affairs; and it is a great pity that what happened did happen.

I have been most interested in the case presented in, as I am sure members will agree, a very able manner by Mr. Jones who, in moving the motion, told us that his knowledge of the North-West was not as great as it would have been had he had more experience in that part of the State. Nevertheless, as one who made a visit such as his, and was able to compile and submit to the House so much useful information on a motion of this nature, he deserves our heartiest congratulations.

The expression, "port-hole politicians," which is sometimes applied to members of Parliament who visit the North-West is one that I do not like and do not agree with; because—as I am certain representatives of the North-West will agree—it is difficult for one to visit that part of the State by ship and, in the brief space of time available at ports, get far enough inland to see all that is to be seen. While I do not profess to have a great deal of knowledge of the North-West, I did spend the best part of three years there during the war in what were called operational base units of the air force. I saw a good deal of that part of the State in the three years I was there; and recently I made a trip north in the "Koolinda".

At this stage, I desire to express my thanks to the Chief Secretary for making it possible for me to undertake that trip. I had booked to visit the North much earlier than my actual time of departure; but Parliament was called together sooner than was expected, and I had to cancel my booking. However, when I approached the Chief Secretary and told him of my desire to visit the North, he,

in co-operation with Mr. Boylen, made it possible for me to undertake the trip, and I appreciate that very much.

I had an interesting voyage on the "Koolinda", and saw something of the conditions under which the State Shipping Service operates, and some of the difficulties with which it is faced. I share the view expressed by other members that the State Shipping Service is very much overtaxed, and that the ordering and the eventual placing in operation of another ship will no doubt be of great advantage to the people of the North-West.

During the debate, it has been said that members of Parliament should make it their business, if possible, to visit the North-West and see for themselves what is going on there. I agree heartily with that statement, but do not think that such visits should be limited to the North. I feel it is the duty of every member of Parliament to visit—so far as he is able to do so—not only the North-West, but also all other parts of Western Australia.

Hon. G. Bennetts: A Reso tour each year to different parts of the State would be a good idea.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I recall that during the debate on the Address-in-reply Mr. Bennetts mentioned the value of Reso tours of the State, and I think the suggestion has some virtue. The more we can see of our own State, the better are we able to judge the difficulties under which people in the various areas are working.

There have been certain aspects of this motion put forward by members who know a great deal more about the North-West than I do. The Minister for the North-West told us last night what he thought on the subject, and Mr. Barker also gave us his ideas on the North. We naturally expect representatives of the North-West to know more about that part of the country than do others in the House. I will not reiterate all that has been said by other members in dealing with this question, but during the debate one or two matters were mentioned on which I would like to comment.

It has been suggested that, under the heavy defence programme of the Commonwealth, the North-West will, of necessity, play an important part; and I entirely agree with that, because we have many thousands of miles of coastline which would become extremely vulnerable in the event of an invading force visiting our shores. It has been said that one way to overcome the threat of invasion is to populate the North-West; but I do not altogether agree with that, as I do not think population alone would be effective.

I do not wish it to be thought that I do not agree that the North-West could and should be populated to a far greater

extent than it is at present; but I repeat that population alone would not be a satisfactory means of defending that part of the country. If there were 40,000 people in the North-West at a time when an invading force attacked our northern shores, they would not be effective in preventing a landing.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: No; but would it not counteract their knowledge of our empty spaces and, indirectly, be a means of defence?

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I do not believe for one moment that if we had even 140,000 people in the North-West it would take away any of the knowledge that potential enemies already have of that country.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: You misunderstand me.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: Let me finish my speech! I am speaking of the Asiatic peoples, and I think they have all the knowledge they require about the North-West of this State. I was up there during the war; and to my knowledge, aerodromes that we thought were in very secluded places were easily picked out by the Japanese, who bombed them apparently whenever they wished to do so. Mr. Barker might recall the attacks by the Japanese as far south as Exmouth Gulf, and the short attack at Port Hedland, as well as the many scares of the people of Geraldton, all due to the intimate knowledge which the Japanese had of the northern part of our State.

