

House, and indeed all persons, deplore the lack of housing accommodation for our people. The Honorary Minister attended a conference of persons connected with the building trades, and it matters little what terms he employed to impress upon those present the necessity for producing more and more of the wherewithal to provide houses to accommodate our people. Whatever strong terms he used and whether he meant each one of them in its entirety, his object, as a responsible Minister, was to try to do his duty as he saw it, knowing the conditions because of the position he holds.

I believe everything is not right regarding the production of timber at the mills. I believe that the larger timber companies who pay great royalties per load on the timber taken from the forest have tied up many thousands of acres of timber, a privilege that is denied to the smaller people and to the spot mills which could utilise it if it were available. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred to private enterprise and the socialisation of production. In view of the position in which we find ourselves, what does it matter who does the job? There is room in this country for both and both should be getting on with the task. The amendment refers to our deploring the situation. I am sure that everyone here does so; but when it comes to ousting the Government, and particularly a Minister who is trying to do his job in a manner which does credit to him, I propose to support him right now.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	22
Noes	25

Majority against 3

Ayes.

Mr. Brady	Mr. McCulloch
Mr. Coverley	Mr. Needham
Mr. Fox	Mr. Nulsen
Mr. Graham	Mr. Panton
Mr. Guthrie	Mr. Rodoreda
Mr. Hawke	Mr. Sewell
Mr. J. Hegney	Mr. Sleeman
Mr. W. Hegney	Mr. Styants
Mr. Hoar	Mr. Tonkin
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Wise
Mr. May	Mr. Kelly

(Teller.)

Noes.

Mr. Abbott	Mr. Nalder
Mr. Ackland	Mr. Nimmo
Mr. Brand	Mr. Owen
Mrs. Cardell-Oliver	Mr. Perkins
Mr. Cornell	Mr. Read
Mr. Doney	Mr. Shearn
Mr. Grayden	Mr. Thorn
Mr. Griffith	Mr. Totterdell
Mr. Hearman	Mr. Watts
Mr. Hill	Mr. Wild
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Yates
Mr. Mann	Mr. Bovell
Mr. Manning	

(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

On motion by Mr. Marshall, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 31st August, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Iron and steel industry, as to establishment and site	519
Meat and potatoes, (a) as to fixed and retail prices	520
(b) as to blackmarketing in meat	520
Fremantle harbour, (a) as to congestion and labour employed	520
(b) as to port dues and labour costs	520
(c) as to review of Tydeman scheme	520
Regional Development Council, as to Avon Valley request	521
Main Roads Department, as to repairing Garrett-road bridge	521
Education, as to school for Halls Creek	521
Native affairs, as to establishing institution, Fitzroy Crossing	521
National savings groups, as to participation by Government employees	521
Timber, as to Bunbury export figures	522
Government buses, as to Osborne Park service	522
Water supplies, as to comprehensive scheme, Collier-Narrogin section	522
Jurors' fees, as to allowance and previous adjustment	522
Railways, as to "PM" locomotive boilers	523
Housing, as to applications for rental homes	523
Crayfishing industry, (a) as to Advisory Committee's report	523
(b) as to publishing report	523
(c) as to close season	523
Address-in-reply, fourteenth day	524

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

QUESTIONS.

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

As to Establishment and Site.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) What is the latest stage reached by the Government in its negotiations to establish a large-scale iron and steel industry in Western Australia?

(2) What financial arrangements have been made to establish the industry?

(3) Is it intended to establish the proposed industry in the Bunbury district?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The Government is still awaiting a report from Brasserts regarding all the physical and economic aspects of the establishment of an iron and steel industry in this State.

(2) Answered by (1).

(3) Although the Bunbury district is understood to be favoured as a location for such an industry, it would be premature to make a firm decision on this matter.

MEAT AND POTATOES.

(a) As to Fixed and Retail Prices.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Attorney General:

(1) What is the present fixed price in the metropolitan area of the following commodities:—

- (a) Beef—Sirloin, ribs, steak (rump), steak (chuck), corned silverside, corned brisket (rolled), sausages;
- (b) Mutton—Leg, forequarter, loin, chops (loin), chops (leg);
- (c) Potatoes?

