

strict economy must not be exercised in the endeavour to reduce our annual deficit. I trust that the Leader of the Country Party will exercise all the force of which he is capable in order to compel the Government to take that line of action which his executive has instructed him to do under their rules and constitution.

On motion by Mr. Boyland, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.27 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 11th August, 1921.

Swearing-in of Member	185
Questions: Lakeside firewood workers	185
Stock at Northern ports	185
Esperance railway and jetty	185
Albany railway accident, compassionate allowances	185
Mining leases, Brownhill Company	186
Address-in-reply, fifth day	186

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

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER.

Mr. Piesse (Toodyay) took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

QUESTION—LAKESIDE FIREWOOD WORKERS.

Mr. LAMBERT asked the Premier: 1, In view of the possibility of further industrial trouble on the Lakeside woodline, is it his intention to lay on the Table of the House the exact terms and conditions showing the concessions granted by the Government to the Woodline Company on the goldfields consequent upon the settlement of the dispute in 1919? 2, Is he aware that the Lakeside Company is endeavouring to use the terms of such settlement to override an award granted to the engineers by the Industrial Arbitration Court? 3, Will he take steps to ascertain the full particulars of the Lakeside Company's attitude towards such award and take such action as may be expedient to prevent a cessation of work?

The PREMIER replied: 1, It was not so intended, but if the hon. member desires this course to be taken he may table a motion to that effect. 2, It does not appear that

the 1916 agreement, which was subsequently extended in 1919, applies to any other than the members of the Firewood Workers' Union on the woodlines affected. 3, This is a matter between the employers and the employees.

QUESTION—STOCK AT NORTHERN PORTS.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Premier: In view of the high ruling prices of meat and the large number of stock available in the northern ports (some 60,000 to 70,000 in the Port Hedland district alone), can the Government offer any assistance or propose any scheme whereby the stock may be brought to market?

The PREMIER replied: I will make full inquiry into the position.

QUESTION—ESPERANCE RAILWAY AND JETTY.

Mrs. COWAN asked the Premier: What were the reasons for placing on the Estimates last year the sum of £40,000 for the construction of a jetty at Esperance Bay, and some £20,000 towards the construction of the railway when the matter had been in abeyance for years, and when our financial condition is at so low an ebb?

The PREMIER replied: (a) No financial provision was made on last year's Estimates for construction of jetty at Esperance Bay. (b) The resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly on 27th February, 1918—"That in the opinion of this House the first railway to be constructed in pursuance of the programme of railway construction authorised by Parliament should be the Esperance-Northward line," made it incumbent on the Government to proceed with this railway before the construction of others could be considered.

QUESTION—ALBANY RAILWAY ACCIDENT, COMPASSIONATE ALLOWANCES.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has any compensation, compassionate, or sustenance allowance been paid by the Government to either or both of the widows of the men who were killed in the railway accident near Albany in November last? 2, If so, what are the particulars relating thereto?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes; compensation was paid to both widows. 2, To the widow of the late Dr. Blackburne the maximum amount authorised under Section 39 of the Railways Act of 1904 was paid, viz., £2,000. In the case of the widow of the late Mr. Fennel the maximum amount under the Employers' Liability Act of 1894 was paid, viz., £591 12s.

QUESTION—MINING LEASES, BROWNHILL COMPANY.

Hon. P. COLLIER asked the Minister for Mines: 1, How many gold mining leases are held by the Brownhill Company, Kalgoorlie? 2, What number, if any, are amalgamated, and what is the area so held? 3, When was the amalgamation approved?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, It is presumed that the hon. member refers to the company called the Oroya Links, Limited, and this company holds 18 gold mining leases. 2, Sixteen of these leases are amalgamated into three groups, while two of them are not amalgamated. The total area is 237 acres. 3, The amalgamations were approved on various dates, viz., 18/1/00, 15/2/00, 1/5/01, 4/7/03, 9/9/08, and 18/5/10.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. BOYLAND (Kalgoorlie) [4.40]: In the first place I desire to outline my position, and to explain where I stand so far as the parties in this House are concerned. Hon. members will know that I was elected as a straight-out Nationalist, and when I stood as such my desire was to support the Government absolutely, in the face of what was happening in the State at the time. Therefore, I am going to support the Government, but I will not hesitate to criticise anything that I think, from my point of view, needs to be criticised. I congratulate our lady member on being elected to a seat in this House, and particularly for one reason. I have been fighting for reforms for many years past, especially in regard to the welfare of the miners, having been one of them, and an afflicted one too. Consequently I welcome the advent of Mrs. Cowan which will serve to remind hon. members where those people, who are down and out, and who are in need of sympathy, are standing. There is no doubt that Mrs. Cowan, having worked for so long in that direction, trying to do good for the people who are in unfortunate circumstances, will be in a position, better than anyone else, to bring these matters before the House to enlist the sympathy of Parliament. I compliment the Government on the splendid majority they have. Looking at both sides of the House one can see that the majority behind the Government is a stout one and there should be nothing to prevent them submitting for consideration anything which will have the effect of bringing about economies. The country is staggering under a huge deficit and with the help of the criticism which has been offered in the public Press, the Government, I have no doubt, will try to get the State out of the difficulties it is in at the present time. Another matter that I am pleased about is that the true position has been put before the general public. Mr.

Pilkington, the former member for Perth, delivered a lecture before the Land Tax and Land Values League, in which he outlined the true position of affairs, and he should be thanked for making that position perfectly clear. We find now that the Premier has clearly outlined the position so far as the trading and business undertakings are concerned. This will enlighten the public and show exactly what the Government are up against with a very small revenue. I contend that the Government should concentrate on those utilities which are really needed to push the country along. For the time being all superfluous matters should be absolutely dispensed with, should be left for consideration when our State is in a better financial position. I shall not enter into details on the subject of finance, because the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition and the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) have dealt with that question exhaustively. We have had enough of figures for the present. I sincerely congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on his offer to help the Government. If only his party will back up the member for Boulder in that respect, all the people of this State will acclaim the hon. gentleman as a statesman solicitous to help the country out of its difficulties. The mining industry is what I particularly represent. My constituency is well known; indeed, the Golden Mile is world-famous. What I am against to-day is the tone of pessimism which one hears everywhere concerning Kalgoorlie. Leading business men and leading financiers of Perth are heard to say, "Oh, the goldfields have gone down; they are settled at last, I believe." But that is not so by any means whatever. Only last week's newspapers reported that the Old Bayley's mine had found a schistose lode 8 feet wide, of which the values are £6 18s. per ton. At Mount Monger, towards the North-East of the Monger Proprietary Mine, a new show has been discovered assaying from 6dwts. up to 9ozs. I fail to understand why, in the face of such reports, people should think that this State's goldfields are going down. Years ago the south end ore channel of the Golden Mile was deemed by leading geologists to be non-existent. Then a party came along with a divining rod, with the backing of a few shop assistants and other people in Perth, located the south end ore channel. The Government Geologist has given it forth, through the Minister for Mines, that the material of this south end ore channel is the same as that of the Golden Mile. Let hon. members consider the possibilities to Western Australia of that discovery, in the light of the fact that the Golden Mile has produced over 72 million pounds' worth of gold. The Golden Mile, let me point out, comprises only some 80 acres, while this new discovery offers 2¼ square miles for exploitation. The possibilities are beyond comprehension. Having regard to Kalgoorlie alone, there is no ground whatever for

pessimism as to the gold mining industry of Western Australia. Then there is the Mount Monger field. The "Kalgoorlie Miner" of Tuesday last reported a new show with assay values of from 6dwts. to 9 ozs. I had the pleasure of journeying up to Mount Monger recently, and I went down a show there. The contention of the Government Geologist as to that field has been that the gold would not go down; or, at all events, the Government Geologist issued a report which was construed as having that meaning. Certainly, his report absolutely killed Mount Monger for the time being. Had it not been for the genuine prospector, Mount Monger would to-day be relegated to obscurity. But what is being done there now in fact? One of our grand old prospectors, Mr. McCahon, with others, hung on, and various other parties hung on also, notwithstanding the fact that, in the face of the pessimistic report of the Government Geologist, a number of options had been turned down. The result is that McCahon and party to-day have about £30,000 worth of gold in sight in their little show alone. Another result is that the Mount Monger Proprietary Co. are to-day crushing stuff going over 2 ozs. On the south side of that property there is a show called the Lass of Gowrie, which also has plenty of crushing material. I suggest to the Minister for Mines that his department should do something at Mount Monger. We have heard of unemployment on the goldfields, and, unfortunately, it is considerable, though I do not think it is so widespread as the Leader of the Opposition has stated. There are numerous old miners unemployed on the Golden Mile, who are perfectly fit to go out into the Mount Monger district, and there are rich leaders in that district worked to the water level, or worked to depth in the hard ground with which hand labour cannot cope. With a compressor and a gas engine and a couple of steel drills, those leaders could be further exploited, and thousands of ounces of gold would probably be won. We shall not get another Kalgoorlie in a hurry; perhaps we shall not see another Golden Mile in our lifetime. But, nevertheless, the Mount Monger leaders have crushed from 4 to 12 ounces per ton. Unemployment, as I have said, exists on our Eastern Goldfields; and I feel sure that the leading inspector of mines at Kalgoorlie, who thoroughly knows the genuine miners and bona fide prospectors, could organise parties of them to go out and exploit those Mount Monger leaders, with the assistance of the Mines Department. Let me say particularly that I am not condemning the Mines Department. Our present Minister for Mines is one of the most sympathetic Ministers I have ever known; and I have found occasion to see him repeatedly since my election as member for Kalgoorlie. I offer this suggestion in order to help to win more gold. We hear plenty of criticism of the Mines Department. Now, I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and therefore I speak of the Minister

for Mines as I found that hon gentleman. Those leaders at Mount Monger can be worked and exploited as I have said. I am sure that the leading inspector of mines at Kalgoorlie would, if called upon for a report, back up my forecast that thousands of ounces can be won in the Mount Monger district alone by the means I suggest. I motored through that district only a week or two ago in company with the leading inspector of mines of Kalgoorlie, and when we crossed the Great Western Railway within eight or ten miles of Mount Monger I said to him, "I think this is some of the finest country I have seen for prospecting; this country should contain thousands of ounces of gold." Since I made that remark, the Press has reported the occurrence of an alluvial rush on that very spot over which we were motoring at the time. Therefore, I contend that with a little assistance the possibilities of our goldfields are limitless. There is still another new development to report. I refer to an old mine of which a company called the Lake View South had possession for a number of years, eventually abandoning the property. A party of working miners and prospectors went in again and opened up a lode, worth, I believe, ounces to the ton. The Great Boulder Co. have turned down an option over the property, and this morning's newspaper states that the Associated Northern Co. have turned down a similar option. But for what reason? On account of the heavy taxation involved, which would amount to something like £25,000.

The Minister for Mines: They can get over that, if they like.

Mr. BOYLAND: I know that the Government intend to bring down a Bill to overcome that difficulty. The sooner that measure is introduced the better it will be for the mining industry. Nobody in the world is taxed by Governments like the prospector is—by State and Federal Governments alike. I am sure the Government of Western Australia are sympathetic in this matter. Let me mention a case in point. Not long ago an old prospector came to me. He has been prospecting in Western Australia for 27 solid years, and prior to that he was prospecting in New South Wales. During all those years he has been helping to develop Australia. He is helping to develop Australia to-day. This old prospector was on Hampton Plains before the boom came. He was prospecting there, trying to find a lode. He did find a lode before the boom occurred, and he sold it. In the first instance, he had to give two Shylocks 1,000 paid up shares for assisting. In the second instance, he got shares paid up to 6s. per share. And to-day the Taxation Department are looking to him for payment of a tax which he cannot pay for the simple reason that he got practically no cash and that he cannot sell his shares. For six months he was unable to dispose of his shares on the market, and in the meantime the boom had broken, so that this old prospector received practically nothing. He did get a very

small amount in cash, and on that he willingly paid taxation. But now he comes to me and says "Do you think it fair that after my 27 years of battling I should be called upon to pay this taxation that I cannot pay? The Taxation Department are making a dishonest man of me." I went to the department, but the department could do nothing. I am pleased, therefore, to know that the Government are about to introduce legislation to provide against such unfair imposts. I sincerely hope and trust that the Bill in question will be among the first to be introduced. The Lake View Gold Mine during six months of its existence turned out a ton of gold per month. Indeed, I believe that during one of those months it turned out no less than three tons of gold. However, the management treated those three tons as a reserve, and spread that gold over six months. That mine to-day is looking better than it has done for years. Previous managers had cut the inside out of the mine, as the saying goes. Instead of working the property in a conservative fashion and averaging values, as the Great Boulder and Golden Horseshoe and other managements did with their mines, the Lake View management simply cut the inside out of the mine; and they did that for market purposes. The company, like other Western Australian companies, has sent hundreds of thousands of pounds won in this State away to other parts of the world to look for fresh properties. It is the prospector Western Australia has to depend upon for the finding of new mines here.

Mr. J. Thomson: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOYLAND: During my election campaign I happened to get hold of a report of the Great Boulder Proprietary Gold Mine for 1914. That report was a revelation to me. It spoke of lodes bearing in from the No. 13 level of the Great Boulder Perseverance into the Great Boulder Proprietary, and from those some very fine assays were obtained. But Mr. Hamilton, in his conservatism, said that it would not pay to work, as the lodes were too small. As a miner of life-long experience, as a man who has worked in the mines of this State, I assert that neither Mr. Hamilton nor any other man knows to a foot what is in front of him on the Golden Mile. I have seen instances of where lodes have been passed. I have seen a shaft go down and a crosscut go in, and two drives have been put in, and then a drive has come up from the other direction, without values being found, and then the block that was left has subsequently been opened up, by cutting in the other way, and has yielded 2½ ounces per ton. As an instance I may quote what is occurring on the Perseverance Mine to-day. Tributaries are there working the mine successfully, whilst the company could not make it pay. And the reason why the company could not make it pay was that they did not work

the mine in the proper manner. They set out to get large tonnage—from 18,000 to 22,000 tons per month—and they were taking mullock with the lode. The upshot of it all is that to-day the prospectors have cut their tonnage down to 5,000 per month, and are making a huge paying proposition of the mine. The work of the tributer has returned to the people of Kalgoorlie some £20,000 or £30,000 worth of gold per month. I for one will be very pleased when some solution is found in connection with the Tributing Act. A Royal Commission is now sitting to investigate matters in connection with that Act, and in the circumstances I have no wish to go further into this phase of the question. If, however, the tributers do not continue their operations in connection with the mining industry, it will mean a loss of from £20,000 to £30,000 per month to the people on the goldfields. It will practically close up Kalgoorlie for the time being. Reverting to the Lake View South mine, there are great possibilities ahead of the mine if it is opened up as a mine by people who can provide the necessary capital, put in machinery, and go on with development work. It may possibly turn out to be another mine like the Lake View. Should that be the case, we will see 200 or 300 men employed there, and a new avenue of wealth opened up for Western Australia. I desire to touch on the matter of wages on the Eastern Goldfields. I was sorry to hear the Acting Leader of the Country Party refer last night to the wages of miners and to hear him ask why the miners could not take a smaller wage for the time being, so as to help the industry along. The miner on the Eastern Goldfields has been one of the worst paid men and the most long-suffering for years past. Through all circumstances he has stood loyally by his work, but the fact remains that he has been exploited. To-day, while the men on the tram receive 15s. 10d., the men on the Golden Mile get 16s. per day. If we add the goldfields' allowance of 1s. 6d. per day to the wage of the former it would make their wage up to 17s. 4d. per day. In view of that fact, can it be contended that the miner is over-paid, or that he should agree to accept a reduction? On the contrary, should we not put forward every effort to reduce the cost of living? We are losing a fine national asset on the Eastern Goldfields. I refer to the low-grade ore, which is being left behind, while the mining of the high-grade ore is receiving attention. We cannot expect men to go down into these mines, to go down into places which, I term, absolute hell. They are not treated in a fair or just manner, and working conditions in the mines are not at all satisfactory. To-day it is not mining; it is quarrying. The mines have attained great depths and because the matter of ventilation was neglected in the early stages of our mining industry, the work in the lower levels is positively

cruel. The men in those mines should receive more adequate pay compared with the men who are employed in centres such as Perth. In the Senate recently, Senator Lynch declaimed against men on the trams, and in other avenues of similar employment, securing high wages at the expense of the primary producers. The wages of the men in the mines went from 11s. 2d. minimum to 13s. 4d. in the past. Senator Lynch declaimed against the primary producers being debarred from receiving as much as the men who had soft billets arising from the work of primary production. When it is contended that the wages of these men should be cut down, let members pause and consider rather the advisability of concentrating on the reduction of the cost of living. The Governments of Australia, and, for that matter, the Governments of the world, have been helping to maintain a high cost of living. It may be a revelation to members of this House when I mention that the war time profits tax in England brought in a million a day, while a perusal of the Australian statistics shows that the Federal authorities collected £2,500,000 on account of the excess profits tax. The effect of this has been to encourage the profiteer. Three or four weeks ago I read in the "Western Mail" that the profits are 100 per cent. more to-day than in pre-war time. We cannot get away from the fact that, because the profiteer is encouraged as I have indicated, we should concentrate in an endeavour to reduce the cost of living, so as to make wages more adequate. If that were done, the low-grade ore, which is now being left behind, could be treated. I do not know if hon. members can imagine what it means. If that low-grade ore is left behind, it can never be worked profitably, unless wages come down to black country conditions. This is a white country and wages should not be allowed to reach that low level. The ore has to be mined with the rich ores in these days, and for that reason the low-grade ore cannot be mined in the future under existing conditions. We found out only last year that an agreement was entered into to send our surplus butter overseas. Whilst our local butter was being exported, large quantities of margarine were being imported. The leading papers of the day published statements showing that the margarine was deficient in vitamins. One of our leading analysts, Mr. Mann, reported that it was deficient in that direction. Despite these facts, our children were expected to eat margarine, while the more wholesome butter was being exported overseas. Was that not a scandalous state of affairs? Here, in this glorious country of Australia, our local product could not be used for the benefit of our children, but had to be sent overseas so that the profiteers could reap their profits. In their references to the excessive profits said to have been made during the war by our wool people, members who dealt with that subject were rather unfortunate. I do not know whether