While I sincerely hope that development will lead to a greater population in the North-West, I do not think that it would do much to restrict the activities of an invading force. As a matter of fact, I believe that development and population of that part of the country might have the opposite effect; because, if such areas were more settled, an invading army would find more on which to live than could be found in the North at present. If I have not made myself clear to Mr. Barker, I will not mind him informing me.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Do not encourage him. He has already made his speech.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: It was the policy—

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: Have I your permission, Mr. President, to make an explanation? There has been an allusion to what I said during my speech. I think there is a misunderstanding and wish to point out—

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member should discuss the matter with Mr. Griffith after the House adjourns.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I would be pleased to discuss the matter with Mr. Barker. Obviously I misunderstood what he said. I might even have afternoon tea with him, if he buys it.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: I am on a diet.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: During the last war it was our defence policy to develop aerodromes along the coast of Western Australia for use by heavy bombers, and some of them were used for that purpose. But I do not think that the fact of their being inland has any great military value at present, because, although they were situated perhaps 100 or 200 miles inland, that distance, to a modern bomber, does not mean more than an extra quarter of or half an hour in the air. For that reason, I feel that the position of those aerodromes would be of no great strategic value at the present day. I agree, however, that their maintenance is necessary.

While I was on the "Koolinda," certain very unsatisfactory features of the State Shipping Service were pointed out to me in connection, in particular, with signalling. Although this may not have any direct bearing on the motion, I hope I will be permitted to comment on it, as it has a direct bearing on the administration of the North-West, which is a most important factor in connection with this motion. The difficulties surrounding this matter were outlined to me; and, as a result, on the 2nd August, 1954, I wrote to the Minister for State Shipping. I think it will be best for me to read this letter so that members can get some idea of the subject matter with which I was dealing. I wrote as follows:—

My dear Minister,

During a recent trip up the North-West coast, there were certain things which came to my notice, and I now take the opportunity of submitting to you some facts concerning signalling so far as the State Shipping Service is concerned, and in doing so, to point out the difficulties which are being experienced by State ships in their progress up the coast in relation to berthing at various ports, the employment of labour, and the discharge of cargo.

The method at present used by State ships when approaching such places as Carnarvon, Port Hedland, Onslow, Point Samson, Derby and Wyndham is to communicate with the nearest wireless operating station, and convey per medium of telegrams (which are frequently lengthy and expensive) to the State Shipping Agent at any one of those ports information concerning expected berthing times, and manpower requirements for the discharge of cargo.

On having this matter explained to me it became evident that the difficulties which were being experienced were difficulties which an attempt should be made to overcome in view of the cost incurred where explainable mistakes are made in respect of berthing times, due to weather and other elements on the sea.

An example of this is a ship expecting to berth at Port Hedland on a Sunday. The captain of the ship is thus obliged to advise the agent at Port Hedland, via Broome, that the ship expects to berth at a specified time on Sunday, and the telegram in regard thereto has to be sent on Saturday, and it must contain, in addition to the berthing time, the requirements of manpower at that port for the discharge of cargo.

It appears to me that a far more satisfactory method could be employed by State ships in communicating with agents on the coast by means of radio-telephones which are easily operative over a space of up to 30 or 40 miles. It is quite impossible for the ship to communicate with the agent on shore by any other means at the moment than the telegraphic method because State shipping agents cannot read semaphore, and therefore are unable to communicate on a ship-to-shore basis.

The installation of a radio-telephone wireless on the ship, and one in the possession of each State shipping agent on the coast in ports where it is required, would immediately facilitate easy discussion on the spot concerning conditions, estimated time of berthing, tidal water, manpower requirements, and all other expectations during the whole of the other seven days of the week and at any time of the day, whereas at the moment, no message can be sent without re-opening a post office after 5 p.m., or before 9 a.m.

An important feature of the installation of such equipment would be an immediate saving in the employing of gangs particularly at the week-ends where, as I have already stated, Sunday arrangements must be made on Saturday.

I have made inquiries which reveal that this equipment is not terribly costly—somewhere in the vicinity of £150 to £200 per set. The ports that would require this equipment would be Carnarvon, Port Hedland, Onslow, Point Samson, Derby and Wyndham; the ports of Geraldton and Broome having direct communication. It would be necessary to equip each State shipping agent with a radio-telephone or a walkie-talkie set as the expression is used, and also each ship on the coast.

It will be easily seen that with such equipment a ship would then be able to stand out of these ports some 30-40 miles and with ease and facility discuss with the agent on shore all things necessary towards the conduct of the ship on the course of her journey.

I do not submit this suggestion in any manner of interference, but purely in good faith, suggesting that if some

such procedure were adopted it would be of great value to the State shipping lines.

I understand that the general manager of the State Shipping Service (Mr. Owen) knows something of this matter.