(2) Can he state the actual charges being made to consumers for the above commodities?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) (a) Beef—Sirloin beef, 1s. 7d. lb.; sirloin steak, 1s. 11d. lb.; rolled rib, 1s. 6d. lb.; rib with bone, 1s. 4d. lb.; rump steak, 2s. 1d. lb.; chuck, 1s. 4d. lb.; silverside, 1s. 5d. lb.; rolled brisket, 1s. 2d. lb.; sausages, 11d. and 1s. 1½d. lb.

(b) Mutton—Full leg, 1s. 3d. lb.; short leg, 1s. 4d. lb.; loin, 1s. 3d. lb.; shortloin chops, 1s. 4d. lb.; leg chops, 1s. 4d. lb.

(c) Potatoes—11lb., 3d.; 2lb., 5½d.; 3lb., 8½d.; 7lb., 1s. 7d.; 14lb., 3s. 2d.; 3½lb., 9½d.

(2) As far as I am aware, the prices charged are those submitted, although from statements I have read in the Press and inquiries made by the Prices Branch I believe some blackmarketing is taking place. As a result of investigations by the Prices Branch a number of prosecutions have taken and are taking place.

(b) As to Blackmarketing in Meat.

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Attorney General:

(1) Has his attention been called to the statement by the Acting President of the Meat Federation appearing in "The West Australian" on the 29th August, in which it is claimed that the blackmarket in meat is responsible for the exorbitant prices being charged to consumers?

(2) If the facts are as stated by Mr. Mickle, what is his intention in regard to them?

(3) Will he take immediate, drastic and effective steps to crush the blackmarket in meat, and so bring relief to the consumers who are being ruthlessly exploited by present prices?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) The task of eradicating the blackmarket is extremely difficult without the co-operation of the public and all sections of the trade. If the consumers and the retail butchers would report to the Prices Branch all cases of black-

marketing coming to their notice immediate action will be taken and it will materially assist in eliminating the black-market.

FREMANTLE HARBOUR.

(a) As to Congestion and Labour Employed.

Mr. FOX asked the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

(1) Is she aware that 11 ships are anchored in Gage Roads at present?

(2) Is she aware that unloading of ships was delayed over the week-end because employers did not engage all the labour available?

(3) Is she aware that out of 879 men available for work over the week-end only 339 were engaged to work on last Sunday?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) and (3) Yes—Shipowners on grounds of economic ship operations do not employ large numbers of men on Sundays when wage rates are 2½ times ordinary rates.

When men are employed on Sundays the tendency is for most of them to take two days' leave to which they are entitled during the following week. The man hours gained on Sundays are seriously negated.

(b) As to Port Dues and Labour Costs.

Mr. FOX (without notice) asked the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

Following the answer to my question, is the Minister aware that the extra money paid for harbour dues on ships staying in port over the week-end would offset the extra money paid to waterside workers?

The MINISTER replied:

I must ask for notice of this question. I would like to explain that there is some misapprehension among members opposite, who think I am the Minister responsible for vessels that come in to berths at the harbour. My jurisdiction over supply and shipping ceases when vessels get in to the harbour and does not extend to when they are berthed.

(c) As to Review of Tydeman Scheme.

Mr. SHEARN (without notice) asked the Minister for Works:

The Government having arranged for Mr. H. C. Meyer, Chief Engineer, South Australian Harbour and Rivers Department to inquire into and report upon the Fremantle Harbour extension proposals, when does he anticipate being able to publicly announce the full text of the terms of reference in regard thereto?

The MINISTER replied:

The terms of reference will not be made public until after the arrival of Mr. Meyer.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL.*As to Avon Valley Request.*

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE asked the Acting Premier:

(1) What were the Government's reasons for rejecting the application from local governing authorities in the Avon Valley areas for the setting up of an Avon Valley Regional Council?

(2) Will the Government reconsider its decision in this matter?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) The reasons are set out in the papers which have been laid on the Table of this House.

(2) The Government will consider any further representations which the local governing authorities in the Avon Valley areas care to submit.

MAIN ROADS DEPARTMENT.*As to Repairing Garrett-road Bridge.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Is he aware that the Garrett-road bridge has fallen into a bad state of repair?

(2) Are the few men working on the bridge at present only engaged in patching it up?

(3) Will he state when it is the intention of the Main Roads Department to put the bridge into proper trafficable condition and protect the wood work with a good coating of paint?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Repairs are in hand, one-third of the cost having been contributed by the two local authorities concerned.

(2) The men are engaged on maintenance work.

(3) (a) Answered by (2).