those particular members have read the statements made by Senator Guthrie, who stated in the Senate that the price the pastoralists received for their wool during the three and a half years up to June, 1920, I think, was 1s. 2½d. per lb. The Senator went on to say that at that price the cost of material would be about 8s. 3¾d. for a suit length. We must remember that 7 lbs. of greasy wool make up three and a half yards of cloth. From this it will be seen that the men who are making the profits on the wool are not the wool people themselves. The profits are made by those who handle it subsequently. Recently a witness, giving evidence before a Commission, stated that it cost him 8s. 6d. a yard for tweed in Flinders-lane and he found that it cost 28s. per yard to purchase in the same place later on. Senator Fairbairn, one of the richest men in Australia, told the Senate that he wanted to buy a couple of natural wool singlets, and he found that he had to pay 35s. each for them in a city shop. His wife went to one of the suburbs of Melbourne, I think it was Prahran, and she bought Australian all-wool singlets for 11s. 6d. Naturally the lady contended that her buying was far better than that of the Senator. I do not think that profiteering is going on as far as the wool men are concerned, but certainly it is indulged in by those who handle it subsequent to purchase from them. That procedure was encouraged through the incidence of the war time profits tax, for the reason that the Government were collecting the money.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. BOYLAND: When the Acting Leader of the Country Party said that the miners should take a smaller wage, in order to assist in keeping the mining industry going, he might have directed his attention to the price of wheat, which stands at 9s. per bushel. It should be remembered that the war was not won for the farmer alone, and that when the price of his wheat went up that very fact would have its effect throughout other industries. We must not adopt the attitude that the farming industry is the only one which must be considered. I grant that the farmer must get a fair price for his product, just as the producers of our cattle, sheep, or fruit must get a fair price for their respective commodities. I also grant that the Government of the country should see that those people get an adequate market for their products, besides getting a fair equivalent in price for what they are producing. In addition, they can get more than that, if possible, when the goods are exported overseas. With the price of wheat at 9s. per bushel, bread is sold on the gold-fields at 6½d. cash, and that has been the price for some time. I want members to throw their minds back to the time of the great coal upheaval, when the Federal Government found it necessary, during

the war period, to grant a bonus of 3s. 6d. per ton to the coal mines. That 3s. 6d. per ton cost the Mount Morgan gold mine in Queensland over £7,000 per year for hard coke. How can any industry stand up to those prices? How can other industries carry on under such conditions, and how can the cost of living be brought down in such circumstances? In many industries the increased cost cannot be passed on. The gold mining industry is one of those, for we cannot pass on the cost in the price of gold. We have been fortunate in receiving the gold bonus, but even then, that bonus has only just kept the industry alive, and no more. The Chamber of Mines need never have been so pessimistic, however, as they were when the award, in connection with the mining industry, was delivered. There was no need for that pessimism for the mines had had their good times, and had made large profits during their good periods. They were not penalised in those days. Yet to-day we are told that the wolf is at the door. The mining companies have declaimed for years that the same wolf was at the doors of the companies. Now they have come to the Country Party and have got their members to say that wages must come down. I presume that they have approached the Country Party because I find that the latter are fighting the mining companies' battles here. Because the mining industry representatives have joined the Primary Producers' Association, their claims are being advocated by the Country Party members in this Chamber. If these low grade ores are to be utilised in our gold mines, the cost of living must be reduced, and the farmer must be prepared to be absolutely fair with the rest of the community. As I have already mentioned, the war was not fought for the farmer any more than for the other sections of the community. The people on the goldfields did everything possible to bring about a satisfactory result to the war. Their enlistments were abnormal, as also were their contributions. On the goldfields we paid to the wives and children of soldiers who were at the Front the difference between the husband's military pay and the money he was earning in civilian life. We continued to do that right through, and subsequent to, the war until such time as the husbands returned and were re-established in civilian life. For instance, on the Great Boulder gold mine over £10,000 was subscribed to the different war funds. That was simply a wonderful effort. Australia lost 60,000 men, and our population has been depleted to that extent. In addition to that, we had 188,000 men wounded and incapacitated. Getting down to the sordid side, the war cost us in cash some 400 million pounds. On the whole, the people of Australia have contributed their share towards the war as well as any other people, and they should be considered as well as the farmer. William Morris Hughes, when he came back from the Old

Country, told the people of Australia that they would be fed first, after which the primary producers would be at liberty to export their wheat and other products for just as much as they could get for them. The whole of the people of Australia stuck loyally by the Government, and they should be considered. The wheat man must study those in other industries, such as the metal-liferous industries. If the price of wheat is advanced, the price of bread follows, and so it goes on. It is a vicious circle, and it has been outlined over and over again. To say that the wages man should be hit first, is absolutely unfair. Professor Copland made it clear to us from his charts that while the wholesale prices stretched away up to the top, and the retail prices were next, the working man's wages were still down on a far lower level. It was the abnormal rise in prices which brought about the rise in wages. In consequence, in this State we have had to dole out charity. Why should that be, in a rich country like this? Simply because wages cannot follow soaring prices. We have to be just to the worker, and see to it that he gets a fair deal. At a conference I attended on a wages question, I pointed out that a delegate with me who was a married man with one son, who was at the war, was in receipt of £4 a week. A man living opposite who has a wife and six children was getting £3 7s. per week. That man was sued for £30 by the local store-keeper. Why should such a man have to go into court? Simply because notwithstanding his industry he had not the wherewithal to live and maintain his wife and family. Why should that be permitted in a country like this? And then we are told that wages must come down! Why not reduce the cost of living, by giving us wheat at a fair price? Mr. Hill, of the Country Party in Victoria, in attempting to hit Mr. Hughes, said that the farmers would not get a fair deal from Mr. Hughes, that if Mr. Hughes had his way, wheat would have been sold for 6s. 6d. Mr. Hughes had said he did not care how much the farmer might get for his wheat overseas, provided the farmer fed the people of Australia at a reasonable price. Mr. Hughes said that 6s. 6d. would be a more reasonable price than 7s. 8d. However, Mr. Hughes was overridden. To those who say the miner should do something to help the industry along, I say the miner should be helped in the first place, and given a chance to maintain his wife and children.

Member: The price of bread has not much bearing on the aggregate cost of living.

Mr. BOYLAND: Every increase, even in the price of bread, has helped to raise the cost of living. It is a vicious circle, a dog chasing its own tail. What the price of offal means, we saw from the report in the "West Australian" of what Mr. Watson said in respect of the pig industry. We declaim against the importation of two million pounds worth of products from the East, yet we are

killing our secondary industries by high prices. If the cost of living can be reduced in my district, we shall then be able to work that national asset which is being left in the ground, and which possibly we shall not get later. I am pleased to know that the Esperance railway is under construction and that the Premier has said that the only first-class Crown wheat lands of any consequence today are in the Esperance district. The building of the Esperance railway will scarcely affect the centralisation policy with which we have been familiar for so many years. This railway has been promised by successive Governments. I was chairman of the meeting at the Half-way, Kalgoorlie, when the present Minister for Mines contested the by-election, and Sir Henry Lefroy announced that in consequence of the report of the Royal Commission on Esperance land, the Esperance railway would be built. That railway will not mean any loss to anybody in this part of the State. Esperance will not affect any other port. The chief point is that we shall be utilising the wheat lands down there. The Premier says we must have immigration. Obviously, land must be found for the immigrants. Why, then, should not that magnificent stretch of country be opened up by a railway? Within 50 miles of Esperance Bay lies the finest fishing ground around Australia. This was proved by the ill-fated trawler "Endeavour" when she was at work in that locality. How much better would it be to build up a fine fishing industry there than to continue importing tinned fish from overseas! We have had to pay 2s. 2d. and 2s. 3d. for tinned salmon.

Mr. Angelo: The industry at Shark Bay will remedy all that.

Mr. BOYLAND: There is plenty of room for the expansion of that industry. Our population must be fed. The centralisation of the past has shown that this country cannot advance under that policy. Out of a population of 329,000, no fewer than 190,000 reside within a radius of 12 miles of the G.P.O., Perth. Practically the same may be said of every other State of the Commonwealth. Ninety per cent. of the freight in each State goes through the capital city of the State. We are not utilising our outports. Let the outports be developed and the country worked, and we shall soon get population. Only the other day I met an old mining mate who, on the promises of past Governments, had invested £1,000 in Esperance. None of those promises having been kept, he finished up in debt, and for years had to work hard to pay off his obligation. A few of the men down there have hung on, feeding their farms with money in the hope that sooner or later the railway would come along. I should like an assurance from the Minister for Railways that the rails now being pulled up between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie will be utilised to expedite the Esperance railway.

The Minister for Railways: It is not my responsibility. The Minister for Works will use those rails.

Mr. BOYLAND: I hope the responsible Minister, whoever he may be, will see to it that those rails are not taken from the goldfields, but will be used to push along the construction of the Esperance railway. A letter in the "Kalgoorlie Miner" has declared that this is the intention of the Government.

The Minister for Railways: It would be more sensible to arrange for the construction of the line from Norseman. We do not want any more disconnected railways.

Mr. BOYLAND: The Government have shown commendable sympathy with the mining prospector. During the election the Premier was reported to have said that the recent discoveries on the goldfields had justified the assistance given to prospectors. Under the direction of the Minister for Mines is a prospecting board and a mines' developing board. Prospectors recommended by the prospecting board can be sure of sympathy from the Minister. I do not know of any bona fide case favourably reported upon by the inspectors which has been turned down by the board. It is the prospector on whom we have to depend. The mining companies have taken hundreds of thousands of pounds out of the State. Who were responsible for Lake View South, Mount Monger, Hampton Plains, St. Ives, and Bayley's Reward? Not the Chamber of Mines, not the geologist, but the man who battles through the back country, the man with the small purse and the big heart, the man who went out with pick and water bag.

The Minister for Mines: What has he got out of the Ives Reward discovery?

Mr. BOYLAND: Nothing.

The Minister for Mines: Then what have some sharks got out of it?

Mr. J. Thomson: That is the fault of the Minister.

Mr. BOYLAND: Of course you can always find speculators exploiting a prospector's toil. You have the Golden Mile worked by huge companies. Had it not been for Hannans and other men, the goldfields might not have been discovered yet. In 1892 I was camped in Queensland. There were men there building up cheques with a view to going prospecting in the heart of Western Australia. This was the incentive that caused my father, my brother, and myself to come to Western Australia. My father had been on goldfields all his life, and having heard so much about the possibilities of Western Australia, caught the gold fever, and we were on our way here when Bayley's was discovered. It is the hardy prospector who, by finding the gold, has done so much to build up this State. The other man comes along and exploits it afterwards, but that is the way of life, and I do not complain of it. Probably we would do the same thing if the opportunity occurred. The man who deserves all possible consideration is the prospector, but he does not ask for too much. In connection with the subject of mining, I wish to refer to the dreaded disease of miners' complaint.

Unfortunately, I am one of the sufferers, and I can speak feelingly on this subject. A short time ago I was told through a letter, which appeared under a nom-de-plume in the "Kalgoorlie Miner," that I had only a superficial knowledge of the complaint. Seeing that I have been in an awful state of health during the last seven years, my knowledge of it cannot be very superficial. I stood out with others and fought for the miners' relief scheme, and have always taken an interest in my fellow sufferers. The writer of that letter spoke untruthfully when he said that my knowledge was only superficial. That man had an axe to grind and a job to look after, and he acted through a second party. The Miners' Relief Fund has outlived its usefulness. The old age and invalid pensions are being availed of. Whenever a man becomes stricken he applies for an invalid pension, or if he is old enough for an old age pension. The widows' payments are on the very lowest scale. I know of men who fought in the war and who have been called upon to assist to support mothers or widows who were a fair charge on the fund. Why should they? They went out and offered their lives for their country. Luckily their lives were preserved, but they are now called upon to assist to shoulder the burden of supporting a mother whose husband had contributed to the relief fund. The Miners' Relief Fund is a contributory scheme, one-third being contributed by the Government, one-third by the mine owners, and one-third by the men working in the industry. These men have a just right to the money, but the payments are very niggardly. If I had applied for relief from this fund, being a man with a wife and three children, I would have received £2 a week, towards which I would have had to subscribe. If I had gone for an old age or invalid pension and State aid I would have received £2 2s. a week without contributing a penny. These sufferers contribute their money and endanger their lives, and when they are dying with this dreaded complaint, they are starved. Just when they require some of the luxuries of life they have not the wherewithal to purchase them. They have to depend upon the benefit societies, in short, on charity. Thank God I have not had to rely on charity, but how many of my fellows have had to, and they have been compelled to accept it for the sake of the wife and little ones. Coming to State aid, the widow does not receive enough. A woman with five children was augmenting her Miners' Relief Fund payment by working as charwoman for the Government for 16s. a week. She had to keep the house going and look after the five children. When the eldest child reached the age of 14, her payments were cut down. Unfortunately we on the goldfields have not work for children leaving school and, through the Trades Hall, these children were cut out because their employers could do without them. Fortunately, the Government showed

themselves sympathetic and helped this woman. Why should not we have something better than this paltry Miners' Relief Fund?

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

The Minister for Mines: Why not have something to prevent men reaching that stage?

Mr. BOYLAND: It is regrettable that preventive measures were not taken years ago. The Minister knows that I fought his Government on this matter at the time and came in for a lot of undeserved criticism. I was working for men whom I knew were down and out. I visited these men in the hospitals and they said, "Never mind us, we are down, but for Heaven's sake look after the others." I was misunderstood, and came in for a lot of criticism. I take no credit for what I did, but when I saw these men going out and the women and children being left with nothing more than a subscription taken up on the mine to depend upon—

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It was Jabez Dodd, not you, who worked for those men and got them assistance.

Mr. BOYLAND: The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do.

Mr. BOYLAND: The Minister for Mines will remember that it was a small committee of the Miners' Union who absolutely forced the Government to recognise the penalty provisions of the Act with regard to ventilation and the laying of dust. The Minister for Mines knows that Jabez Dodd came in at the death knock when he saw that we were not to be put aside.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: He did more for the men than you ever did in your life or ever will do.

Mr. BOYLAND: It is all very fine for the hon. member to make unfounded statements of that kind.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I know what I am talking about.

Mr. BOYLAND: If the hon. member had been acquainted with the controversy which took place at the time, he would not have interjected as he has done. It is known on the goldfields and by the sufferers from this complaint who were the men who fought for them from start to finish. The movement arose out of a lecture delivered by a Wesleyan parson named Otto Schroder. The whole country was roused by the controversy we started and the fund was inaugurated. To-day we ask for something in place of that scheme. Jabez Dodd came to the goldfields. We invited him to address a meeting of the Miners' Union on the subject of miners' phthisis, and he came along with a proposed scheme. We went on with the proposal and the scheme was inaugurated. Prospectors have been denied the benefit of the fund because they have not contributed to it. A prospector goes

out and perhaps earns nothing for six or twelve months. The effects of fibrosis are sometimes not felt for years, and then all at once the victim goes down. He consults a medical expert and is informed that he is suffering from miners' complaint. Yet such men who have been out prospecting are turned down because they have not contributed to the fund. When the fund was first inaugurated, it was made a condition of employment that the men contributed to the fund. This, however, has been altered, and a man who has not contributed to the fund for some time has no right to its benefits. When a man contributes his life to the industry, has he not contributed his all? What did Senator Millen say in answer to a question which I put to him in Kalgoorlie regarding the repatriation of our soldiers? I asked, "Suppose a man has been discharged from the military force for a couple of years and medical opinion says he is suffering from war injury, what would you do for him?" Senator Millen said, "I do not care if it is 10 years hence, that man will be repatriated if the medical opinion shows that he is suffering from war injuries." Why should not the same principle apply to the mine workers? If the Government are humane, something must be done in connection with this fund. If these men in the industry are being murdered—and I use the word "murdered" advisedly—simply through the neglect to provide ventilation and to rectify other disabilities, a remedy should be found at once. Although the contributing membership has decreased by one-half or more, the salary of the secretary has been increased from £400 to £500 a year, and other expenses are as high to-day as when the number of contributors was double. If any additional benefits were to be disbursed, they should have gone to the men in whose interests the fund was established. Surely a salary of £400 a year for the secretary was sufficient when a poor devil down and almost out was receiving only 12s. 6d. for himself and 12s. 6d. for his wife. A scheme of compulsory insurance against unemployment and sickness should be inaugurated by the Government.

The Minister for Mines: What about preventing men getting to that stage?

Mr. BOYLAND: Such a scheme would cut out the charity aspect of the present fund.

The Minister for Mines: But why not relieve the men before they get to that stage?

Mr. BOYLAND: The hon. member is Minister for Mines and should act. He and his predecessors in office are responsible for the present position. During the war 60 per cent. of the miners who offered their services were turned down owing to physical disability. Strapping young fellows had to be denied the right of fighting for their country, and some of them almost cried when they had to stand down. Most of the men in the Miners' Corps, even under a compara-

tively slight gas attack, died and went out. Forty per cent. of the patients in the Wooroloo Sanatorium consist of miners from Kalgoorlie. Is it not up to the Government to do something for them? The Government appear to be taking the line of least resistance. So long as the fund can be carried on, they are evidently content. Why not do something for these men by giving them a sum adequate to live on during the closing days of their lives? If we had a compulsory insurance scheme against unemployment and sickness, these people would be in receipt of a fair rate of pay and the burden of the scheme would be distributed over the whole of the people. These sufferers are deserving of every consideration, and seeing that the Minister for Mines has been connected with mining pretty well all his life he should do something over and above what has been done to date. Anyhow I am going to try and see that these people are looked after as they should be looked after. I intend to say a few words about the Wooroloo Sanatorium. There has been a movement for some time past in the direction of raising funds to establish a club for the inmates of that institution. I do not know whether hon. members have visited it. The wards are built on the verandah style, one side being completely open, to admit of plenty of fresh air which, I believe, it is essential the patients should have so that the disease might be cured if it is possible to cure it. Unfortunately, during rough and stormy weather, the patients have no place to which to go so that they might keep themselves warm. There are no such things as fires, and nothing like the beautiful radiators which we have in this Chamber. Those men, many of them in a dying condition, have to put up with the exposure to the elements until they go to bed at night. We can imagine what their condition must be in the depth of winter. The Ugly Men's Association—and I pay a tribute to them because they are one of the finest bodies of men existing in Australia—have, I understand, collected £1,000. An arrangement was made that the goldfields should subscribe a similar sum of money and that the Government should then give pound for pound subsidy. So far as the goldfields are concerned, however, money at the present time is exceedingly hard to get, and those connected with the Mine Workers' Relief Fund have declared that it is entirely out of the question to raise that sum of money. Therefore if the goldfields cannot raise their quota it is due to the Government to go to the assistance of the sufferers in the sanatorium if only for the reason that those unfortunate people are there for the benefit of the State as a whole. If these people were walking about the streets of Perth they would be a serious menace. Consequently we should provide every comfort for them while they are in the institution. So far as the goldfields are concerned, a prominent doctor there—he has since left the State—informed me a little while back that

men were not going to him with fibrosis, but with tuberculosis, which went to prove that the expectoration which is going on was the cause of the spread of the disease. He declared that the mines underground were a hot-bed of the disease. The doctor stated that the surface men were suffering from fibrosis and the men underground from tuberculosis. This too, is what would happen if the men left the sanatorium. We built that sanatorium for the purpose of isolating these sufferers, and to keep the towns clean and free from the disease, and it was intended to provide every comfort for those people. One of their requirements at the institution is a set of blinds to provide protection against the easterly winds. I had a poor brother who was dying there, and the absence of blinds just got on his nerves. The wards are open towards the east and the winds from that direction give the patients a bad time. The absence of protection from those winds is a positive nightmare to the patients when the winds are blowing from the east. I sincerely trust that the Government will see that matters of detail such as I have outlined will receive attention. I am going to make another small complaint. I do not like referring to matters such as these, but in the circumstances I think I am justified in doing so. The relatives of the inmates of the sanatorium are now compelled to pay for their conveyance from the Wooroloo station to the sanatorium, and in addition are charged for a light meal which they have there. This is an innovation and is proving a hardship in many cases. It was previously the custom to permit the visitors to the sanatorium to use the motor vehicle attached to the institution free of charge. It is only a small matter for the Government to grant this concession. The visitors to the institution were accustomed to it and it is hard to understand why the alterations have been made. The inmates are all poor people and their relations cannot afford to pay the recently imposed charges. The better off people, who are affected with the disease, go to the sanatoriums in the East.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They go to worse institutions than that at Wooroloo.