I have not received a reply to that letter yet, but I have not become impatient, because I realise that it is a matter that will probably require some investigation. Also, there will probably be some opposition to it from the Commonwealth authorities, because they would obtain considerable revenue from the very lengthy telegrams that are despatched by the State ships and their agents on matters concerning State shipping activities.

The Minister for the North-West: I cannot see how they could raise any objection.

Hon. Sir Charles Latham: Neither can I, especially in view of the State disabilities grant.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I am pleased to hear the Minister make that remark, because I can see that his thoughts are in line with the suggestion I have made.

The Minister for the North-West: It has been under consideration for some months now.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: In that case my suggestion is not original. I knew that full well when I mentioned that Mr. Owen knew of this matter.

The Minister for the North-West: It is a very good suggestion.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: However, I did not know whether he had been approached on a parliamentary level, and that is why I put the suggestion forward. If it is implemented, in addition to saving some of the capital cost that is now being spent on telegrams, it will greatly facilitate the sailing schedules of the State ships, which is more important.

I understand that when the "Koolinda" put into Broome at the time I was travelling on her, she had only about three or four inches of water between the bottom of the boat and the ocean bed on a neap tide. The State ships cut things very fine when they are subject to tides such as those. They have to make it pretty snappy in getting into port and out again on a neap tide; otherwise, if they missed the tide they would probably have to spend some time in port. I would like the Minister to take this matter up with those who are in charge of the State Shipping Service, and, if it is found that the equipment is not too costly, I hope the State ships will be fitted out in the manner I have suggested.

One cannot help supporting a motion of this nature. At the same time, as Mr. Logan has said, we must realise the difficulty that could be encountered in getting a Commonwealth Government, no matter

what its political colour might be, to support any particular State in any particular venture, especially when we take into consideration that Western Australia is a claimant State. Undoubtedly, our North-West has been a problem to this State for many years, and will continue to be so for many years to come.

It is my belief that the discovery of oil in the North-West will change the situation in that area considerably. Whilst travelling on the "Koolinda," the other members in the party were astounded at the activity in the various ports, particularly Derby. That was approximately four or five weeks ago, and I believe that since then the activity has increased. So difficulties will definitely be encountered when this matter is dealt with on a State-Commonwealth basis.

I am pleased indeed with the constitution of this committee, and I think the mover of the motion chose the personnel extremely well. I trust that the committee will meet the Commonwealth Government at an early date, and that its deliberations will prove to be satisfactory to our State. I am glad that the matter has been raised and, I repeat, that when these questions are brought before the Legislative Council for its concurrence they should be given all the support possible; but, at the same time, I hope that those in another place will see fit not to criticise this Chamber whenever certain members get a chance.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must not make reference to another place.

Hon. A. F. GRIFFITH: I respect the Standing Order in that regard, Mr. President.

HON. A. R. JONES (Midland—in reply) [3.40]: I am glad to have the opportunity of saying something further on this motion and am also pleased that there is no opposition to it. That being so, there will be no need for me to say a great deal. All those members who have spoken have been in favour of the motion, and they have all contributed in some way, towards increasing our knowledge of the North-West of this State.

In the main, the debate has centred around defence; and, following that, the question of the development of the North-West, to increase production, has been made a prominent feature. I think the approach to the Commonwealth Government will have to be based, firstly, on the need for assistance for defence purposes; and, secondly, on the necessity to develop the North-West to foster greater production.

Greater production could result in the proper defence of that area, or possibly something even better than defence. If production were increased, it might mean that we would have no need to worry about

defence, because we might then be able to supply our near neighbours with the wherewithal to feed and clothe themselves.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That is the point.

Hon. A. R. JONES: I did not make an issue of the matter when I mentioned that rice could be grown in the Northern Territory and in the North-West of Western Australia, and that sugar could also be grown in the North of our State. If we could ensure that our near neighbours were well clothed and fed, and thus kept happy, I consider that that would be the best means of defence for our country. When the committee approaches the Commonwealth Government, which I feel sure it will do in the next few weeks, I hope that it will put forward that suggestion for consideration.

So, with other members who have spoken in support of the motion, I feel that we have a good committee; but, as Dr. Hislop has said, it might have been improved if one or more members of this House could have been appointed to it. At this stage we should not quibble because that has not been done, as I am sure that the members who comprise the committee are all men of sound judgment. Nevertheless, it can be hoped that they will follow the suggestion put forward by Dr. Hislop and co-opt three of the gentlemen he mentioned, seeing that they have had previous experience and could at least make available the benefit of their knowledge before the committee presents its case to the Commonwealth Government. I consider that the gentlemen referred to could supply some extremely valuable information to the committee, especially in tendering advice regarding the atmosphere in Canberra, as Dr. Hislop has mentioned.