(b) Any such work would be the responsibility of the local authorities concerned.

EDUCATION.*As to School for Halls Creek.*

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Education:

(1) Has a definite decision been made to build a school at Halls Creek?

(2) If so, have tenders been called for the erection of the building and what date is the erection due to be started?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Treasury approval has been given for the expenditure necessary for the erection of a school and hostel. However, it was found that effective management of the hostel would involve hospital expenditure on the new town site. The school,

hostel and hospital are to be erected under one contract, and amended plans for the hospital are being prepared and tenders will most probably be called for the combined work in approximately three months' time.

NATIVE AFFAIRS.*As to Establishing Institution, Fitzroy Crossing.*

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Native Affairs:

Has a decision yet been made to establish a native institution at Fitzroy Crossing?

The MINISTER replied:

The matter is under consideration. A decision may be looked for shortly.

NATIONAL SAVINGS GROUPS.*As to Participation by Government Employees.*

Mr. NEEDHAM asked the Acting Premier:

(1) Is he aware that the Commonwealth Treasurer has made several appeals to Australian employers to co-operate with their employees in forming National Savings Groups in their respective establishments in support of the Commonwealth Government's efforts to increase national saving?

(2) Is he aware that as a result of these appeals up to date 8,000 National Savings Groups are in operation in industrial establishments throughout Australia?

(3) Is it a fact that the Government Railways and other Government Departments have refused to co-operate with their employees in the formation of National Savings Groups denying thousands of Government employees the opportunity of taking part in the scheme?

(4) If that is so, and in view of the importance of the National Savings Scheme to the Australian economy, will he issue instructions to the heads of all Government departments to afford every opportunity to their employees to form National Savings Groups and thus set an example to all private employers?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) Yes. The Railways Commission considered that it would not be practicable to arrange National Savings deductions through the pay sheets, owing to the shortage of staff and the fact that deductions on account of superannuation, endowment, taxation, etc., had reached saturation point. In one or two other departments the same position existed.

(4) Following representations from the Prime Minister, a circular was sent by the Premier to all departments on the 2nd February, 1949, advising them that the

State Government had agreed to support the campaign launched by the Commonwealth Government in conjunction with all the savings banks of Australia for an intensified drive for National Savings and asking them to arrange to do everything necessary to assist the campaign. The Treasury Department agreed to make arrangements to facilitate carrying out the scheme by deductions from salaries and wages through the pay sheets. The present position will be re-examined with a view to obtaining increased support in those departments where National Savings Groups are already operating and establishing groups in other departments where groups have not been established if it is now found practicable to do so.

TIMBER.

As to Bunbury Export Figures.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Honorary Minister for Housing:

(1) In view of his statement in "The West Australian" of the 30th August, does he believe that the Statistician's figure in regard to timber export from Bunbury is incorrect?

(2) If he does not agree with the Statistician's figure, can he give an indication of what is the true export position?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) No. No figures regarding individual exports from Bunbury were supplied by the Statistician.

(2) Certain figures provided to me through the Bunbury Harbour Board are being further inquired into.

GOVERNMENT BUSES.

As to Osborne Park Service.

Mr. W. HEGNEY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is he aware that on the 28th inst., a number of residents of Osborne Park could not proceed to the city on the 8.20 a.m. bus (Government) from the terminus at corner of Royal and Main-streets because the driver was unable to complete issuing tickets prior to departure at scheduled time?

(2) Does he know that in consequence a number of intending passengers were obliged to pay sevenpence on a private bus to enable them to reach their work on time?

(3) Is he aware that a number of Osborne Park residents were unable to proceed to their homes by the 4.52 p.m. or 5.3 p.m. buses (Government) from Bridge-street, Perth, although they had purchased sixpenny tickets on the footpath from an employee of the Tramway Department?

(4) If he is not aware of the position as indicated above, will he make inquiries and inform the House of the result?

(5) If he is aware of the position, what action does he propose to take to remedy the position?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

(1) I have been made aware that a bus scheduled to leave Osborne Park at 8.15 a.m. on Monday 28th was in fact late in leaving due mainly to passengers being unaccustomed to what was required in the matter of paying their fares upon entering the vehicle. All available passengers were, however, accommodated, and any delay is regretted. This position improved on the following days and will gradually be overcome.

(2) No. Passengers however, have a choice of services from Osborne Park and if they so desire can travel on the non-Government bus for which the fare is greater than the Governmental service before 8.30 a.m.