Mr. BOYLAND: Very likely. I have nothing but good to say in regard to the sanatorium at Wooroloo and the management. Everyone who has gone there to report on it has given the Chief Medical Officer and his staff great praise for the way in which the institution is carried on. I desire to say a few words with regard to land settlement. I wish to compliment the Government on their land settlement policy. I was in favour of group settlement long before I heard of the Government's intentions to introduce it. I do not understand why we cannot prepare places in the agricultural areas on which to put those people who desire to go on the land. The Government, however, are working in the right direction. The people on the goldfields did not understand the question, but I showed them different newspaper articles which outlined the scheme, and after having

had the position explained to them many declared their intention of participating in group settlement. The Premier has promised us a group settlement and he has also stated that if a party of soldiers on the goldfields desire something similar he will fix them up as well. I am a firm believer in the immigration policy of the Government and they will have my support in that regard. Immigration means our security and national salvation. If we are not to have population, how will the country progress? We cannot go on as we are doing. The Government are to be commended for their attitude in this direction and I hope they will persevere in spite of criticisms from outside. I have touched on the secondary industries problem and there is no further need to labour that point. With our primary production advancing we must perforce go on with the secondary industries so as to save the two million pounds sterling which annually goes elsewhere for articles which should be produced locally. The next point I desire to deal with is the question of unimproved land taxation. Our existing lines of railways were built for the benefit of the community; they were built for the people, and therefore there should not be any land adjacent to those lines out of cultivation if it be possible to cultivate it. The owners of this unimproved land are looking for the unearned increment. Otherwise why should they hang on to it? We have quite recently had an instance of this. As soon as the statement was published that it was intended to construct a tramway line to Como, up went the price of land.

Mr. Pickering: Fifty per cent.

Mr. BOYLAND: Even up to 100 per cent. Look at the position at Nedlands and Crawley. See what one has to pay for land there. And we can remember when it could be got not so very long ago for a mere song. The Government should concentrate on this, and I hope pressure will be brought to bear on the owners of unimproved land close to existing railways to compel them to make use of it. If those people who own that land will not do something with it then they should be compelled to pay an unimproved land tax. It is the man who is sitting tight who is preventing the advancement of the country. The Government claim to be a National Government. If they are so they are out for the nation, and they should take steps to do everything that will benefit the nation. One way in which that can be done is to force the unimproved land into occupation. No man should be permitted to hold land in an idle state in the hope of eventually reaping the unearned increment.

The Minister for Agriculture: I agree with you.

Mr. BOYLAND: We all know that increased production means increased population. If we can double our population we shall lighten the burden which the present taxpayers are carrying. Instead of one carrying it to-day, there will be two carrying it.

to-morrow. If new railways are built, in the face of what is happening, they will add to the existing burden. We will have to employ additional people whereas our staffs to-day can cope with what is at present in existence. We should build only those public utilities that are absolutely necessary for the advancement of the country. If it should be necessary to construct railways to assist people who are really isolated I would say build those railways but no others, at any rate not until we get back to a solvent state. The next point I wish to touch upon is the duplication of Electoral Departments. The duplication of the Taxation Departments has been cut out, and the Federal Government are now collecting taxes for this State, with a saving to us of £20,000 per annum.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There may be a saving. We do not know yet.

Mr. BOYLAND: The preparation of the rolls for the recent general election has cost this State a large amount of money. That expense could have been saved entirely, or at all events very largely, if the Federal rolls had been utilised for the compilation of the State rolls. The State Government, however, employed house-to-house canvassers.

Mr. Johnston: Only in the cities.

Mr. BOYLAND: The officer in charge of the Federal electoral office at Kalgoorlie knows practically whenever people come and go; he has been there so long. In my opinion, the Federal rolls on the goldfields are as good as can be got.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The post office gives the officer information.

Mr. BOYLAND: The officer gets information from all quarters. In view of the knowledge available in the Kalgoorlie electoral office, we could certainly cut out our State Electoral Department so far as the goldfields are concerned; and I have no doubt the same thing would apply throughout Western Australia. The State Government employ the clerks of courts offices to compile rolls. During my election I discovered that a person whose name was struck off the State rolls was not notified. On the other hand, the Federal Electoral Department give due notice prior to the striking off of a name. When polling day arrived in Kalgoorlie, people who have resided there for 20 years in one house found that they had no vote. Such a thing could not occur under an amalgamation of the Electoral Departments. The Federal electoral roll is absolutely up to date. Under the State system rolls can be built up, can be stuffed, and stuffed very badly. During the by-election at which Mr. Scaddan was opposed by Mr. Lutey, 200 names of our side were cut off the roll—which absolutely lost Mr. Scaddan the election. Prior to the next succeeding election, 605 names were put on. Of those 605 names, 183 were put on by my side, and the rest mostly by the

other side. I made inquiries as to whether everything was in order, and was told "Yes." But after the election I was distinctly and deliberately informed by the opposition that they knew they were going to beat me by 500 votes. How did they know? Again, when the North and South-East Province elections came around, I had to conduct Mr. Cornell's campaign, that gentleman being at the front. What did I find then? I found roll-stuffing rampant. I had no fewer than 350 names with crosses against them to show that they were cases which should be challenged to sign No. 9 form upon coming forward to vote. I found also that the wives of men who were freeholders appeared on the roll as freeholders. Their husbands, however, were still paying the rates. We made one discovery after another. We found that there were votes in respect of camps worth £2, whereas the value should have been £50. Four or five cases were brought before the police court, and fines were inflicted.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We obtained photographs of some of those camps.

Mr. BOYLAND: I can tell the House all about those photographs. I am going to deal with all the untruthfulness that was uttered in this Chamber at the time concerning those houses. After that biennial election an officer from the Electoral Department in Perth visited the goldfields, and, as a result, 550 names were struck off the South Province roll alone. In that election numbers of people who never had the value for the vote were on the roll and came along and voted. The striking off of those 550 names in respect of one province shows that the electoral system of this State is not what it should be. I am not blaming the Chief Electoral Officer or his staff. The Chief Electoral Officer was limited in regard to funds, and could not obtain the same facilities as were available to the Federal officer. The latter, if he wants a man or two to help him along with his work, can always get them. The North-East Province election was marked by practically the same features as the South Province election: roll stuffing was absolutely rampant.

Mr. Simons: Who won those two elections?

Mr. BOYLAND: Mr. Cornell and Mr. Ardagh.

Mr. Simons: The rolls were stuffed the right way, then.

Mr. BOYLAND: No, they were not. People who came to me with a less qualification than was necessary and asked my advice, were always told by me, "You have not got the qualification; do not vote; for I am not going to pay your fine, or help to pay your fine." That was what our side did; but on the other side politicians were running around the country getting the signatures of people and putting in claim cards. The Electoral Department knew of those things, but took no proceedings in the matter—whether such was the policy of the Gov-

ernment or not, I am unable to say. However, three photographs were produced here. One was a photograph of Mr. Sadlier's house, built on a leasehold and rated at £15 per annum; the leasehold itself having a valuation of £10 per annum. The second photograph was that of a house belonging to Mr. W. L. Crowe; his valuation was £10. He had voted on the Labour side during the years before, until the war came about; and his vote had never been challenged. But when the roll stuffing was shown up, he came to me and said, "What must I do? I have always voted on this qualification." I said, "Well, do not vote this time."

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A leaseholder of £10 is eligible.

Mr. BOYLAND: This man had a lease out in the bush, a stock lease.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It does not matter where the lease is situated.

Mr. BOYLAND: Mr. Sadlier's qualification should have been £10 in all, including water rates. In the second case the man had a dwelling and had the qualification, but did not vote. The Leader of the Opposition has said in this House that the man did vote, but that is incorrect. The third case was that of a man who had a house partly on a leasehold and partly on a surveyed road. His wife foolishly put her name on the roll as a freeholder. The husband and wife were some of those foolish people who would do anything for Labour. They voted on that qualification, and eventually were fined for so doing. Of the three photographs produced, two were absolutely in our favour, while the third showed an illegitimate claim, seeing that the house was partly on a leasehold and partly on a surveyed road. Then there was the case of a union secretary, owner and occupier of a house, who put his wife on the roll in respect of a paltry three or four pounds a year. When that man was challenged, he said it was due to a set against him. The only remedy for this state of things is to cut out the duplication by amalgamating our State Electoral Department with the Federal Electoral Department. I may stand again for election, if I last long enough; and then I shall want no unfair advantage, but shall want only the votes of such people as are entitled to be on the roll. If people are not entitled to be on the roll, let them refrain from voting. I have some more matters to bring before the House, but do not feel equal to the task. On some future occasion I shall perhaps be a little fitter and able to go further. But I repeat that if this country is to advance in respect of gold mining, we must help the industry in every way we possibly can. There is no occasion whatever for pessimism as regards Western Australian gold mining. Gold is being won all the time, and new finds are being made every day. Finally, let me express my very sincere hope that the sufferers from miners' complaint, the unfortunate inmates of the Wooroloo Sanatorium, will in future receive

that measure of fair treatment which has not been accorded to them in the past.

Sitting suspended from 6.11 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [7.30]: I join with the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Boyland) in his remarks regarding the mining industry and what it has done for Western Australia. Up to the time of the discovery of gold, Western Australia was practically unknown, not only in other parts of the world but throughout Australia. It was only after the discovery of gold that Western Australia moved out of the rut in which it had been for many years. It was only then that prosperity was gained by other industries, and it was through the discovery of gold that Western Australia was enabled to develop to its present stage. While I concur with the member for Kalgoorlie in his remarks regarding what goldmining has done for this State, I cannot understand him pledging his unreserved support to the present Government. When it is realised that in the speech, extending over 2½ hours, which the Premier delivered the other evening, there was not a single reference to the mining industry, I cannot understand the member for Kalgoorlie pledging his support as I have indicated. The Premier did not evidently consider the mining industry worthy of a mention in his lengthy speech.

The Minister for Mines: We do not fire off all our big guns first.

Mr. Boyland: What the Government have done is shown by the activities on the fields.

Mr. McCALLUM: If those activities are such as were indicated by the member for Kalgoorlie in his speech, I would say that the activities of the Government were not characterised by much vim, otherwise why the present stagnation in the industry? After the exhaustive address delivered by the Leader of the Opposition the other night, I do not think there is any necessity for me to traverse the usual ground followed during the Address-in-reply debate. If the speech of the Leader of the Opposition erred, it erred on the side of fairness. No one could complain of the attitude adopted by the member for Boulder, nor of the procedure which he outlined. That procedure and that attitude will be strictly followed by members of the Opposition. After an examination of the Governor's Speech, members should ask themselves whether there is a single sentence or even one clause that holds out hope of relief from the present economic pressure, a pressure which has existed for the past four or five years. What hope is there held out for the people as indicated in that Speech? Are we to understand that the Government have no policy at all so far as relief from the present economic pressure is concerned? What hope is there of relief from the poverty that prevails at the present time and the hardship manifest in the homes of the workers throughout the country?

There is nothing in the Governor's Speech which outlined the policy of the Government which would indicate that the present Administration have any policy in that connection.

The Minister for Mines: Did you go to the football match yesterday?

Mr. McCALLUM: Had the Government anything to do with that function?

The Minister for Mines: There was a record gate taken at that match—a record for Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: What does that show?

The Minister for Mines: It does not show that there is too much poverty about.

Mr. McCALLUM: It means that the people enjoyed some relaxation. Does the Minister contend that people should exist without relaxation? The fact that there was a record gate does not affect the position I am referring to. Does the Minister object to people finding 1s. 6d. for the privilege of a little relaxation at a football match? The Minister himself has enjoyed relaxation all his life, and does he desire to debar others from a little enjoyment? That is not the standard of life he has usually followed. I contend, however, that some relief should be given to the people who are suffering from economic hardships at the present juncture. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, and I will strictly follow the lead that he has given us, when he says that so far as the finances of the State are concerned, that question will not be made a party matter. No attempt will be made by me to make any political capital out of the present state of the finances. We should all give of our best in the attempt to solve the problems that are ahead of us, and should under no circumstances seek to make party political capital out of the financial position. While agreeing that that is the attitude which must be adopted, I would remind hon. members that the attitude which the Opposition intend to adopt is far different from that adopted by members now sitting on the Ministerial side of the House when they were in Opposition. When Labour was in power, members now occupying the Ministerial benches were never tired of stating that the finances of the State could never be straightened out nor yet could our financial position be solidified until the Labour Government were turned out of office. In those days they did not come forward with any offer of help to the Government of the day; they did not argue that the State finances should not be made a party political matter. Their one aim seemed to be to get rid of a so-called incompetent Labour Government, and more especially were they determined in their efforts to get rid of the then incompetent Treasurer.

The Minister for Mines: They woke up.

Mr. McCALLUM: They wanted a Government of business men; a Government composed of men with business acumen. I have often been highly amused at the use of that term. In the official position I held for many years past, I often met our business

men and I found that there is nothing they like so much as to be termed "business men." As soon as one refers to them as "business men" out go their chests and they strut about like peacocks. No matter if they only have a few tin tacks and a few pots and pans to sell, they are all business men. These people desired a Government composed of business men. They are satisfied to have a Government composed of business men now. They have such a Government, but where is there any alteration since the Government of business men have been in power? The policy adopted by the Leader of the Opposition of not making the finances a matter of party politics is not a new one so far as Labour is concerned. The Premier has admitted on more than one occasion that the Labour Party have pursued that policy. We will continue along those lines. On the other hand, however, that is not the policy adopted in the Eastern States by the parties in opposition to Labour Governments there. In Western Australia we are playing the game and we are being fair to the country. What is the policy of the parties in opposition to Labour Governments in the Eastern States? Take Queensland, for instance: in that State action was taken to send a delegation to London to do nothing else than to pursue an endeavour to ruin the financial credit of that State. The delegation went to London in order to prevent the Premier of Queensland from floating a loan to develop that rich State.

Hon. P. Collier: They wanted to ruin Labour.

Mr. McCALLUM: They put every obstacle in the way of the Labour Premier so as to prevent him from securing capital.

The Minister for Mines: They were not quite silent when I was in London.

Mr. McCALLUM: You were with us then, and that made all the difference. These people were willing to do anything to defeat the Queensland Premier, and they were not concerned with the interests of the State. They were actuated by party political motives. These parties were not willing to drop their own politics when dealing with the financial position. They were willing to brush the Labour Party aside so long as they could get a clear run for themselves. That attitude is not confined to Queensland, for when the member for Boulder (Hon. P. Collier) and I were in Sydney a few days ago we were informed that similar opposition was being raised against the New South Wales Labour Government and was evidenced against the Premier, Mr. Storey, in London. We have most reliable information to show that inquiries are being made from London in Sydney as to the provisions of certain Bills which the Labour Government intend to introduce, before they will sanction the Government's loan going on the London money market. That is the attitude which is adopted on the financial questions by the opponents of Labour in

the Eastern States. It shows that when it comes to the test, the question has to be faced as to whether we are to submit the proposals of Governments in Australia before they become the laws of the land, for the approval of the London Jew—the London financier. If any self-governing people are to be expected to do such a thing, the sooner the people's eyes are opened, and a stand made on the question, the better it will be for the self-governing dominions as a whole. These are the things that have happened in the Eastern States, and I hope that party politics will never reach such a low level in Western Australia.

Mr. Teesdale: Hear, hear; that is right.

Mr. McCALLUM: I hope there will be no such action so far as we on the Labour side of the House are concerned, and that members on the Ministerial side will never sanction any such action.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It was done in 1911-12.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know that.

Mr. Underwood: It is a pity it was not effective, too.

Mr. McCALLUM: We are putting that aside, however, and we are not adopting any spiteful attitude. We will put the interests of this State and its finances beyond mere spitefulness. We have done that and yet we are the one party accused of standing out for political party purposes apart from considerations of the interests of the State. When it comes down to the real test of the things that count in the interests of the people as a whole, there can be no question but that the Labour Party can claim to be national in its attitude, no matter what interests have been brought into the fight. I do not intend to deal extensively with the financial position, but while Labour was in power, the Press of the State and our opponents were never tired of complaining about the taxation the Labour Government heaped upon the people. The present Government have actually doubled direct taxation since they have been in office and at the same time they have increased the deficit by over 400 per cent. It would appear that the deficit figures have mounted so high that they have dazzled the imagination of the people who do not realise that it has towered up to nearly five million pounds, whereas it was only a few hundred thousands when the Labour Government were in power. For every hour of the 24 hours of each day in the 365 days of the year, the present Government have gone back on an average of £80 per hour. They are doing that now. The finances are still drifting. Despite the fact that they have doubled the taxation, the heavy burden of taxation is felt most by that section of the community least able to bear it. Although the Arbitration Court has declared that £1 a week is the lowest amount on which a married man can be expected to live—that is the basic wage here—the present Government drew in taxation from people receiving less than £4 a week the sum of £18,000 dur-

ing the last financial year. It means that from those people who, the court says, cannot live on less than £4 per week, the Government have extracted £18,000.