I would like to point out that one or two of the suggestions that I made were possibly taken the wrong way. I am sure that Mr. Barker misunderstood me. I did say that possibly, in the next 10 or 15 years, the population could be increased by some 30,000 or 40,000. I did not mean that would be the limit of the possible population for the North-West, but I do believe that is something at which we can aim for the next 10, 15, or 20 years; and we would have some chance of making good. But, of course, when one industry is set up, a second one follows; and as each industry is added to the North-West, a greater demand is made for more labour. One labourer usually brings a greater population of two or three more people.

So it would not be a hard thing to visualise that in 30, 40 or 50 years' time, with a few water and irrigation schemes being commenced, and with the mineral resources available further south, the population will grow to the figure, which Mr. Barker hopes for, of 500,000 or more. We all hope that will come about. I did mean, by my original remark, to indicate that for

the next 10, 15 or 20 years it would be possible to accommodate 30,000 to 40,000 people.

Mention was made by the Minister for the North-West—and by others, too—of the quality of beef which is being produced from the Kimberleys. After having a good look at the quality—some in the yard and some in the freezing chamber—I am satisfied that it is not all the fault of the Kimberleys that the quality of beef is not better than it is. I saw some beef from a station called Rosewood, just over the border in the Northern Territory. I believe it is the most up-to-date station in the North-West where research has been undertaken thoroughly, and the right type of stock has been introduced. Particular care in the selection and study of animals has been part of the station's policy for many years.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: And the provision of water?

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes. I believe it is run on very sound lines indeed. The manager of the Wyndham Meat Works took very great pride in conducting us through the freezing chamber and showing us the 800 beasts which had been slaughtered a short time previously. They were as uniform as peas in a pod. Whilst the beasts were not of great weight, they were nice steers which, according to Mr. Henning, is the desirable type of beast today.

Hon. C. W. D. Barker: That shows what can be done.

Hon. A. R. JONES: Yes. The country is there; and if it is managed properly, and there is sufficient money to develop the industry in the right way, good results can be obtained. Reference was made to the possibility of fostering the growing and conservation of fodder. I did not mention it previously, but at the present time, just out from Derby—40 to 60 miles away—some conservation work is going on. Experiments are being undertaken by one of the Durack boys, and another whose name I have forgotten. One of them last year baled 10,000 bales of lucerne and other fodder from a very small acreage—something like 40 to 50 acres. It was unfortunate we could not look at the area. The boat did not stay long enough on our return journey, though we had everything teed up with that object in view.

It was mentioned by Mr. Simpson that he was in a way sorry this particular resolution did not cover a certain area east of Meekatharra and Wiluna. Possibly that area could be treated similarly, but there has to be a line of demarcation somewhere. Unless someone can draw a line south of the 26th parallel to include that part of the country, we cannot do anything about it; and for the purpose of this resolution, it cannot be included. It is worth while to persevere with the possibilities, because at the present time some experimental work is being carried out.

Fodder is being grown, too, on the east side of Wiluna, where there seems to be an abundance of water underground, which proves again that the North-West has a potential of greater production when things are gone into thoroughly and research work is done. Wiluna people are proving that by growing fodder and conserving it by way of baling. Every indication we have—whether it be in the North-West of Western Australia, or south round the Wiluna and Meekatharra area—points to the fact that experimental and research stations are going to play a very major part in the development of the country, and will ultimately by the means of establishing pastures and supplying fodders, thereby raising the cattle and sheep capacity.

Before resuming my seat, I would like to thank all members for their part in this debate. It is a pity that all motions and Bills which come before this Chamber cannot receive the same enthusiastic support and debate as this one received. Not necessarily do I mean that everyone must agree with everyone else. Where there is the human element, there will be differences of opinion. But there has been real enthusiasm in this debate; and I trust that we will all benefit from it. I hope that in the debates before this House in future, we shall evince the same enthusiasm.

I would like to thank the Minister for the North-West for making it possible for me to see what I saw when I visited Carnarvon, Derby, and Wyndham. Had it not been for his co-operation, the party I went with, and I myself, would not have had the opportunity of seeing what we did, and I would not be as well informed as I am, although I claim I still know a very little of the North-West.

Question put and passed and a message accordingly returned to the Assembly.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. G. Fraser—West): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Tuesday, the 7th September.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.56 p.m.