(3) No. However, if a greater number of people than bus capacity on any route were available at a given time, they would be accommodated on the following vehicles. The sale of tickets at the queue is to prevent late departures.

(4) Tramway officials are closely watching peak time movements and where found necessary amendments to vehicle movements are made.

(5) Answered by (4).

WATER SUPPLIES.

As to Comprehensive Scheme, Collie-Narrogin Section.

Mr. NALDER asked the Minister for Water Supply:

(1) How many miles of piping have been completed between Collie and Narrogin in regard to the Comprehensive Water Scheme?

(2) How many miles of pipe are required for this purpose?

(3) When does he anticipate the completion of the pipe-laying between these two towns?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Thirteen and a half miles.

(2) Eighty-one miles.

(3) Providing steel plate is available from oversea, the programme provides for completion of the pipeline in approximately two years.

JURORS' FEES.

As to Allowance and Previous Adjustment.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked the Attorney General:

(1) Does he agree that it comes within the category of public service for a worker to take home to his wife a fortnightly pay which indicates that he is £3 10s. short of his normal pay owing to the fact that he has been required by the State to serve on a jury for three days?

(2) When was the last adjustment made to the fees of jurymen?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) and (2) The last adjustment in the fees of jurymen was made on the 17th September, 1943. This matter will be placed before Cabinet for consideration at an early date.

RAILWAYS.

As to "PM" Locomotive Boilers.

Mr. STYANTS (without notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

Yesterday the Minister, on behalf of the Minister for Railways, furnished answers to some questions that I had asked about PM engines. I asked—

(1) Is it correct that one of the recently-acquired "PM" locomotive boilers, after only three weeks' service on engine No. 728, has been withdrawn from traffic?

The Minister replied that "PM" 728 was withdrawn from traffic in April in accordance with the general order issued that the nine "PM" locomotives then in service be returned to the workshops for modification. My second question was—

(2) Is it true that 79 tubes had to be taken out and replaced because of the unsuitable methods applied during the construction of these boilers?

The Minister replied:

"No."

I went to the East Perth running sheds this morning and discovered that this engine had not made its initial appearance in April, although we were informed by the Minister that it had been withdrawn from traffic in April for the purpose of effecting some minor repairs. In company with the officer in charge there, I found that the implication contained in my question was correct and that something like 80 tubes had to be taken out of that locomotive because of certain defective workmanship and unsuitable methods.

Mr. SPEAKER: What is the hon. member's question?

Mr. STYANTS: I now ask the Minister—Can he give any explanation of the inaccurate and misleading information contained in the answers given by the Railway Department to my question and, if not, will he get the facts for the information of members?

The ACTING PREMIER replied:

I do not know, at this stage, that the answers given are inaccurate or misleading, or both, but I will undertake that the statement made by the hon. member will be referred to the appropriate people and inquiries will be made of them, so that he may be further satisfied on the question.

HOUSING.

As to Application for Rental Homes.

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

How many outstanding applications for Commonwealth-State rental homes are in the hands of the State Housing Commission for houses—

(a) in the metropolitan area?

(b) in the country?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

As to the 31st July, 1950—

(a) 9,323.

(b) 1,869.

CRAYFISHING INDUSTRY.

(a) As to Advisory Committee's Report.

Mr. FOX (without notice) asked the Minister for Fisheries:

Following the answer given by the Minister to a question by me yesterday, I now ask him the following:—Is there any reason that prevents the Minister from making public the report of the committee, appointed by his department, which met at Fremantle recently to inquire into the crayfishing industry?

The MINISTER replied:

It is not the policy of any Government to make public reports and information given on a confidential basis, but I have already stated that this information will be made available to the hon. member at any time he cares to see it.

(b) As to Publishing Report.

Mr. FOX (without notice) asked the Minister for Fisheries:

Following on the Minister's answer, I now ask him the following:—As this is a matter of vital importance to the general public, as well as to those engaged in the fishing industry, does the Minister not think this report should be made available to the public as a whole?

The MINISTER replied:

No.

(c) As to Close Season.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN (without notice) asked the Minister for Fisheries:

(1) Is he aware that an officer of the C.S.I.R.O. has stated that there is no need to have a closed season for crayfish during the next three months?

(2) If so, why has the closed season been made, in the face of that statement by an expert of the C.S.I.R.O.?