Mr. Latham: I suppose the court allowed for that.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, the court did not. I want to make the position clear. If the Premier will look up the taxation forms which have to be returned to the Commissioner, he will find it there set out that those who are receiving wages and keep have to allow 25s. per week as compensation for board and lodging. The law provides that any single person has exemption of £100 per annum, and no more. It means that the servant girl, the waitress, the housemaid, and others who are allowed board and lodging in with their wages, if they get 15s. per week they are brought under that clause, which provides that they are entitled to an exemption of only £100. Thus every penny they get is taxed and, in addition, 25s. per week which they have never received. And this Government extracted £18,000 last year from those who, the court has said, are not receiving a living wage! The first essential step to the straightening out of the finances is to make the position of Treasurer a one-man job. Surely the job is big enough to occupy the full attention of one Minister! During the period January to June, of this year, the Treasurer was not once in his office for an unbroken week. It may be quite right for the Premier to travel about the country and meet the people and mix among them. I believe that is a good policy for the Premier to follow. I believe also it is perfectly right that the Minister for Lands should travel about the State. But I do not think it is right for the Treasurer to be buried at Nornalup, and marooned in the North-West. While the Treasurer was away, the finances were drifting, the deficit piling up, and every month some Government department exceeding the vote passed by Parliament. It showed that there was no control, no grip of the finances on the part of the Treasurer. The first essential is that the Treasurer himself shall show that he is in earnest. If it is to be attended to properly, it is a job for one Minister alone, and he should be stripped of the duties of Premier and Minister for Lands. It is impossible for any one man to give proper attention to the three offices. It is of no use Ministers complaining that they have no control over the expenditure, because no Government official can exceed his vote unless he has the sanction of the Minister.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Oh yes, he can.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the Minister must approve.

Mr. Underwood: The Minister does approve; that is the point.

Mr. McCALLUM: Why does he not sit back and say this must stop? The officer must get the Minister's approval.

The Minister for Mines: After the money has been spent.

Mr. McCALLUM: Well, the officer knows that he will get it later on. Again, what has the Government to say about the extravagance revealed by the file relating to the Agent-General's home in London? On that file the Treasurer pleads time after time with the Agent-General that he should effect economies. What notice does the Agent-General take of those appeals? He goes right ahead, spends £25 on champagne glasses and a total of over £6,000 on the house and furniture. What has the Treasurer to say about that?

Mr. Pickering: But he could not do that without authority.

Mr. McCALLUM: The file shows that he did it despite the appeals made to him by the Treasurer. What has the Government to say about it? Can they not say to this official "If you will not carry out our directions, then in the event of your incurring the expenditure, it must come out of your own pocket." But the Government simply sit back and allow the matter to drift, and the officer knows that formal approval will come along afterwards. I think other Ministers, beside the Treasurer, require to show more vigilance in their work. During recent months there has been one long procession of Ministers of the Crown to the Eastern States.

The Minister for Agriculture: And of delegates from trades unions.

Hon. P. Collier: They pay their own expenses.

Mr. McCALLUM: The affairs of the country are not neglected when trades union delegates are away. Even since the election we have frequently had the experience of there being only one Minister in town for days on end. The Minister for Mines controls two big spending departments, one of which the Treasurer says accounted for the increase of over a quarter of a million in the deficit. Yet the Minister for Mines can trip over to the East to play bowls, and can go to Adelaide to inquire into the health of the monkeys in the Zoo.

The Minister for Mines: I have never got ill and asked my co-workers to pay for it.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, if you were ill there might be some excuse. You cannot plead illness. Yet you ran away to play bowls and to inspect the Zoo at Adelaide. There must be a change from this life of pleasure; an alteration, a getting down to solid business. Although I do not suggest that the whole of the financial position is affected by local influences, yet there are a good many local conditions which should be attended to immediately. There has been a good deal of discussion about economy, and it seems to be generally understood that economy means retrenchment. In my opinion the mere sacking of a few officials will not relieve to any material extent the financial position of the State. If it is to be a question of sacking, and if the sacking is to apply to wages men alone, the Government can expect to hear about it. If there is to be retrenchment, it must start from the top, and the wages men

must be treated fairly. The old policy of making the workers carry the whole of the burden of retrenchment must not be retained if the Government are to look to the Opposition for assistance in solving the financial problem. The reply given by the Minister for Railways to a question by the member for Yilgarn (Mr. Corboy) would lead members to believe that the new appointments in the Railway Department entail no increase in the cost of administration. Yet although the Railways have already sacked a good many men and given others notice, the following appointments have been made quite recently: Officer in charge of finance at £550; officer in charge of operations at £550; industrial officer—I have not his salary; district traffic superintendent, Perth, at £425; district traffic superintendent, Northam, at £450; chief clerk at £282; two traffic inspectors at £319 each; two district engineers at Bunbury and Northam at £485 each. In addition, an assistant engineer at a salary of from £318 to £359 in the district engineer's office at Narrogin, Geraldton, Bunbury, and Northam respectively; a clerk in charge district engineer's office, Bunbury and Northam, respectively, at £269-£309; a cost clerk, district engineer's office at Bunbury and at Northam, respectively, at a salary of from £229 to £259; inspector of works and buildings at Bunbury and at Northam at a salary of from £319 to £359.

Mr. Mann: Is that not decentralisation?

Mr. McCALLUM: These are all additions to the administrative cost of the railways.

The Minister for Railways: I say they are not.

Mr. McCALLUM: Then you had better show that they are not.

The Minister for Railways: I will do so.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know a number of men who have secured the appointments.

The Minister for Railways: I am not denying the appointments, but I say that they represent a saving in cash to the department.

Hon. P. Collier: Was the Commissioner able to show that?

Mr. McCALLUM: The financial position of the State is not due solely to local conditions. There are in operation world influences which no Government could entirely control. When the war ended, the whole of the countries of the world were facing a very serious position, perhaps more serious than while the war continued; and the cry went up from all the countries of the world that the only solution of the problem was to produce, produce, produce. Yet we found that within 12 months the very people who were setting up that cry complained that the markets had collapsed, that unemployment problems were everywhere in evidence and that millions of men were out of work. In America the proposition was seriously put forward that the whole of last year's cotton crop should be destroyed. This year in America, in Egypt and in India instructions were issued that the acreage under cotton should be materially decreased. At

the same time there are millions of people unable to get sufficient clothing. In Austria and other countries of Europe people are going about clad in paper for want of something more enduring. Mills are closed down in America and in England, while millions of people in those countries are out of work. These same people who were crying produce, produce, produce, and were implying that this party stood for the limitation of production, are now themselves adopting a policy of go-slow, of sabotage. We have an example in Melbourne, where the proposition has been put up that the wool crop of Australia should be destroyed, either sunk in the sea or set alight. We have the Prime Minister (Mr. Hughes) advising the fruitgrowers of Tasmania to cut back their trees, reminding those growers that there was no market for their products. Talk about the policy of the I.W.W.! And this has come from the very people who have accused this party of trying to limit production and to restrict the production of wealth in the interests of the great masses. We had the further spectacle of scores of ship loads of Australian mutton being hung up in English ports. The cool storage chambers were chock full of meat supplies. They could not get another carcass into the stores; it was impossible to unload the boats. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) saw it with his own eyes and I read an account of it. Notwithstanding this the people in England were rationed as regards meat supplies and the people of Australia where the meat was produced were paying extortionate prices for it, a suggestion was actually put forward to render the carcasses down for tallow. That is the direction in which the policy of the Government and their supporters is leading us.

Mr. Latham: What control have we over the London meat market?

Mr. McCALLUM: The hon. member and his party talked about producing but they did not consider the other end of the problem, namely the markets; they looked at only one side of the question without examining the whole situation. What is the position in the East? There is not a boot factory in Victoria or New South Wales employing its men full time. The great bulk of them have closed down or are hardly working at all. Factories and shops alike are chock full of boots; everywhere they are over supplied. Yet there are tens of thousands of people in Australia who are unable to buy sufficient boots for their families. I witnessed at the office of the Bootmakers' Union in the Melbourne Trades Hall one Friday £10,300 being disbursed by way of unemployed pay to boot-makers who could not find work. That is the economic position in which we find the industries of the country at the present time. The whole system under which we are living is undergoing an extreme test.

The situation is very delicate and will require very careful handling because we are up against a big problem. Yet we have heard no end of talk during recent years that the whole remedy lay in the hands of one side doing more work and producing more. No consideration was given to the world's markets, or to the effect on the general masses of the people. It is of no use putting up arguments of that kind to men who know, to men in these industries who are up against things all day and every day. They want to examine the situation more carefully before there can be any chance of getting them to agree to such a policy as that outlined by the Government. There are quite a number of local influences that the Government can invoke to straighten out the finances. We heard the Premier in his speech say, "My estimate for the deficit would have been realised if it had not been for the railway strike" and so he brushed the subject aside. "The railway strike accounted for it; it has nothing to do with me." Are we to understand that members of the Government accept no responsibility for the railway strike? Can they brush the subject aside with the bald statement that a quarter of a million of money has gone in consequence of the railway strike and without any consideration whatever being given to the question? Are not the Minister for Railways and the Commissioner of Railways to carry some responsibility? Are we to take it that a quarter of a million of the people's money has gone and that nothing more is to be said of it except that the strike accounted for it? Are the Government to bear no responsibility? The price which the people of this State have had to pay for wheat during recent years accounts to some extent for the position of the finances to-day. I wish to state as clearly as I can my position in regard to the wheat pool. I wish to remind members of the Country Party that the wheat pool was founded by a Labour Government. I wish them to remember that the idea of the wheat pool was conceived by a Labour Minister. I want them to know too that the wheat pool can last only so long as the Labour movement stands to it. The moment the Labour movement withdraws its support, it will be gone.

Mr. Johnston: They are standing to it in the East.

Mr. McCALLUM: If the Labour Government of New South Wales withdrew their support, there would be no wheat pool in that State. The only party of much account in Victoria which stood up for the wheat pool has been the Labour Party.

Mr. Johnston: The Farmers' Union Party.

Mr. McCALLUM: They could have done nothing but for the support of the Labour Party. Was there enough of them to put the Government out without the support of the Labour Party? They would have

been barking at the heels of the Government till further orders but for the support of the Labour Party. The only party in South Australia standing for the wheat pool is the Labour Party. It is only too clear that the moment the Labour movement withdraws its support from the wheat pool—and be it remembered Labour was responsible for establishing the wheat pool—it must go. Labour established the wheat pool on broad principles and Labour stands to those principles still. Our friends opposite, who seem to have engendered a good deal of bitterness towards us, ought to have it brought home to them that they have to thank the Labour movement for the position in which they find themselves to-day. What was the position when the wheat pool was founded? The Imperial Government had commandeered all the transport for war purposes; none was available for the carriage of wheat, and I ask members of the Country Party what would have been the value of wheat—their product—to them if there had been no wheat pool? In the absence of transport, was there any financial institution in this country which would have paid them 1s. a bushel for their wheat?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They would not have looked at it.

Mr. McCALLUM: Farmers would have been driven off their holdings.

Mr. Pickering: And the effect would have been reflected on the supporters of the Labour Party.

Mr. McCALLUM: It would not have been limited to them; it would have been felt all over the Continent, and it would have been indeed a sorry day for Australia. Members of the Country Party and those who opposed the Labour movement had not conceived any idea as to how to handle the wheat question. It remained for the Labour movement to devise ways and means. In fact any number of our opponents were averse to the scheme.

Hon. P. Collier: Many of them opposed it.

Mr. McCALLUM: I want to remind members of the Country Party also that the whole credit of this country was pledged to the farmers. They were given guarantees of certain figures which they had never realised before. They ran absolutely no risk. They were put on such a footing that the producers in any other country on earth had never been so fortunate as to occupy. I am just outlining these facts as a reminder for the Country Party. After all that the Labour movement has done to put the farmers where they are to-day, what treatment are the farmers giving to the people of the country in return? What treatment are they meting out to the people who have done so much for them? It is not only through the wheat pool that the Labour movement has assisted the producer.

Hon. P. Collier: The Industries Assistance Board.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, and the Agricultural Bank. From those two institutions the farmers got money to build homes and develop their business at a rate of interest at which no working man in this country could borrow money, and this money advanced with very small security too, was Savings Bank funds or the savings of the workers of this State.

Mr. Johnston: At 7 per cent. interest.

Mr. McCALLUM: For 6 per cent. until recently. Could the hon. member borrow money at 7 per cent. on the same security?

Hon. P. Collier: We advanced it at 5 per cent.

Mr. McCALLUM: At the outset yes, and then it was raised to 6 per cent. and later to 7 per cent. It was the hard savings of the toilers of this country, the money of the workers which was lent to the farmers to develop their holdings and carry on their business. No working man in Western Australia could have got a loan of his own money from the same bank to build a home for himself or set himself up in business or develop something for his future use and enjoyment. His savings were tied up for the especial and exclusive use of the farmers of this State to develop their holdings and carry on their business. I am not complaining of this; I do not wish to be misunderstood. I say that it was the correct policy to adopt. I am only making mention of it in order to show what is being done and how we are being treated by the members of the particular party whose constituents have thus benefited.

Mr. Pickering: How about the workers' homes?

Mr. McCALLUM: They ceased almost simultaneously with the Labour Government going out of office. No money has been advanced for the erection of workers' homes in the metropolitan area for years.

Mr. Johnston: In the country?

Mr. McCALLUM: Very few.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have had more millions than they have had thousands.

Mr. McCALLUM: It does not end there. There are one or two other items to which I wish to refer. The farmers are exempt from income tax as regards income derived from products of the soil.

The Minister for Agriculture: If they get no income they pay land tax.

Mr. McCALLUM: They have that much advantage over any other section of the community. No other section of the people in this State have that advantage.

The Minister for Agriculture: Which advantage?

Mr. McCALLUM: The advantage of paying no income tax on the line of business to which they apply their lives. The future business of a farmer is the growing of wheat, and yet he pays no income tax on the in-

come derived from his products. This does not apply anywhere else in the world.

The Minister for Agriculture: If you have no income, how can you pay the tax?

Mr. McCALLUM: If a farmer has £2,000 or £3,000 income, he does not pay income tax on it.

Mr. Latham: Of course he does.

Mr. McCALLUM: Not if that income is derived from the products of the soil. The Treasurer, in his policy speech last year, pointed that out and reminded farmers of the fact. I took pains to look up the Act and study the particular section, and I know that the member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Troy) put in a claim for a refund on the amount he had paid.

The Minister for Agriculture: The Commissioner of Taxation always knows the farmer's address.

Mr. McCALLUM: Then there is the question of the subsidy which the railways of the State pay to the farming industry. It is hard to estimate its full extent, but it has been published that the loss on the carriage of fertilisers runs into £60,000 or £80,000 a year.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier said it was £60,000 odd last year.

Mr. McCALLUM: Since then the cost of haulage has increased, and the amount is probably now well over the £100,000 mark. In reply to a question which I put the other day the Minister for Railways admitted that practically all the requirements of the farmer were carried at a loss. Although the Minister says it is impossible to get out the details for which I asked, I have been advised by men who ought to know that the railways are subsidising the agricultural industry to the extent of a good many hundreds of thousands of pounds a year.

The Minister for Agriculture: And yet under that policy you cannot keep the people out of the towns to-day.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not complaining of that policy. I hold that when we run the railways strictly as a business concern with regard only to the profit and loss account, we shall be running them on a false basis. The railways should be utilised as a means of developing the country, opening up new areas, and developing our resources generally. That is the whole principle of State owned railways. I am not suggesting that the policy is wrong.

Mr. Mann: Then what are you complaining about?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am merely indicating a few facts leading up to the point I wish to make.

Mr. Underwood: What is it?

Mr. McCALLUM: That we have had to stand up against criticism regarding what we proposed to do for the farmers—

Mr. Underwood: Where do you come in?

Hon. P. Collier: It would be interesting to know where the member for Pilbara comes in.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Minister's reply to my question relating to water supply showed that there was about £23,000 outstanding in the agricultural areas. Every ton of timber that goes over the wharf at Fremantle pays wharfage amounting to 1s. 10d. Ore pays up to 2s. per ton. If you and I walk across that wharf with a parcel or a bag we have to pay a tax. But in connection with all the tens of thousands of tons of wheat which have been carried to Fremantle and shipped from there, not a penny piece has been paid, and nothing from that product has gone towards the upkeep of the harbour or the cost of making the port. In return for all that, we find that the people of the State have to pay more for the wheat produced in Western Australia than all the niggers and Chinese in the Orient are asked to pay. There has been relief given to every country on earth except the country in which the wheat has been produced. The Germans, the Frenchmen, the Austrians, the Egyptians, the Chinese, the Japanese, and the people of almost every country on earth have had relief, but not so the people who have stood up for the farmers and helped them to develop the country and to put them into the sound financial position in which they now find themselves. I want to know whether that is fair or just. I want to know whether there should not be some move, so far as the Country Party are concerned, to recognise what the people of Western Australia have done for them, so that those people might be given relief from the position they are in to-day. Imagine paying 6d. a loaf for bread in Western Australia! It is a positive scandal. I know the Minister will argue that we are still on the average getting our wheat cheaper than the average oversea sales have panned out.

The Minister for Agriculture: Absolutely.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will tell the Minister how the average sales overseas have panned out. They have panned out a little higher than we are paying, and it was owing to the big sales which were made to France in the early stages, sales which averaged 12s. odd.

Hon. P. Collier: At what price are the Government selling the wheat to Germany? They are not game to tell us.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Government charged France 12s. odd and they sell to Germany for 7s. odd. They sell to France, Britain's ally, at a higher price than to Germany, our enemy, with whom we were never to trade, we let them have it at 7s. a bushel. And, in addition to that, Germany gets six months' credit in which to pay. At the same time our people here are charged 9s.

Hon. P. Collier: And they call themselves patriots!

Mr. McCALLUM: The whole scheme is based on a wrong foundation and it cannot last. We can easily understand that the people will not tolerate a continuation of the pool under such circumstances. In my judg-

ment the farmers made a great error when they set up their claim for the world's parity. They will yet be sorry for it. If there had not been a drought in Russia this year, the production of wheat in Australia next year would not have proved a paying proposition at the world's parity.

Mr. Pickering: What would you do?

Mr. McCALLUM: In asking for world's parity the farmers based their claim on false premises, and they will yet be sorry for it. I know they have already shifted their ground, and the Premier the other day, in dealing with the matter, did not say "world's parity" but said "not less than world's parity." So they are evidently going to make a move from world's parity to try to put something additional on to what the parity may be for the sale in other parts of the world.

The Minister for Agriculture: The cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will come to that in a moment. I heard an interjection to the effect that the people did not consume so much bread that the slight increase in the price of wheat made very little difference. The member who made that interjection is evidently shortsighted if he thinks that the price of wheat only affects the price of bread. What kind of nonsense is it to say that the price of wheat will only affect the price of bread. Let us remember what effect it has had on the poultry industry. A deputation waited on me a little while back and one of the members of it took me out and showed me a place where, a few months before, there had been 35,000 head of poultry, and where at that particular time there were less than 5,000. We are still sending over a million sterling out of the State each year for dairy produce which should be produced locally. The price that is being paid for wheat is killing the poultry industry.

Mr. Pickering: Look at the price of eggs.

Mr. McCALLUM: Who can afford to pay 4d. for an egg? Eggs have become a luxury and they have disappeared from the working man's table. In connection with pig-raising, an enterprising firm established works outside Midland Junction, and I am now advised that unless there is an alteration in the price of wheat, those works too will have to close down and then more men will be thrown on the unemployed market. With the regulating of prices, and the pooling system, the Government are regulating the industries completely out of existence. The effect on the dairying industry throughout Australia is most marked. The price of butter, we find, has gone up to something exorbitant. It increased in price until it became a luxury in most homes, and figures showed that the importation of margarine had advanced to an enormous extent. Butter has gone off the market to a great extent and it will be a long while before the people can get back to it. The sale of margarine is still increasing each month because the people cannot afford

to pay for butter. In the end it will mean it will not pay to carry on these industries. When the wheat pool was carried on under the control of the direct representatives of the people, when it was under the control of the Labour Government, everything was all right and what was done was in the interests of the people. Now the pool has developed into a huge monopoly. It consists now of merely wheatgrowers and, if I may say so without offence, the board of control is composed of wheat-growers and men who depend almost entirely upon the votes of the wheatgrowers to keep them in their position.

The Minister for Agriculture: How many Labour Governments were concerned in the formation of the first wheat pool?

Mr. McCALLUM: The Commonwealth Labour Government financed it and every State Labour Government supported it. If we develop the position that men in any industry can get together and secure from the Parliament of the country a monopoly for their product and then can fix their own figure for it, what is to be the position of that industry?

Mr. Pickering: What is the position when you cannot sell your potatoes for even £3 a ton, as was the case here last year?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not going to criticise without saying what I think should be done. I ask, what would be the position if, say, the waterside workers met together with the men who depended entirely upon the votes of the wharf labourers to keep their positions, and claimed that they were entitled to determine what they were to get for their labour? What would happen in such a case? Take the railway men. What would happen if they met and determined, with those who relied upon their votes, on what they, too, should receive for the product that they had to sell? That is the position that is being developed now. I remember well appearing in the Arbitration Court some little time back and hearing Mr. McGibbon, who represents this State on the Australian Wheat Board, trying to prove that a wage of £2 a week should be paid to thousands of girls in Western Australia. One of the girls who was in the witness-box was put through a most humiliating cross-examination by this man McGibbon. He asked her the price of a costume she was wearing, how many she required in a year, and many other unnecessary details. Do the farmers have to submit to such an examination? If this kind of thing is good for one section of the workers of this State then everyone should have to undergo it before being given the price they require for the product they have to sell. I believe that before the pool was established on many occasions the growing of wheat throughout Australia was not a paying proposition. The farmers worked very long hours and under most objectionable conditions. Our suggestion is that the genuine farmer—not the St. George's-terrace farmer—

Hon. P. Collier: Nor the contracting farmer.

Mr. McCALLUM: By the genuine farmer I mean the man who is doing the work—should receive consideration at our hands. This man in the past has been the sport of the speculator and the middleman, and we have no desire to see him go back to that condition of things again. We say there should be a guarantee that all wheat used for local consumption by the people of Australia should be paid for at the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. The cost of production should be fixed after inquiry and in that production there should be taken into consideration the work of the farmer himself, and that done by every member of his family who has assisted in the production of that crop, all of whom should be allowed the ruling rate of wages. No one should be asked to work for less than what is a reasonable thing.

The Minister for Agriculture: Lay down that basis for every industry and you will soon reach the millennium.

Mr. McCALLUM: We are prepared to lay it down for this industry now for the exportable surplus. Let us use all the activities of the State and the Commonwealth, the officers of the Agent General and High Commissioner, the Commonwealth Bank, the State and Commonwealth Steamship Services, the State Export Departments; in fact all the activities should be put at the disposal of the industry so as to secure the best price the world can offer for the wheat exported. Does the Minister mean to tell me that the price is so exceptional that an independent tribunal cannot fix something that will be reasonable? Such a policy as I advocate would place the primary producers of this State on a sounder footing and in a better position than they have ever occupied before. They have never had such security as the adoption of that policy would give them. Is there any comparison between this policy of the Labour movement, and a policy which asks for world's parity—a world's parity which may be 3s. 6d. or 3s. next year? Under the latter policy the farmer will not know where he is from one year to another. Perhaps next year, or certainly the year following, the farmers will change their policy, and will advocate that which we are now enunciating. Thereupon the farmers will claim our present policy as their own new-born child. The Labour Party have repeatedly experienced that sort of thing. We have had to do the pioneering work in propagating principles and making them popular, and then those principles have been put forward by the other side as their own. What did the Labour Party do as regards the Commonwealth Bank and the Australian Navy? We brought those about in the face of the keenest opposition from our friends on the other side. Eventually, however, those friends of ours came round and claimed our policy as theirs. With regard to

wheat production, I have set out what is the policy of the Labour movement. There is no Parliament in Australia which has accepted that policy as yet, and there is no farmers' organisation which has yet shown the least inclination, after all the Labour movement has done for them, to come and stand up for a policy which they must admit will do more for them than the policy which now they advocate. I have stated where I stand in the matter of the Wheat Pool, and that is where the Labour movement stands. There is no doubt about our attitude on that phase of existing problems. I want to go further and say that I regret very much the absence from the Governor's Speech of any reference to the position of this State's secondary industries. Everyone cannot be a wheat grower. The present Government do not seem to be able to see past a wheat field. What is to be done with our boys is becoming a very serious problem here. I frequently have parents coming to me to ask what they shall do with their boys. Very many boys are not fit to go on the land, and, even if physically fit, a large proportion are not adapted for that life. But even if all our boys were suitable for a country life, it is not good policy for any State to have practically all its workers engaged in one industry. What struck me most during a visit I recently paid to the Eastern States was the wonderful growth there of the secondary industries. Our secondary industries have absolutely languished. In that respect there has been no progress in Western Australia, but rather retrogression. I agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) that if private enterprise will not step in to develop secondary industries here and give employment to the people of Western Australia in manufacturing their own requirements, thus preventing money from going outside the State, the Government of Western Australia will have to take steps in the matter.

Mr. Teesdale: You snuffed out private enterprise in secondary industries as soon as ever it showed its head.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know that during the general election some hon. members opposite contended that the way to find employment for our boys in secondary industries was to waive the trade union restrictions upon the number of apprentices engaged. The ex-Attorney General said that what he would do was, instead of having one apprentice to every two or three journeymen, to have six apprentices to every journeyman. Numerous members opposite have advocated a similar policy. But I want to remind those hon. members that there can be no more foolish policy than that, whether from the point of view of the interests of the industries, or from that of the interests of the youths themselves. What sense is there in letting a youth spend the most valuable time of his life, that between the ages of 16 and 21—when he should be fitting himself for his future career—in

an industry that one knows will afford him no outlet when he has finished his apprenticeship?

Mr. Underwood: Then, what are you going to do with the boys?

Mr. McCALLUM: I want to know the Government's policy in this respect.

The Minister for Mines: At the moment, on your own statement, the same thing applies in the other Australian States, and more so than here.

Mr. McCALLUM: Nothing of the sort.

The Minister for Mines: You were just now telling us about the conditions in the boot industry, thousands of workers being unemployed.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes; but that is only a temporary slump. I stated also that during recent years the secondary industries of the Eastern States have shown wonderful growth. That reminds me of the Minister's replies to certain questions about the construction of a new ship for the North-West trade. I hope that if the Government do decide to have a new ship constructed, they will permit Australian ship builders to have a say in the building.

The Minister for Mines: At the ship yard established down here?

Mr. McCALLUM: If we cannot construct a ship in Western Australia, the next best thing is to have the work done in the Eastern States by Australian people.

The Minister for Mines: If it can be done in the Eastern States, we can do it here.

Mr. McCALLUM: Not for the moment, because we have not the ship building yard and have not the docks. But New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, and Victoria have proved that they can turn out ships at prices which will compare with anything of the kind in the world. Australian workmanship has been proved to be the best in the world. I had the privilege of going over the great steel works at Newcastle, New South Wales. There I not only inspected the steel works, the galvanised iron manufacturing works, and the wire netting works; but I saw every department of the works, spending a whole day there. I was more than pleased to find that those works, which started by importing labour from abroad, and particularly the much-boostered American labour, now employ hardly any but Australian labour, the great majority of the Americans having departed. In the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's works there are only six Americans left. Practically, Australian workmen are now doing the whole of the work, and in doing so are creating world's records in every branch. Again, I was delighted to find at the head of several of the departments young men who had earned their trade in Western Australia. They were head men, and in charge—which is a great credit to the apprenticeship system initiated by our Western Australian Arbitration Court. We turn out in this State, making allowance for the facilities

offering, some of the finest tradesmen that Australia produces. So much is proved by the positions which our young men are now occupying in the Eastern States. I wish to suggest as a means of investigation, as a method of ascertaining how we can best develop our secondary industries, the establishment of industry boards. I suggest that industry boards be established, consisting of equal numbers of the employers and the workers in each industry. Those boards should be composed of experts on both sides—of the men who have the financial knowledge at their fingers' ends, who can feel the pulse of the industry not only here but in other parts of the world; and of the men who are familiar with the mechanical side of the industry, who know its actual working. Let such a board sit down and have a stock-taking, as it were, of the State's resources. Such boards could let the Government and the people of Western Australia know exactly what the State is able to do. Let such boards be established for the purpose of exhausting all possible fields of inquiry as regards each industry, and then let those boards put up a definite and concrete proposal to the Government and the people of this State. Indeed, the proposal might be published throughout the world, for the information of financiers and speculators possibly inclined to take advantage of the knowledge of what this State can do, and who would thus be informed of the best methods for establishing industries here. In that way a great deal might be done to create employment in Western Australia. Further, I hope that by means of industry boards the employer and the employee will get to know each other better. I am not suggesting that these boards should be in the nature of Whitley boards, which have not proved a great success in England. I am not suggesting that the industry boards shall have anything to do with wages or working conditions. It is not possible for employers and workers to agree on wages and working conditions without a good deal of argument and fighting. On the special matters to which I refer, I wish the employers and the employees to meet on common ground, where they can agree in all respects. I do not wish them to meet for the purpose of discussing matters about which they are sure to fight.

Capt. Carter: You want the millennium. Why not get a round table conference on the Whitley system?

— Mr. McCALLUM: I do wish to see the millennium, though there is not much immediate prospect of it.

Capt. Carter: You will not get common ideals between employer and employee until the millennium arrives.

Mr. McCALLUM: I quite agree with the hon. member.

Capt. Carter: Then why not take the next best course?

Mr. McCALLUM: I am trying to do that.

Capt. Carter: The next best course is to adopt the Whitley system.

Mr. McCALLUM: I say that system is wrong.

Capt. Carter: Why?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McCALLUM: I can only make my statement. If the hon. member cannot understand it, the Almighty has not gifted me with the faculty to supply the hon. member with the necessary understanding. If the experts from each side in an industry were to meet in the task of investigating the possibilities of that industry, in which the whole of their interests are centred, to which the great majority of them are giving their lives, we might be able to obtain some information that would be of material assistance towards the establishment of secondary industries in this State. I will cite, if I may, as a particular instance the building trade. I am disappointed that the Government have made no reference in the Governor's Speech to the housing problem. That problem is a very pressing one just now. But there is no suggestion, either in the Governor's Speech or in the utterances since made by the Premier, that the Government at all realise the pressing nature of the housing problem. Under the system of industry boards which I suggest, we would have the builders and contractors and the architects and the building engineers and representatives of the bricklayers and the carpenters and the plumbers and so forth meeting to discuss matters relative to the building industry. Under such conditions, I submit, there would be a very good prospect of the experts coming forward with some suggestion for effectively dealing with the housing problem. It is to be remembered that at the present time an ordinary workman's home cannot be constructed for less than £800. The money cannot be obtained for less than eight per cent. What working man in this country can afford to pay the interest charge involved? But an industry board dealing with the housing problem would very probably be able to devise some cheaper means of construction than that which is now followed in this State. That appears to me to be the best means that can be suggested for promoting the industrial development of Western Australia. I hope the Government will do something in that direction. I put forward the proposal with every desire to see secondary industries developed here, with every wish to see smoother working between employer and employee, with every anxiety to get both sides in industry to understand one another better. The employer himself is now saying that his position is not understood by the worker.

The Minister for Mines: The lack of understanding is not all on one side.

Mr. McCALLUM: Of course it is not. Very often the worker does not understand the position of the employer. I am perfectly sure that the employer does not always understand the workers' point of view any

more than the employees always understand the employer's view.

The Minister for Mines: It all depends who is on the box seat. If the employer is on the box seat, he will stay there.

Mr. McCALLUM: I admit that.

The Minister for Mines: And so will the employee, if he is on the box seat.

Mr. McCALLUM: I always have contended that the men should sit around a table and discuss matters, apart from a fight. For the most part the only time the employer and the employee meet is when there is a dispute about wages and working conditions. Always they meet to fight. Let that be out. Let them sit down and discuss matters affecting their industry quite apart from the question of wages and working conditions. Let them sit down and discuss how additional employment can be found, how the natural resources of the country may best be developed through their particular industry and other similar problems.

Mr. Pickering: Nothing of that sort could be decided without an understanding regarding wages.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am cutting out the wages question altogether. The laws of the land provide a course for dealing with the wages question.

Mr. Angelo: You could not get down to estimates without settling the question of wages and working conditions.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not suggesting a matter of estimates or wages at all. In any case, the employers know what the ruling rates of wages are, for they are fixed by law. They know what the working hours are and what the other terms of employment are. They are all to be found at the Arbitration Court. The men in the industries affected know the operation of their respective industries.

The Minister for Mines: They do not know how many bricks the bricklayers will lay.

Mr. McCALLUM: Do not the bricklayers sitting round the table know how many bricks they will lay? If the Minister is inferring that the bricklayers are slowing down on their job—

The Minister for Mines: No, I do not.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is only a fortnight since I returned from the Eastern States. When I returned, I met an ex-secretary of the Bricklayers' Union in Perth. He had been for the last three years in the Eastern States and he came back to Perth to take up a position here. When I saw him he was packing up his bag and he told me that the pace was too much for him here. He was going back to work in the Eastern States.

The Minister for Mines: Why did you not send him to me? I would have given him a free pass.

Mr. Mann: At any rate, you did not believe him.

Capt. Carter: Did he come from Queensland?

Mr. McCALLUM: These men talk as if they had full knowledge of the position! I

say quite candidly, although members sitting opposite will probably say I am not speaking the truth—and I emphasise my statement with all the experience I have had of the trades union movement—I do not know one union in Western Australia which limits the output of its membership. If any member of this Chamber can tell me one single union which has done so, he will give me information of which I have no knowledge.

Mr. Underwood: I will give it to you.

Mr. McCALLUM: All this talk about the workers restricting the output is ridiculous. The statistics of the world show that the workers of Australia produce more wealth per head than any other workers on the face of God's earth. So far as the workers of Western Australia are concerned, they will compare with the workers of any other part of the Continent.

The Minister for Mines: That is not argument.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the truth.

Mr. Underwood: That is not the truth.

Mr. McCALLUM: Does the Minister suggest that the men slow down on their work?

The Minister for Mines: I do not say that. I say that your argument does not hold good because the conditions of employment here, the climatic conditions and the condition of the soil, permit us to produce more than is possible in other parts of the world.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will challenge the Minister to take one industry in any part of the world and compare it with a similar industry in Australia, and to compare the output per man here both as to material costs and results, with the output per man elsewhere. Take the case of the Broken Hill Proprietary Works at Newcastle, where a man was examining rails which were being put through the final tests. There was the expert with two assistants, one on each side of him. The expert stated that the Americans doing that work were turning out from 80 to 90 rails per day, whereas the Australian workmen were turning out 200 to 220 rails per day. I do not care where members go, they may deery the Australian workman, but I say that we have not got his equal on the face of God's earth.

The Minister for Mines: That is only heroics.

Mr. McCALLUM: Why is the Minister for Mines deerying the Australian workman?

The Minister for Mines: I am not. I say the basis of your argument is wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: What basis do you refer to?

The Minister for Mines: I am speaking of Australia as a whole.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am too.

The Minister for Mines: You are not. You are taking an individual case, and I say that climatic conditions and so on, enable our workers to achieve those results.

Mr. McCALLUM: You inferred that the Australian workman was slowing down.

Mr. Underwood: At any rate, I am saying that he is slowing down in the North.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not think anyone takes the member for Pilbara seriously, no matter what he says. There are certain operations in connection with industries here which necessitates men protecting their own interests. There is a highly developed system brought into operation under which a man is allotted a certain time for a specific job, and he is given a docket. He has to fill in his docket and show how long it has taken him to complete the work. He may be given work to do in the following year which is simply a repetition of the job I have referred to. The following year the two times are compared and if the workman takes longer this year than he did last year, he gets a "please explain." No allowance is made for any difficulties he may encounter in performing the job. I speak as a skilled workman in my trade. I have taught apprentices in connection with that trade, and, in my particular line (that of book binding, the climatic conditions affect the output very considerably. In the summer time, book binding dries much quicker, whereas in winter one has to wait for it to dry. In summer, paper will curl, and so it goes on. There are a thousand and one things that have to be taken into consideration, all of which affect the question of output. If the men have to enter their times on the dockets, in their own interests the workers must keep some record of their output. If that is what hon. members are referring to when they speak of the limitation of output, I hope they will believe me when I say—it is true, every word of it—that if any practice of slowing down is in operation, I do not know of it. I have conducted the business of unions in Western Australia for years past, and have been intimately connected with the Labour movement during the whole of that period, and speaking from my lengthy experience, I say that this talk about limitation of output is so much fudge. Speaking the other night, the Premier said that he deplored strikes. He does not deplore strikes any more than I do. There is no one who deplores strikes more than the man who strikes. Members surely do not think that men go on strike for fun. It is an intensely serious business.

Mr. Angelo: There must be a thundering lot of serious men in Western Australia.

Mr. O'Loghlen: The member for Gascoyne is not on the minimum wage.

Mr. McCALLUM: With all this talk about strikes, and with all the difficulties Western Australia has been faced with during recent years, it should be remembered that we have got through with less trouble than was experienced in any of the Eastern States or in any other part of the British Empire.

The Minister for Mines: Why do you not give the Government any credit for that?

Mr. McCALLUM: I will not do so, and I will tell you why. I say that the whole credit is not due to the Labour organisations. I have said before and I repeat here,

that a good deal of the credit is due to the present secretary of the Employers' Federation. That gentleman met us in an open manner and never failed to arrange a conference when a request was made for one. He did everything possible to encourage employer and employee to meet together. The present secretary of the Federation has done yeoman service. Had the Government adopted the same spirit as the secretary of the Employers' Federation has done, there would not have been a railway strike in the early part of the year.