The MINISTER replied:

I do not know what officer the hon. member refers to, but I do know that the officer appointed by the C.S.I.R.O. to investigate and advise in connection with the

crayfishing industry in Western Australia has advised that there should be a closed season.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourteenth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day:

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [4.50]: I desire to make one or two observations in support of the motion so ably moved by the member for Cottesloe. I have noticed that some members referred to that member as the "new member for Cottesloe." However, I would remind the House that he is as old as the seat itself and during my years of experience in this Chamber I have not known of any other man to have preceded him in the seat now known as Cottesloe.

Prefacing my observations, may I join with others in offering you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations upon your re-election to the Speakership of this House. In those congratulations I incorporate the Chairman of Committees also. Both of you have served your apprenticeship and we can expect dignity, decorum and impartiality in future debates in this Chamber. I desire also to congratulate those—both new and old—who find themselves smugly reposing on the Ministerial benches. Accidents will happen in the best regulated institutions. However, they have my congratulations.

Hon. A. H. Panton: And sympathy!

Mr. MARSHALL: But I fear, even so early in the session, that many of them realise one cannot hold Ministerial office without suffering acutely from headaches. They have my sincere congratulations although I hope that their sojourn on the Treasury bench will be brief.

The Minister for Lands: That has spoilt it.

Mr. MARSHALL: To the new members, too, I desire to offer my congratulations because at one time I was a new member myself.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What a wonderful memory!

Mr. MARSHALL: I suppose we are all proud of victory and feel somewhat elevated when we attain a rank where we can place the three letters, M.L.A., after our names. Having listened to those who have already contributed to the motion, may I congratulate them on their maiden efforts. From my experience in this Chamber I do not remember having listened to better efforts.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: What about the chap who was elected in 1921?

Mr. MARSHALL: Quite a number of men that came into this House in 1921 have long since gone out and some have passed over the Great Divide. However,

the efforts of the new members were particularly good and I am sure they will be an acquisition to this institution as time progresses.

Mr. Graham: You are on the wrong side of the House!

Mr. MARSHALL: From my experience of the hon. member I do not think he knows where he is.

Mr. Graham: You are asking me to be rude.

Mr. MARSHALL: I consider it obligatory to endeavour, if I can in my humble way, to redeem myself from the bad odour into which I may have fallen because of a particularly vicious attack made on me by the very hon. member for Victoria Park.

I always accept criticism if it is truthful, clean and wholesome. As public men we must all be prepared to be criticised, not only for our actions and utterances in this Chamber, but we will also be criticised by the public and institutions outside this Chamber. To that I take no exception, but when a member endeavours to rob me of my good name by linking it up with an organisation or institution that is rotten within itself, then I take very strong exception. He can rob me of my personal goods but if he takes my character from me then he has taken everything and by associating me with communism he has done that. Probably, the hon. member has no name to lose; therefore he does not respect anybody else's name. However, I am sure I will be able to reply effectively to this most honourable member. I do not know what my Leader and Deputy Leader propose to do although they were not so caustically castigated as I was.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: I gave it the answer it deserved.

Mr. MARSHALL: Let us have a look at the offences that I committed which, in the hon. member's opinion, justified his right to be ruthless and vindictive. As to those acts which I did perpetrate I will take responsibility for and answer to. I do not deny that I wrote a letter to the State Executive of the Labour Party. I was inspired to take that action because of the attitude of this hon. member to the welfare of a number of workers who reside in his electorate. He did not deny the accuracy or the truthfulness of the letter. He passed that over, but sought to imply that in its distribution I was responsible for encouraging and associating myself with communists and their activities. That letter was written by me as the hon. member in this House eulogised and patted the Government on the back because it had extended road transport, owned by private enterprise, into the avenues of Victoria Park. This took the patronage of that particular district from its rightful owner—the State-owned transport system.

The hon. member did not advocate that the Government might bestir itself and bring its transport system up to a more modern and efficient standard, and so hold the patronage which might ultimately pay interest and sinking fund and liquidate the liability in which the taxpayers became involved some years ago by the purchase of this system. The system was built up with the idea of promoting industry and creating communities which have now made it possible for private enterprise to reap huge profits. Private enterprise did not come in during the early stages when the system was undoubtedly a losing proposition but, immediately the State goes to a good deal of expense in order to provide a transport system which builds up a community and makes patronage both possible and profitable, then private enterprise steps in.