The Minister for Mines: You can say that now, but that does not make it true.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is true all right. I was not here during the early stages of that trouble, but when I met the Commissioner of Railways he would not budge. He had made his mind up and he said that what he had decided upon had to be done. He absolutely refused to move and said it was no use putting forward proposals. I do not say that the fault was all on one side. Both sides had their backs to the wall, with daggers drawn. When a third party came along, with an earnest desire to put an end to the strike, the Commissioner of Railways might well have put aside his personal dignity.

The Minister for Mines: It was not a question of dignity, but of principle.

Mr. McCALLUM: A question of principle!

The Minister for Mines: Yes, there was the Arbitration Court to which the men could have gone.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is where the Minister differs from the attitude of the Secretary of the Employers' Federation. If he had made that remark every time a union approached the Federation, numerous strikes would have occurred. I do not for a moment contend that every time men go on strike they are right, but they always think they are right. No strike has ever been decided upon without being very well discussed first by the members of the organisation concerned. Always a great deal of consideration is given to the matter before any drastic action is decided upon. Any impartially minded man entering a room where a body of men are engaged in discussing the question as to whether they shall go on strike, whether they shall go home without their wages day after day, whether they shall cease their work and face the poverty that strikes mean for them—if any such man should look around the room and see the seriousness marking each man's face, note the determination of the men and the intense expression on their faces, he would never again say that strikes are lightly entered upon. The question as to whether there shall be a cessation of work or not, is always discussed most seriously before men determine upon extreme action. One or two strikes have been mentioned and I will deal with them. At this

stage I desire to give the Premier every credit for making his straightforward statement the other night regarding the Wyndham Meat Works. It has been given out to the public right up to the time when the Premier made his statement, that the reason why the Wyndham Works were not in operation this season was because of the demands by the unionists. The Premier has made it clear that such was not the case, and that even had an agreement been reached between the management and the union, the Wyndham Works would not have been opened this season.

The Minister for Mines: That is not quite correct.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier made that statement the other night.

Mr. Underwood: He did not.

The Minister for Mines: If that is correct, I have been misled in the matter.

Mr. Teesdale: He never made any such statement in this Chamber.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier said that the real reason was the shortage of shipping.

Mr. Underwood: Get away with you!

Mr. Teesdale: He gave that as partly the reason.

Mr. McCALLUM: He said that was the real reason.

The Minister for Mines: He said that we could not go on because of the increased rates demanded which made it unpayable. Subsequently we found out that it was just as well, as we could not have got the shipping if we had started.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is true that an offer was made by the management to the unions to renew last year's working agreement. The union asked for certain alterations. After a conference the management wrote to the unions, withdrawing their offer. They wanted an alteration. Then the union offered to submit the matter in dispute to arbitration, any form of arbitration which the management liked to suggest.

The Minister for Mines: We are learning something now.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the truth. That offer was refused. Later the management wrote withdrawing the offer to renew last year's agreement, and said that no third party would be given a say in it, that the manager was to be the sole judge. The law of the land is arbitration. We are always having it preached to us "Why don't you go to arbitration?" Yet here the Government themselves refused to allow the union to go to arbitration. Last night the acting Leader of the Country Party lectured the Leader of the Opposition and myself, declaring that we ought to use our influence with the men in the direction of settling the shearers' strike. Since that hon. member is a champion of constitutional means, why does not he lecture his own party? The A.W.U. has offered to submit the dispute to arbitration, to any form of arbitration.

The Minister for Mines: Not in the Arbitration Court.

Mr. McCALLUM: The A.W.U. is not registered with the Court.

The Minister for Mines: Why does it not register?

Mr. McCALLUM: The application for registration is now being prepared. But all legal advice up to date has been to the effect that the A.W.U. is not eligible for registration. The question is now to be tested. If the union cannot go into the Arbitration Court it will accept the finding of the members of the Arbitration Court sitting outside the law.

Mr. Latham: Has that offer been made?

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, and turned down.

Mr. Angelo: It is too late now. Half the shearing is finished.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is a new reason. First we are lectured and told that we ought to adopt constitutional means and then when we say we are ready to go to arbitration we are told it is too late.

The Minister for Mines: It would have been better if the offer had been made in time to avert the strike.

Mr. McCALLUM: I agree, but every effort should be made even now to get the industry going again.

Mr. Pickering: Did not they put up the irreducible minimum?

Mr. McCALLUM: How often is the irreducible minimum put up by both sides? If I had never agreed to modify the irreducible minimum there would have been many more strikes in this State than there have been. Another dispute mentioned by the acting Leader of the Country Party was that in connection with the firewood supply. I told him that he did not know the facts. When that work closed down there was no dispute in respect of wages. There was there but the one class of employees working for wages, namely the carters. All the rest were on piece work. There was no argument as to the rates of piece work.

The Minister for Mines: Not when they closed down.

Mr. McCALLUM: The only argument at the time was that the carters in bringing the wood to the line occasionally tipped it on the low side, and in consequence it had to be lifted up. At other times it was tipped at a distance from the line and had to be moved in subsequently. But the company had only to tell the carters where to tip it. It did not cost an extra penny.

The Minister for Mines: On your own statement the carters were on piece work.

Mr. McCALLUM: No, they were being paid £4 10s. per week. All the others were on piece work; those are the facts. I will tell you the real reason why the work was closed down. They applied to the Price Fixing Commission for an increase in the selling price, but were refused.

The Minister for Mines: The application was not refused.

Mr. McCALLUM: It was, but it has since been granted.

The Minister for Mines: I say you are wrong.

Mr. McCALLUM: I got the information from the union and from the company also.

The Minister for Mines: I was a party to the agreement that they should supply for a certain figure when they got the permit; and I complained that they went to the Price Fixing Commission without consulting us. I know that they got the increase.

Mr. McCALLUM: I was advised by the secretary of the company this morning that they applied for an increase and that their application was refused, but has been granted since they closed down.

The Minister for Mines: I can assure you that they got an increase and were supplying at the increased price.

Mr. McCALLUM: Perhaps this is a second increase. The trouble was not one of wages; the real trouble was with the construction of the line and its equipment. The line was laid in the low-lying portion of the concession, and whenever there was heavy rain it was followed by considerable washaways, representing a continual drain on the finances. Then the engines were not strong enough; instead of pulling a rake of eight trucks to the top of a hill they could only pull four, and had to come back for the other four. All this added to the working costs. Is it fair that the workers in the industry should be asked to carry that impost? That was the trouble the company found themselves in. Yet, the acting Leader of the Country Party lectures the Leader of the Opposition and me, declaring that we ought to use our influence to get the men to accept whatever the company offers. I am not going into the details of the Esplanade Hotel trouble.

The Minister for Mines: Why leave firewood to get on to fireworks?

Mr. McCALLUM: I will deal with the fireworks in a moment. When previously I referred to the Esplanade Hotel dispute my reference was not to the merits of the dispute but to the actions of the Government, which is entirely different. Before leaving industrial disputes I wish to refer to the remarks of the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) who in moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply argued that the wives of union members should have a vote on the question of the declaration of a strike.

Mrs. Cowan: So they should; they suffer more than you men ever suffer.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is an old argument adopted by the Tories ever since trade unionism has been governed by Act of Parliament. Only recently they have been giving reasons for it, namely that the wives' votes would prevent strikes.

Mrs. Cowan: I did not say that. I said they should be consulted before a strike was declared.

Mr. McCALLUM: The statement made was that they should be given a vote in the

union when it came to a question of declaring a strike. No argument was put forward such as one would expect from a lady who has won the distinction of being the first lady to sit in an Australian Parliament. Let me here congratulate the hon. member on that very great distinction. But one would have expected from the hon. member a lofty argument showing that the wives' responsibility was equal to that of the husbands, and that on equality of responsibility equality in decision was demanded. That argument was not used. The only argument used was that they should have a vote in order that they might prevent a strike. If the more lofty argument had been used it would have involved the master bakers. There was no suggestion that the wives of the master bakers should have a vote in their dispute.

Mrs. Cowan: Certainly they should have.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the member for West Perth never used that argument; probably it did not occur to her. Perhaps it was that she knew the wives of the master bakers would be too class conscious to "rat" on their husbands, would be more likely to vote with them. Those good ladies would be more class conscious than would be the wives of the workers. Let us examine this argument, for the statement which made won a good deal of approbation from members on that side of the House.

Mrs. Cowan: And on your side of the House also, in respect of the wives themselves.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will give the hon. member my experience among the wives of trade unionists. I should know something about it.

Mrs. Cowan: You do not have the wives in the union.

Mr. McCALLUM: I will let the hon. member know my experience of the wives of trade unionists. It is implied that a unionist will go to a meeting of the union and vote for a strike without having even talked the matter over with his wife, without considering the position of his wife and children; that he is such an inhuman monster, is so callous, that he has no feeling whatever for his wife and offspring, but goes and votes for a strike without giving any consideration to his folk at home.

Mr. Money: The trouble is with those who have no wives.

Mr. McCALLUM: You mean it lies with the single men.

Mrs. Cowan: What about the enthusiasm the single men?

Mr. McCALLUM: Let me give my experience in one union. I attended a meeting of the union; they had been discussing a strike and were just about to take the vote. A single man got up and asked "Are you going to carry the motion to strike?" The cry was "Yes, let us take the vote now." Then said the single man "Yes, it is all very well for you married men, but I am a single man. You married men have homes to go to. What is to become of us single men?" I heard that

distinctly put up at a trades union meeting. The single men had no homes to go to and the married men had.

Mrs. Cowan: Might I remind you that my principal argument was that boys and girls of 16 to 21 have votes and their mothers do not have votes.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Who was doing the work?

Mr. McCALLUM: The argument will not hold for a moment, because there are not boys of 16 who have votes unless for their own work.

Mrs. Cowan: Quite so.

Mr. McCALLUM: Are not they entitled to them?

Mrs. Cowan: No.

Mr. McCALLUM: The argument clearly was that it was only to apply to the question of a strike and was designed to prevent a strike. That was the contention, quibble as the hon. member may. The suggestion is made that if the men want 1s. a day increase and the boss offers 6d., the wives will be there to vote for them accepting the 6d., and if the boss offers nothing at all, instead of the men being determined to fight for an improvement, the wives will be there to fight for the boss's terms being accepted. The contention resolves itself down to this, that the wives of the trade unionists of this country would be loyal to the boss and disloyal to their own husbands. What kind of a compliment is that to pay to the wives of our workers?

Mrs. Cowan: Loyal to their children, which is more.

Mr. McCALLUM: Let me give the hon. member one instance which occurred in my own experience in her electorate. My experience has been that the trades unionist who puts forward the argument that his wife has driven him back to work is looking for an excuse to scab, that the wives are usually the most staunch supporters of any claim for improved conditions. There had been a strike for about a fortnight and both the employer and the workman lived in West Perth. I was sent for to inspect the home of the workman. This is usual in cases where there is an application for special relief. The husband was too proud to ask for special relief but a neighbour had called me in. It was suggested that I should go into the house and see for myself. I went there and told them what had happened and what I wanted to know. The husband asked me to go inside and see for myself. I there found a bailiff in possession having an inventory taken of every article in the house. The employer was the owner of the house. Lying on the bed with a little baby was the mother, and an inventory had actually been taken of the mattress she was lying on. The strike had lasted only a fortnight and the whole scene sickened me. As I was leaving the room the mother appealed to me in these words, "Mr. McCallum, I hope you will not let this scene influence your judgment." I asked, "Why?" Her reply was, "My husband is a teetotaller: he does not gamble and the tobacco he uses I buy for him. He hands to me practically every shill-

ing he earns. I am a thrifty woman and make every stitch of clothes for the family, but after his being out of work for a fortnight, this is our condition. This is what we are forced to. Do not let this weaken your stand. Go out and fight, and for God's sake get some improvement in the conditions under which our men have been working." I have not lost faith in the wives of the trade unionists as the member for West Perth seems to have done. She seems to think that they prevent strikes. Why, look at the women of Broken Hill. After a strike of nearly two years' duration, who was it that kept the spirits of the men up?

Mr. Wilson: Look at the wives of the coal miners.

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes, and of our men at Fremantle. In the bulk of the great industrial troubles in all countries, it is women who urge the men on.

Mrs. Cowan: Give them a vote, but do not give their children under age a vote instead.

Mr. McCALLUM: It does not matter to me what arguments are put forward on the other side; they simply do not know.

Mrs. Cowan: They ought to.

Mr. McCALLUM: The member for West Perth is content to cast a slur on the working classes of this State, to brand them as men without souls, men with no feeling for their womenfolk, cold-hearted and callous, and without thought for their offspring. I want to tell her that, no matter where the men are employed, whether on the water front, in the field, factory or workshop, whether on the scaffold, walking like spiders on top of a big edifice where the slightest false step would send them into oblivion, whether in the bowels of the earth facing death every day, these men have human hearts and the same feelings for their wives and children as has the finest lady in this land, even though she lives in King's Park-road. The wives of the workers are women, the same as the member for West Perth, and they have the same consideration for their offspring. The argument that the unionists do not give consideration to them is unworthy coming from such a source.

The Minister for Mines: What about letting the women do all the voting at the ballot boxes?

Mr. McCALLUM: We shall be passing through troublous times as we have been doing during recent years, but in my judgment there will be no necessity for Australia to pass through the trying times which the older world has experienced. I do not think there is any need for us in this country to develop the extreme feelings and passions that have been displayed in connection with the reorganisation of industrial affairs in the older parts of the world. What has happened in other countries need not necessarily happen here. I am not one who binds himself to the theory that because something has been done elsewhere, the same thing should be done here. If I had been in

Russia, I do not know what stand I would have taken. I may have been with Lenin, I may have been against him. The solution of the problems that confront the people of Russia are probably quite different from those which present themselves to us in this country. As one who has tried to study and understand the conditions in Russia—I have read works by writers of almost all nationalities—these go to show that it is of no use trying to form a judgment regarding the conditions in Russia from the cable messages which appear in our daily Press. I have come to no judgment or decision as to whether Lenin or Trotsky did the right thing in Russia. I may say, though, that I am an admirer of the capacity and intellect of Lenin. Every man who has met him, no matter whether he agreed with or strongly denounced his actions, admits that he is a man of most powerful intellect and personality, one of the greatest men of the age. I have sufficient faith in his judgment to believe that, if this man had been in Australia, he would not have found it necessary to do in this continent what it was found necessary to do in Russia. I am not one who considers that there is likely to be any revolutionary force here.

The Minister for Mines: You do not count the lamp-posts like a former member who was with us?

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not think there is any necessity for that. A man who advocates revolution by force in Australia is either a crank who wants force for the mere sake of force, or else he has no conception of the position as it prevails in Australia. I do not think the wage system is going to last, but I think that we in Australia will gradually evolve an improvement suitable to Australian ideas and sentiments. I am not pledging myself to what is going to happen in other parts of the world. In Italy the workers have pledged themselves almost unanimously to syndicalism. They have raided and taken industry by force, and in many instances have been confirmed in their possession by Act of Parliament. In parts of France and in Germany it is the law that, according to the amount of capital invested, and the number of men engaged in the industry, so shall the management of the industry be carried on, the men themselves having a direct say in the control of the industry. In America and in England big claims are being advanced to give the workers some say in the control of industry. I have been closely examining an experiment made in the building trade in England. It started off with a meeting of two organisations of employers and employees and it developed into a conference of all the agencies engaged in the building industries of Great Britain examining the position. They came to the conclusion that the main burden on the industry was the man drawing big dividends from building construction and taking no part in

the work itself. There were big limited liability companies which had invested money in building construction and which were the burden on the industry. They agreed on a scheme which has been put up to the Government for legislative sanction, under which the amount of capital invested shall be taken control of by all the agencies in the industry, representation being given to each group, bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, engineers, architects, and so on forming a council to control the industry. The money is paid for at the current rate of interest for gilt-edged securities and the drone has thus been eliminated. Big operations for the construction of homes in a number of provinces are being tendered for. This is one scheme which I intend to follow with a good deal of interest to see how it works out. I am not one who subscribes to the idea that arbitration has failed. It may not have come up to expectations, but any number of ideas and Acts of Parliament have not achieved all that was desired and expected of them. Lighthouses were built in order to prevent shipwrecks, but no man would be foolish enough to say that, because shipwrecks do occur, we should demolish all our lighthouses. The Arbitration Courts have not prevented all strikes, but they have shown the way to settlements in many cases, have prevented many upheavals, and led to the smooth working of industry on many occasions when serious trouble threatened to disturb the country from one end to the other. May I put forward three suggestions which can be given effect to now without any new Act of Parliament or law, and which in my judgment will tend towards the smooth working of the industrial machine here. First of all, there should be a permanent President of the Arbitration Court appointed. To date, the position has been that a judge of the Supreme Court has been in the Arbitration Court merely by way of filling in time. No judge who so far has occupied that position has studied the economic and industrial situation. Every one of the Judges who has presided over the Arbitration Court has said candidly that he wanted to get out of the job as soon as he possibly could. What is needed as President of the Arbitration Court is a man who will apply himself to the task entirely, will make it his sole business, will say "I am here in the interests of the community, to get smooth working of industry, and I will make that my sole object."

The Minister for Mines: That was suggested to the Labour movement years ago, and the suggestion was rejected.

Mr. McCALLUM: They think differently in the Labour movement now. I put the suggestion forward as one who knows the Labour movement pretty well. I do not know when such a proposal was rejected by the Labour movement.

The Minister for Mines: I do.

Mr. McCALLUM: It may have been rejected by some small section of the move-

ment, but I do not know of one occasion when it was turned down by any representative organisation of this country.

The Minister for Mines: I know of lots of such occasions.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am prepared to face any Labour organisation in this country, and stand by that suggestion.

The Minister for Mines: I believe the Labour organisations are coming round to that view now.

Mr. McCALLUM: That is the position. The next point is that there should be centralisation of administration as regards the Arbitration Court. The administration is at present divided between the registrar and the clerk of the court. The centralisation I suggest would tend towards smooth working, and the whole of the administration could easily be carried on in one office. Moreover, under such a system the business of all parties concerned would be materially facilitated, as compared with present conditions.

The Minister for Mines: The office of the Arbitration Court ought to be a bureau where either employer or employee can go to obtain information on industrial matters.

Mr. McCALLUM: That would meet the situation. But let us not have a registrar controlling one section of the Arbitration Act and a clerk of courts controlling another section. One man should be there to do the whole of the business. The last Parliament passed a short Act amending industrial legislation, and one of the provisions of that Act gives power for the appointment of Commissioners, who would have authority to call compulsory conferences—any points at issue not settled at such compulsory conferences to be referred to the Arbitration Court for decision. I would suggest that the three members of the Arbitration Court, and I would go so far as to include also the clerk of the Arbitration Court, should be appointed Commissioners, and that whenever they have any knowledge of strained relations between employers and employees, whenever they have knowledge of a likelihood of industrial trouble occurring, any one of them should be entitled to call a compulsory conference, and any one of them should be available for an approach from either side. The Commissioners could fine the issues down to the few points on which the parties cannot agree, and those points only need then be referred to the court. By that method a great deal of the time of the court would be saved, and its business would be expedited. That method would prevent the parties from getting at loggerheads, and it would tend to settle a dispute before feeling ran high. But the whole business of the Arbitration Court has developed too much into red tape and cast-iron regulations. There has not been enough of common sense brought to bear upon the business. Sufficient attention has not been paid to the views of men concerned with the Arbitration Court, men who know something of the feeling on either side. I want now

to make an earnest, honest appeal to the Minister for Mines not again to make a display of armed force in connection with industrial troubles, such a display as occurred recently. I make that appeal as one who values human life above all other things on earth, as one who wishes never to see one drop of human blood spilt because of industrial disputes. I do not want anything to occur that will even for one moment involve the possibility of a sacrifice of human life. We want to escape such happenings as we have read of in the old world, where it has now become the practice, as soon as there is industrial trouble, or a big strike, to bring out armed forces on behalf of one side or the other. If we are to escape that kind of thing here, the desire to escape it must not obtain only on one side.

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear! That is the point.

Mr. McCALLUM: If we do not want those happenings here, it is not sufficient for us who hold responsible positions in the Labour movement, and exercise some influence over the rank and file, to appeal to our followers not to use force. It is no use going to large bodies of men and arguing with them on those lines, if we have the reply hurled back at us, "Look what the other side are doing; they have brought out armed forces; they are prepared to shoot us down; they have even gone so far as to provide field hospitals with nurses to bandage us up after we have been shot down." The position is very delicate and difficult. The attitude adopted in connection with the Esplanade Hotel trouble seemed to me absolutely ridiculous. In the Eastern States it was a laughing-stock. Nevertheless, the position was so critical that the least slip made by, shall I say, some hot-head on either side—

The Minister for Mines: Hear, hear! On either side.

Mr. McCALLUM: The least mistake on either side might have resulted in the lighting of a conflagration as to which it would be beyond the power of any Minister or of any one of us to say where it would end. I know it will be contended that the action taken in connection with the Esplanade Hotel affair was owing to certain threats which had been made. I was out of the State at the time of the trouble, but I have read up the newspaper reports of what occurred. I have consulted with the men in charge, and neither from them, nor from the newspaper reports, can I learn of any threat of any sort having been made until the day when there was that demonstration by the police. I admit that one speech made on that day may be said to have contained a threat. But up to that point I can find no trace of any threat, and all the men who were in authority tell me that no threats whatever were used. If it is asked what I would do in the circumstances, my answer is that if I had been in the Minister's place, I would have sent for the men holding re-

sponsible positions in the Labour movement and would have said to them, "It is reported to me, and it is rumoured around the city, that certain happenings are about to take place on such and such a day, and that your side are preparing to do this or that. Now, I want to know from you where you stand in this matter, whether you sanction the proposed action, and what attitude you as responsible men are taking in connection with the trouble."

Mr. Pickering: A very sensible suggestion.

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier has often enough admitted in this House that every time we have met him we have laid our cards on the table and been perfectly open and frank with him. There is no Minister of the Crown, either in this or in any other Government, with whom I have had business while I was chief executive officer of the Labour movement here, who can quote one instance where I have deceived him or failed to be perfectly candid and frank with him. In my opinion, that is the only way to get through. At the time of the Fremantle trouble, I went to the then Premier's residence and got him out of bed and spoke to him in his pyjamas, telling him I knew what was the position at Fremantle. I took this action in order that the then Premier should know exactly what would occur. It is no use demanding that reason shall prevail on one side only, and that all the force shall be on the other side. We know that men's passions have become intensified. The war has made men abnormal. They are now in quite a different position from that which they were in during former days. The industrial situation requires very careful and skilful handling. I believe that we are facing a difficult problem; but if each one of us makes up his mind to give the best that is in him to the solution of the problem, and to be candid and honest, there is no need for any of us to face the future with any other feeling than that of complete confidence.

Captain CARTER (Leederville) [9.41]: Following upon the lead established by the Leader of the Opposition, and I think I am right in saying the lead given by every previous speaker, I desire to offer my congratulations to the member for West Perth (Mrs. Cowan) on her attainment to the high distinction of being the first lady legislator in the history of Australian politics. I desire also to offer my congratulations to the House on the splendid spirit of amity which appears to prevail. In personally congratulating the Leader of the Opposition upon his excellent speech in this debate, I told him—and I believe every member of the party to which I belong would say this with me—that the hon. gentleman's policy of moderation and straightforwardness is one to which we can all subscribe. I believe that if that policy is to be given a trial, and if we witness cohesion between the party sitting opposite and the Ministerial party, there are

brighter times ahead for Western Australia than have been seen during the past several years. I am also glad to have noted the spirit of fairness in the speech of the hon. member who has just concluded. I congratulate him on that spirit, but I cannot agree with him when he says that his own leader, the Leader of the Opposition, "erred" on the side of fairness. I have yet to learn that one can err on the side of fairness in dealing with matters of such grave import as are coming before this House for discussion during the present session, and as I believe and hope will come forward in every session which we shall enter upon. It is not my intention to make a long speech, and I propose to be bound by that declaration, though I think almost every speaker has begun by proclaiming his intention to refrain from delivering a lengthy oration. In the first place, whilst I shall touch upon the finances, I do not propose to commit the House to the task of listening to a diatribe from me on that subject. Mine is not a discursive criticism, but simply a plea, and a very earnest and honest plea, to the House, and to the Government more especially, for the adoption of businesslike methods. We are faced to-day with a deficit, in round figures, of five millions sterling, which, if we run it out at an ordinary, low rate of interest, represents an outgoing of something like £800 per day. So that every day we have to send out of this State 300 golden sovereigns, or their equivalent, in order to meet the interest which we owe as a State. We speak a great deal about our sinking fund, and take a great pride in it. We declare that our assets are good, and quite equivalent to our financial obligations. But that is not satisfactory in a country such as ours. At all events, it is not as satisfactory as it should be, considering the meagre population which is holding this vast territory with all its limitless possibilities. On this subject again I say that mine is a plea for business acumen and for businesslike methods. We need tight, keen, close-fisted supervision of all expenditure wherever it is, and of whatever nature it may be. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who said the other evening that something drastic had to be done. I quite agree with that declaration, and I say that something drastic should be done immediately, that the pruning knife should be put in wherever it is necessary, and that the promises made on the hustings by Ministers and every one of their followers, and by the Leader of the Opposition and every one of his followers, should be redeemed, and redeemed at the earliest possible moment. The other day I was speaking with a man who is the managing director of one of the largest business concerns operating in this State, with a turnover of something like three-quarters of a million. He told me that within eight days of the annual balance his management had placed before them, perhaps not an audited, but a truly certified balance sheet, with an es-

timate for the coming year attached thereto. Now, it seems to me that we should inculcate upon our Government departments some of the methods employed by the company referred to. We have a much bigger turnover, but we have a much bigger staff to handle it. We should realise that it is essential that greater efficiency than has been displayed in the past should characterise the Civil Service. The company I have referred to has no overpaid advisory boards, committees, or commissions, or an overpaid salaried staff. Their staff merely comprises hard working, but well paid and competent officers, who are doing their job well. It is necessary in a concern such as the one I have referred to for the employee to be worthy of his hire if he is to retain his position. I am sorry to say that in at least some of the Government departments there seems to be no keen desire on the part of officers to give of their best to the country. There is no evidence of keen efficiency. I am in favour of the appointment of a select committee or a Royal Commission, whichever may be the cheaper and more effective to deal with this subject, to go thoroughly into the question of the Civil Service. One might ask with all sincerity and without any irrelevancy, in the words of the Scriptures: "How long O Lord are we to suffer?" I believe that this State has suffered to a serious extent through the lack of control of our departments, and owing to the unbusinesslike methods adopted. Economy has been the watchword all through the speeches which have so far been delivered throughout this debate. The Leader of the Opposition used that word as his text and preached a very fine sermon. The Premier, in his reply, promised economies and proceeded to show how those economies could be effected. I believe the Premier is sincere in his desire to effect economies and I shall give him my hearty support in his efforts in that direction. I think he is honest when he says that economies are being effected and that they will be continued. I hope too, that the Ministers who are sitting with him in Cabinet will give every assistance to the Premier in his efforts to effect economies. I trust that in their own departments they will see to it that those things which are not useful shall be cut out; and let us proceed with the activities of those departments in a more businesslike manner.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You will have to let a lot go before you do that.

Capt. CARTER: I am not blaming any Government in particular, for mistakes will happen in the best regulated families. We have heard a lot about what happened in 1916, and of the way the finances were handled up till then. It must be remembered, however, that there has been a war since 1916.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: There was a war on at that time.

Capt. CARTER: That is perfectly true, but it is only recently that we have been feeling the full effects of the war. We felt some of the effects in 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, but we are feeling them more now.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We did not have a drought during those years.

Capt. CARTER: In 1916 the people of Western Australia did not know that the war was proceeding. I give the member for North-East Fremantle every credit for what he did during the war period in the interests of not only the State but of the Empire as well. I give him that credit not only for what he himself did, but for what his family did as well. I have a personal knowledge of what that was, but I repeat that in 1916 we as Western Australians did not know there was a war proceeding. We were reaping benefits where other countries were suffering.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: All the timber mills were closed down long before that.

Capt. CARTER: It is only to-day that we realise the full effects of the debacle of 1914. We have in the Premier a man who is an optimist. He has been dubbed an optimist on many occasions and while he is optimistic regarding the future, that is only good so far as it goes. That optimism is of little avail unless it is backed up by practical efforts.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is backed up with practical efforts.

Capt. CARTER: I hope and believe that that is so, and that the Premier will be assisted in his efforts by the Ministers serving with him.

The Minister for Agriculture: I hope so.

Capt. CARTER: O hope the Minister for Agriculture will see that there is an improvement in his department. The fact remains that we are up against a deficit of five million pounds. We have to face the music and should be able to do so with a consolidated front. During the war isolated positions or units which became isolated constituted a danger to the whole front. This lesson of the war may be applied to the financial position of Western Australia, and it points to the necessity for combining to conserve the interests of the State to help to lift us out of our financial troubles. The Leader of the Opposition has given the members sitting behind him a splendid lead. If we present a united front, there is every possibility of finding a way out of our present difficulties. It is essential that every avenue of economy should be availed of. When it is realised that with a population of 330,000 odd people, some 190,000 are living within a 12-mile radius of Parliament House, anyone having a regard for economics will realise the condition of affairs which is bound to arise. The figures I have given are approximate, but they afford me the opportunity of pointing out that our population is out of all proportion to some of our public utilities. The Leader of the Opposition drew attention the other night to the fact that in

Western Australia we have one mile of railway for every 87 persons in the State, whereas in Victoria there is a mile of railway for every 460 persons.

The Minister for Agriculture: We have been opening up the country.

Capt. CARTER: I admit that and I am not running down any particular Government or the developmental policy they pursued. I know that this State is one which has to be developed. The year before last I travelled 8,500 miles by road all over the State and I had an opportunity of seeing the industries of Western Australia first hand. I was impressed by the possibilities ahead of our industries and I hope these will prove beneficial to the country in the course of a comparatively few years. At the same time, one cannot but realise that our railway construction is out of all proportion to our population. I am strongly opposed to any further extensions in connection with our railways until such times as our financial position is more stable. For the same reason I am opposed to any extension of the tramway system as operating in the city of Perth to-day.

Mr. Clydesdale: You were advocating recently an extension in your own electorate.

Capt. CARTER: I have never yet done that. I challenge the hon. member to show where I have advocated an extension of the tramways in my own electorate. I believe there is on foot a proposal which, from a business point of view, could not commend itself to any business concern. In face of the deficit, I content we cannot afford to spend £41,160 in connection with an extension which cannot pay its way for at least two years, or more likely, for five years.

Mr. Clydesdale: It will pay its way from the first month it is opened.

Capt. CARTER: That is merely your statement. It proves nothing.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Perth trams are not paying now.

Capt. CARTER: In face of the deficit, the South Perth-Como extension is one which no sane business firm or corporation would consider for one moment. In the first place, it is perhaps the least payable proposition which could be brought forward in connection with our city tramway extensions. The Government are hard up for money and I think they are wrong in proposing such an extension. It has been stated that the extension was approved of by Parliament last session. I have read "Hansard" dealing with this question, and I contend that it proves that the South Perth-Como extension was never mentioned during the discussions in Parliament.

The Minister for Agriculture: The extensions were approved.

Capt. CARTER: They were not approved. I have the copy of "Hansard" with me and I would advise the Minister to read the matter again. The Minister voted against the expenditure under the item: "Tramways, Perth Electric, and Extensions, £87,000."

The Minister for Agriculture: The item was passed.

Capt. CARTER: On the casting vote of the Chairman. The Minister knows it is true that he voted against this extension.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: My vote saved it.

Capt. CARTER: I am surprised to hear that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I thought they wanted rolling stock.

The Minister for Agriculture: The item was passed for the extensions and for everything else.

Mr. Angelo: This particular line was never mentioned.

Capt. CARTER: In the metropolitan area we have one of the most highly inefficient systems operating in the Commonwealth. I have looked closely into the question during the last few weeks and I have no hesitation in saying that the termini constitute a positive disgrace. Take the Bulwer Street-North Perth line; there is a double line to within about five chains of the actual terminus. At that point between 8 o'clock and 8.20 in the morning, one can see anything from three to six cars banked up waiting for the car at the terminus to return. From the time the first car is able to go to the terminus and commence the return journey till the fourth car is able to move, is a period of 14 minutes. The time occupied in running from the North Perth terminus to the Barrack Street Jetty is exactly 14 minutes. In other words, the tram loses a trip every time it goes to the terminus. This position has been brought about through the lack of foresight by the department in neglecting to accede to the request of the North Perth people to duplicate the line to the terminus. The same thing applies at the Mount Hawthorn terminus, at the Walcott Street terminus, and at Inglewood, where they have not got even a loop. The same position obtains in a dozen different ways in connection with the system, which is a disgrace to the engineers in charge of that departmental work. Our tracks are a positive menace. I have asked the Minister concerned for the number of accidents and derailments. The department is still going into the figures. I know that at least three accidents have happened on the Beaufort-street line as the result of trams jumping the rails. It is only by good fortune that we have not had a calamitous disaster through tram accidents. Our rolling stock is dirty and the system as a whole is a disgrace. In the second place we have no money for unprofitable investment. While we have to pay £800 in interest every day we cannot put money into prospective concerns. Would any corporation go looking for prospective business such as the South Perth-Como extension when they have such payable concerns as that which the member for Claremont has introduced to the Minister, and that which I mentioned in a letter which I wrote to the Press, namely the extension of the tramline along Cambridge-street. We need that line badly, and we have two or

three times the population of South Perth to be served. Yet I do not believe that we should have any further extensions until our financial position improves. The South Perth-Como scheme will not bear comparison with any of several which I can mention. Any private tramway system would refuse point blank to consider the scheme which the Minister tells us is to be carried out forthwith. I am not sure that it will be carried out forthwith for I think the House will prevent that action. At the next sitting of the House I hope to give notice of motion to that effect. We have no right to spend the money in our pockets simply because it is there. The Minister has told us that the material has been ordered, is arriving, and will deteriorate if it is not used. It is the first time I have heard of steel rails deteriorating. We must think of what we owe before we incur this new expenditure.

Mr. Clydesdale: Then, according to your argument, Perth is to remain dormant.

Capt. CARTER: No, but the railways and tramways of the metropolitan area are altogether out of proportion to our total population, as our metropolitan population is altogether out of proportion economically to the population of the State. Allied closely with the important question of public health is the question of water supply. Metropolitan members have formed a committee irrespective of party, and laid their views before the Premier. The latest information we could get from the Premier was that he had a further report from the engineer, dealing with the extension of the Canning scheme. He says it will take a couple of millions to build that scheme and that two or three years will be required for its completion. That being the estimated cost, I feel that probably the actual cost will be three millions, and the time necessary for the completion of the scheme at least a year longer than is estimated. There is a tremendously urgent need for some efficient scheme of water supply in the metropolitan area; in the higher parts of North Perth people cannot get water until after 11 p.m., and the water when secured is greatly discoloured and is at a temperature half-way along to boiling point. We should eliminate from the various schemes put forward those which are not satisfactory from a practical point of view. During recent years little or nothing has been heard of the proposed extension of the Mundaring scheme. I have here a few figures, and at a later date I hope to go into the matter exhaustively. The goldfields scheme drew from Mundaring in the year 1919-20 854,000,000 gallons. During the same period the quantity used in the metropolitan area, drawn from all sources, was 2,242,000,000 gallons. Thus the total quantity used was 3,000,000,000 gallons. The capacity of the Mundaring Weir is 5,000,000,000 gallons. Allowing for 700,000,000 gallons supplied by the Victoria reservoir and Bickley Brook there is more than two years' supply in the weir. Those figures are taken from annual

reports; they are very striking. Mr. W. C. Reynoldson, engineer for goldfields water supply, reported on the 16th September, 1904, that in his opinion the extension of the Mundaring scheme was the simplest, cheapest, safest, and most efficient proposition that could be put up. On the 23rd October, 1907, he made another report in which, without giving any reasons, he advocated the Canning scheme, forgetting all about the Mundaring scheme. He advocated the building of a tremendously expensive scheme on the Canning. I would impress upon the House the necessity for a vastly improved water supply in the metropolitan area. The condition of our water supply is disgraceful. The Minister will say that we have bores capable of producing millions of gallons daily of excellent water. But in South Australia not very long ago a very excellent bore, of about the same capacity of ours, gave out in a night, and that was the end of it. We have no guarantee that our bores will carry us for a week. Yet we are paying £8,000 per annum in wages for the pumping of that water into our mains. And still we have not an adequate supply in certain localities. The necessity for the establishment of a proper water supply in the metropolitan area is very great. We have heard much of the dear loaf; this has been mentioned chiefly in relation to the wheat pool this year. As a representative of a constituency which produces over 75 per cent. of the milk consumed in the metropolitan area I am vitally interested in the wheat pool, and I am also interested as a representative of the loaf consumer. In the light of the information I have, I do not think that if the wheat pool is to be carried on in the way it has been in the past it is a safe and sound proposition. Members of the Country Party will say that it is indispensable. I reply that we have already had offers from private firms to conduct the wheat business.

The Minister for Agriculture: What firms?

Capt. CARTER: Dreyfus & Co. for one. However, I do not want to jeopardise the interests of one section of the community for the benefit of another. I believe in safeguarding the interests of our primary producers. Still there are anomalies in the administration of the pool which its most ardent supporters will find difficult to explain. I have here an extract from the "Australasian" of the 13th June last. I am going to give these figures, because when on a previous occasion I gave them they were contradicted, and I was promised that they would be contradicted publicly. They have not been publicly contradicted and so I want to give the Minister a chance to contradict them if he can.

The Minister for Agriculture: I will do so.

Capt. CARTER: The Minister said so before. That was a fortnight or three weeks ago. The extract reads—

Importing countries have ceased control of wheat and flour, and every wheat-exporting country in the world, except Russia and Australia, now has a free market. Before pooling, it cost farmers an average of 5d. a bushel—including rail, agent's commission, labour margin for risks and losses, rentals, overhead and every other charge borne by the wheat—to handle the wheat from farmers' waggons in the country to ship's hold. Under pooling, the same service cost an average of 12d. a bushel.

The Minister for Agriculture: It costs 5d. a bushel.

Capt. CARTER: The statement continues—

On the increase of 7d. a bushel, less than 1d. can be ascribed to increased wages for lumping and other charges. An open market will reduce handling expenses to within 1d. a bushel of what it was before pooling. That will save growers 6d. a bushel.

On the question of chartering, one would think that the Commonwealth Government, with all the information and resources at hand, would surely be able to 'place ships' bottoms for export at something like a fair average price per ton. Listen to what has happened—

In October and November the Australian Wheat Board is reported to have chartered 1,000,000 tons for December to April, loading at from 135s. to 155s. a ton. By December freights were down to 90s. a ton; the January rate was 80s.; February 70s.; March 60s., and April 50s. Present rates are still lower.

They dropped lower than that before they started to rise again.

Notwithstanding cheap tonnage booked since November, the average rate of freight on the 55,000,000 bushels of new season's wheat shipped up to the present is 115s. a ton. Vessels (chartered last November) at 150s. a ton were loading last month alongside of vessels whose charges were 50s. a ton.

I have given the Minister the source of the article and I have read the article to him. I have asked the Minister to refute this statement, but it has never been done publicly.

The Minister for Agriculture: It will be done publicly.

Capt. CARTER: If any business concern, or the wheat pool in particular, has to be saddled with an incubus of 6d. a bushel on its wheat, then it is an unsound proposition. It is no wonder that the dairy farmers in my district are finding it almost impossible to feed their cows on the offal which should be available to them at a cheaper price. There is one question which the member for South Fremantle touched upon and which is of vital interest to this country. That is the amendment of the arbitration law. The hon. member, in the course of his speech, referred to the Whitley council system, and

though he said he was not in favour of it, he went on immediately to propound a scheme which appeared to me to be on all fours with the system he had just previously condemned. I believe in the Whitley system. What I know of it is that it operates in other countries with great credit to itself and benefit to the whole community. There is an opportunity at these round table conferences for an interchange of viewpoints, the community of interest displayed by the employer on the one hand and the employee on the other make for co-operation between the two, and the results have been a decided increase in production. There has been an improvement in working methods and, as the previous speaker mentioned, there has been a utilisation of brains and initiative wherever these have been discovered. There are men in the ranks of the employees who, by reason of their contact with their employers, have been raised to higher positions than they ever held previously. These round table conferences have on the whole been a most effective, cheap, and speedy method of dealing with disputes. They have prevented the strike and they have prevented the lockout. I agree with the hon. member that their chief virtue is that they have not the red tape which attaches to our more formal Court of Arbitration, but I go further and say that they have not the red rag which very often operates when men refuse to come together and be reasonable. If this system could be developed in a greater and more efficient manner in Western Australia—after all it was such a system which dealt finally with the railway strike—then I believe it would make for the better running of the country as a whole. A further matter I wish to touch upon is that of the capitation grant. I was surprised to find that it was not mentioned, especially by speakers on the Opposition side, because there is a very strong possibility that the Commonwealth authorities will make an effort to reduce, if not to finally wipe out, that 25s. per head which is ours to-day. The Premiers' Conference, which was to have dealt with the matter, has been delayed. I do not know whether it is that our Premier is frightened to approach the Premiers of the other States on this matter, or what the reason is, but the fact remains that the 25s. per annum, which comes to us from Customs revenue, has not been touched up to the present, though there is a threat by the Commonwealth authorities to reduce it. If that should happen, it is a simple sum in arithmetic to multiply that by 330,000 to find out what we shall lose. It would be calamitous for this State from a financial point of view. I hope the Government will see that every opportunity is taken to combat this inroad which is threatened upon our financial position. It is not my intention to labour the fact that we are in a peculiar position in regard to the almost total absence of secondary industries. It is a fact which is only too painfully obvious to one who

stands aside and regards the situation. We in Western Australia have a glorious heritage, one of which we should all be proud. We have it in the mineral world and in the cereal world, and we are second to none in other phases of opportunity. The member for Claremont (Mr. J. Thomson) could tell us of the excellent high grade iron ore which may be obtained at Yampi Sound; yet we have no steel works to handle this product. We produce lead and copper and send them out of our State for treatment. We have in our metropolis the cheapest electrical current of any city in Australasia, and where are our secondary industries? They are conspicuous by an almost total absence. Our coastal waters abound with teeming millions of choice fish, and yet fish is a scarce commodity in Perth. It is impossible to place one's hand on a cheap supply because the whole business is in the grip of a ring, and although the Government have made efforts in the past, rather unsavoury in one or two instances, to deal with this matter—

The Minister for Agriculture: Why say unsavoury?

Capt. CARTER: In more ways than one, physically and otherwise. The question has not been satisfactorily dealt with. What can be said of one industry may be said of another. Take, for instance, the woollen mills, which we are told will be established in Western Australia. It is the bounden duty of the Government to assist the consumer and the grower to come together in this matter of the establishment of woollen mills. Let us make that tremendous saving in overhead charges which we have to meet to-day. We have the spectacle of our wool being carted hundreds of miles to the port, loaded in ships, sent thousands of miles across the sea to the Bradford and other mills, brought back again and then sold to us over our own counters with all the overhead charges of railage, freight, manufacture, insurance, commissions galore—there are plenty of middlemen—at the finally enhanced price. I believe that the immediate establishment of such industries would lead to a final and permanent reduction in the cost of living.

Mr. Angelo: Would you ask the Government to start woollen mills?

Capt. CARTER: Let them give every support to those who are now throwing out feelers in connection with the establishment of woollen mills. We have had enough of Government enterprises. The establishment of such an industry would provide employment and training for our youths. At the present time we hear the question, "What are we to do with our youths?" and the answer is flung back in our teeth, "Our youth have practically no secondary industries to engage in." If we are going to support the 190,000 people whom we have in the metropolitan area—and it is economically wrong that there should be such a preponderance of the

population in the metropolitan area—we must take the only truly economic course and see to the establishment of secondary industries. This must be done by every possible means the Government can adopt.

The Minister for Mines: That would result in bringing more people into the metropolitan area.

Capt. CARTER: I do not mind if woollen mills are established amongst our pastoralists. It would be easy to send the youth there for training. I do not wish to have them brought to the city. I am pleading for the establishment of secondary industries and asking the Government to render every assistance to get rid of the incubus of imported goods. We have the raw material in plenty and we have the men to do the work. No finer statement could be delivered than that by the member for South Fremantle this evening—a memorable statement which I believe is true—that the Australian workman is second to none on earth. We have the raw material in plenty and the men in plenty. Why not get to work? Here we are in this august Chamber, sent here to do the work of legislating for the greatest common good, and the greatest common good possible in Western Australia is the inculcation of a desire on the part of the people to promote primary industry and to establish secondary industry to deal with our raw material. We can go from one to another of these industries, fruit canning, paper making, alkali deposits, salt, sugar growing, these and a thousand and one others of which we have not yet touched the fringe. I lived at Mount Barker for a couple of years and saw valuable fruit, windfalls, but jolly good fruit, better than much of that which is often obtained from the shops in Perth, being fed to the pigs because there was no provision for canning, and at that time no possibility of jam-making. Since then an effort in this direction has been made, but not on a scale sufficiently large to encourage the growers to go in for further cultivation. Take Harvey: I think I am right in saying that the fruit-growers there have uprooted whole acres of orange trees simply because they were not paying. Not paying when, in the city at the present time, one has to pay up to 3s. a dozen for oranges!

Mr. Clydesdale: It is on account of the clay that they will not grow.

Capt. CARTER: The position certainly demands most earnest consideration.

The Minister for Agriculture: And is receiving it.

Capt. CARTER: There is room for more action.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is getting action, too.

Capt. CARTER: I hope that is correct. If at any time active work was required, now is the time.

The Minister for Mines: There never was so much attention paid to the establishment

of secondary industries as has been the case during the last 12 months.

Capt. CARTER: I am glad to hear that statement and I hope that action will be taken as well. I hope this House will see that it is taken. I hope this House will assist Ministers in every possible way towards the establishment of secondary industries. Hand in hand with the working of our Railway Department there is that urgent necessity, which faces every young country, for the establishment of main trunk roads, and the upkeep of its roads in general on a good, sound basis. I believe that in this respect we have ahead of us in Western Australia a task which is going to tax not only our enterprise, but also our energies, to handle it in a satisfactory manner. In Victoria there was to be found prior to the year 1912, an aggregation of just about the worst roads in Australasia. During 1912, however, Victoria introduced its Country Roads Act. It was my privilege to attend just recently a lecture delivered by a Perth gentleman who went on a holiday in the Eastern States, taking his car with him. Landing in Adelaide, he toured right through the Eastern States by motor; and he returned by steamer. He was thoughtful enough to prepare a lantern lecture illustrative of his trip; and as a member of the Good Roads Association of Western Australia, he went into the subject most exhaustively, with the specific purpose of showing what was to be found there, good and bad—he showed us both. But, for one thing, he did show us a most wonderful collection of good Victorian roads. He says that the excellence of the Victorian road system—and the Victorian people claim that this is so—is due to the Country Roads Act, and the system of handling roads.

The Minister for Mines: Will you tell us how much Victoria borrowed for the purpose?

Capt. CARTER: I will come to that. New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia have had under very serious consideration the adoption of a similar Act. Indeed, I believe that Queensland has already adopted the Act, with slight modifications. The measure provides for a board of three—two engineers and a skilled administrator—under the control of a Minister of the Crown. That in itself represents a very great improvement, and certainly augurs well for economy as compared with the scheme propounded here by the Minister for Works, who suggests the establishment of three road districts and the appointment of three boards. The powers of the board under the Victorian Act are, firstly, to decide what roads shall be main roads, and take over the same; secondly, to find out the most suitable materials for road construction and maintenance—a function which seems to me to afford wide scope for activity in Western Australia; thirdly, to put into use the most effective methods of road construction and maintenance; and, fourthly, to determine what deviations are necessary, and what new roads should be laid out or made. The Act safeguards local authorities, who have the

right of appeal. Owners are compensated if their land is injuriously affected, or is taken over by the board.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But the ratepayers have no say regarding the construction of roads, and the amount of rates thereby necessitated.

Capt. CARTER: I may inform the hon. member that if this Act, a precis only of which I am giving to the House, does not in every detail meet with the approval of the House, we can have something modelled on the Victorian lines. We can improve upon the Victorian Act just as Queensland has done. There is no reason why we should not consider this Act as a skeleton measure to be filled out in accordance with our own views of what is desirable.

Mr. Clydesdale: It gets right back to the fact that we have not the population here to pay the cost. Anyone connected with municipal affairs will tell you that.

Capt. CARTER: The hon. member would apparently prefer to leave in the hands of the Williams Road Board, if there is such a body

Mr. Johnston: There is, and it is a very good roads board.

Capt. CARTER:—the responsibility of deciding how many miles—I am not sure of the mileage, but I believe it is something in the neighbourhood of 100 miles—in its district shall be considered main roads.

Mr. Johnston: More than that.

Capt. CARTER: The member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale) says it is as sound to leave a condition of affairs such as exists in this State at present, as to attempt something which is better. I say such an attitude is absolutely illogical. We have at the present time a road system which is absolutely rotten, for the simple reason that it is ineffective, and cannot become effective because it is impossible for members of roads boards, or for roads boards as a whole, to handle the job which is put on them.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That is only because they cannot get the money.

Capt. CARTER: That amounts to the same thing. They cannot do anything without money. Where are they going to get the money?

Mr. Clydesdale: It is only because there are not sufficient people here to pay the amount of rates that would have to be imposed upon them.

Capt. CARTER: I take it, then, that the hon. member is resigned to his fate and does not want improved methods.

Mr. Clydesdale: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is all very well for the member for Leederville to talk, but let him wait until it comes to striking rates; that is the point.

Capt. CARTER: I still have to learn from the interjectors of anything in the present system that savours of virtue. There is absolutely no virtue in the present system, which is utterly ineffective and cannot possibly last

much longer. I should expect consideration of this matter from hon. members who have the interests of our primary producers at heart; and I take it we all have. I am not putting forward my roads proposal from a motorist's or a pleasure-seeker's point of view. I am speaking of the importance of roads from a developmental point of view.

Mr. Clydesdale: Quite right.

Capt. CARTER: Our railways run through an enormous area of country; we are wonderfully well situated in respect of railway communication—from an economic point of view, too well situated. But those railways cannot reach every farm, and we have roads running 30, 40, and 50 miles into farming country which is not tapped by railway construction. Therefore it is our bounden duty to protect the interests of the farmer who is distant 20 or 30 miles or more from a railway. If he has to cart his products over, say, 20 miles of quagmires, miscalled roads, he is not being given a chance. It is up to the House to consider very carefully the lines which have been adopted in the Eastern States with so much success. Sufficient should it be for the House at least to consider the matter when I tell hon. members again that Queensland has adopted the Victorian Act and that other States are seriously considering its adoption. It is not necessary for me to go into much further detail on this subject, though I may add that, so far as I can gather from the précis of the Act which I have before me, that it contains stipulations of such a nature as to safeguard the interests of all concerned—the property owner, the board, the Minister controlling the board, and the State as a whole. It is high time that in Western Australia we had roads which would at least give our settlers a chance to handle their products. I speak from experience.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I agree with you there, but our population is small and we cannot do so much.

Capt. CARTER: But is it not going to be more than it is at the present time? If we set out to make all our roads good at the one time, the task is going to prove painfully impossible. But if we set out on a policy of gradual but sure improvement, we shall have a chance of achieving success under a system which has already proved itself to be a thoroughly sound and satisfactory one from every other point of view.

Mr. Clydesdale: Have not the municipal councils and roads boards been trying to do those things?

Capt. CARTER: Yes, but ineffectively.

Mr. Clydesdale: It is very easy to talk like that.

Capt. CARTER: I know the difficulties of the hon. member in his mayoral chair. I would not have them on my mind.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You have given no time to municipal work, and therefore do not understand it.

Capt. CARTER: I understand it from the point of view of one who reads as he walks.

I do not go about with my eyes closed. I appreciate the situation with which these gentlemen are faced. I recognise that they are facing it courageously, and doing yeoman service. But the point is that they are not rendering effective service. Will the member for Canning (Mr. Clydesdale) tell me that they are doing effective service? Will he say that he is not game to try another scheme which will give effective service?

Mr. Clydesdale: Undoubtedly I am game.

Capt. CARTER: Then I fail to understand the hon. member's objection to my proposal. We cannot afford to neglect the roads any longer. I hope that the Government will take into serious consideration the introduction of a Bill which will comprise the main elements of the Victorian Roads Act which I have outlined. I believe it would be beneficial not from a pleasure-seeker's point of view, but from the point of view of the producer and his children who have to travel over these roads to school. I know the State very thoroughly by road, and I know that the roads can be made a great deal better if effectively handled, at a great deal less cost than members may think. By the appointment of a board such as that outlined under the Victorian Act, there is a possibility of greatly improving our roads. We have had a very pleasant period with congratulations and felicitations since we have met, but we should not allow these feelings to overcome the elements of common sense in practice and reality. We are up against a tough proposition as a State, which, to say the least of it, is a serious one. It is necessary for us to pull together as a House and as a people if we are to do that which is our job. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) in the course of his speech said that no body of men liked strikes less than the workers themselves. I agree with that hon. member and I also agree with the member for South Fremantle, when he stated that in Western Australia we have a fine record in connection with the elimination of industrial troubles. At the same time, I plead to members as a whole to use their best endeavours to eliminate that "hot head" element that exists on the Opposition side.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It exists on your side as well.

Capt. CARTER: I am not saying that it does not exist on the Ministerial side of the House as well, but I trust that it will be possible in the future for sweet reason to obtain between the members of both parties, enabling at least a fair and sane view to be taken of questions that present themselves in this Chamber. It is all very well for a member to say—and everyone of us perhaps have our moments of "hot air"—that it does not matter if a hotel should come down so long as no lives are lost. If we cannot safeguard property, we cannot safeguard lives. The same necessity to protect property holders exists as for the protection of the workers, for we must stand by both. If that loyalty to our

obligations which is our bounden duty, will guide us in our deliberations outside the House—I am speaking particularly to those who wield great influence among the workers and to those on the Ministerial side who carry influence with the employers—I believe that a spirit of amity and reasonableness can be brought to bear upon the affairs of this State. I also believe that Western Australia is in for a better and more happy time. I understand that it is usual for members to state exactly where they stand. I have heard that it is usual for a member to say that he supports the Government and then to criticise the Government, or that he supports the Opposition and then to criticise the Opposition. My position is one that I can describe in one word. My first debate in this House took place on the first day I entered the building when I was charged by another member, who shall be nameless, with the dreadful crime of being a Nationalist. That member said that I had no right to call myself a Nationalist and contended that he was just as good a Nationalist as I was. If that is so, I am very glad. In the case of that particular member, I know that is right, and if each one of us could be a Nationalist in the one and true meaning of the word, there would be a much better feeling of amity amongst us and throughout the State. I believe a Nationalist is a man who will stand up to his obligations and will see to it that his professions are a first charge upon his obligations. He is a man who will see that the redemption of his promises is a first charge upon his energy. I believe that a Nationalist, from a political point of view and an Australian point of view, is a man who is so proud of Australia, of Australian men, and of Australian ideals and aspirations that he makes these things a first call upon his strength. He is a man who will stand four square in upholding law and order and constituted authority. I believe he stands for freedom of speech and thought in politics, in religion and in civil life and in all things that make life worth living. Finally, I believe—perhaps I should have mentioned it first—that he is a man who gives fealty to his Most Gracious Majesty the King. These are my political planks and that is where I stand.

On motion by Mr. Mann, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.