But this very hon. gentleman—this sincere member for Victoria Park—when he advocated an extension of that service—I now speak of private transport—he had no regard for the workers of Victoria Park! Yet, he appears to shed crocodile tears on their behalf just a few months afterwards.

Mr. Read: Who will drive the buses?

Mr. MARSHALL: I will tell the hon. member. He would be well advised to keep particularly quiet because he is deep enough in the mire now, let me warn him well, and before I am finished with him he will be well satisfied that he made a great mistake.

Mr. Bovell: I think you are trying to drive a wedge.

Mr. MARSHALL: In close proximity to the time when he was making his utterances there were men being retrenched from the Tramways Department, because it was assumed that as it was a losing proposition their services were no longer required. So although the hon. gentleman has just stated that there were some men driving on the buses, there were also other men, who reside in his electorate, being dismissed.

Mr. J. Hegney: Thirty-five of them.

Mr. MARSHALL: Let us now take a closer look at the situation and see where this hon. member finds himself. Apart from the dismissal of these men, which of the two particular modes of transport, privately-owned or publicly-owned, offers the best conditions to their employees? Will the hon. member reply to that? Do the owners of the privately-owned buses grant long service leave or even pro rata long service leave? Do they give the concessions to their employees which the Tramways Department gives, allowing their tramwaymen to travel to the Eastern States on holidays at a cheaper rate? What he was advocating was the reduction of the standards which his own elec-

tors are enjoying. If that hon. gentleman was capable of knowing or learning anything he should have known that by way of comparison the State-owned transport system provides a service much cheaper than the privately-owned service and thus every employee in Victoria Park has suffered in consequence of his advocacy.

Every individual that lives in Victoria Park and is obliged to travel from that suburb to a place of employment would, if the hon. gentleman had his way, suffer because of his advocacy for a change in the public transport system. No comparison can be made between the standards of employment of the State-owned and privately-owned transport systems. Might I ask that hon. gentleman if he ever has seen a male conductor on the privately-owned buses? No, they prostitute the cheap labour gained from female employees. They use them in preference to men to do the job which the State-owned transport system does not.

The Minister for Lands: Did not the trams have female conductors working on them?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, during the war period because it was necessary, but even so, those ladies did not retain their jobs any longer than was required.

The Minister for Health: Why not?

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. lady had better keep quiet because it might be her turn next. So we find in essence that what the hon. gentleman was advocating was the extension of a low standard for every employee in his electorate, and the charging of a higher fare to every worker in his district who has to leave it to perform his daily toil. But that is not all. Who is it that has to find the money to meet the deficit following the year's operation on the State-owned transport system? Would he suggest that those highly qualified individuals who dispense pills and distilled water are the sole taxpayers in this State? Has he realised that the State taxpayers are liable to make good the deficit incurred by the State-owned transport system and will not the workers of Victoria Park be obliged to pay their share of it?

Has not the hon. gentleman yet awakened to the fact that it is the taxpayers of this State who have to pay for the provision of roads and the maintenance of them in order that the privately-owned vehicles may travel over them, whereas the State-owned transport system has to pay for them itself through the taxpayers, among whom are included the workers of Victoria Park?

Mr. Read: The workers of W.A. have to pay for that.

Mr. MARSHALL: In that case, there are no workers in Victoria Park.

Mr. Read: They are all workers there. There is no need for you to spout year after year.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will show how much sympathy the hon. member for Victoria Park has for the workers in his electorate. All the sympathy he has is extremely minute.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He handed them over to the profiteers two years ago.

Mr. MARSHALL: Undoubtedly! He advocates worse conditions and higher fares for them. He handicaps them in every way and then he says he is sympathetically disposed towards the workers. We will see how sympathetic he was in the matter about which he took me to task. In the letter I wrote I, of course, used the statement that his attitude on that occasion was foreign to the interests of the workers of Victoria Park, and he alleged that that was where the sting lay. Well, was not his attitude foreign to their interests? On this occasion I repeat that his attitude was as foreign to the welfare of the workers of Victoria Park as cleanliness in pigswill would be to the purity of paradise. That is why he argues for lowering the standard of conditions for people employed in the transport system, which would be achieved by handing them over to the system that is privately-owned and thus burden the workers in his district by creating extra deficits and debts at the end of the financial year and, further, force them to pay for the construction of roads to be used by the privately-owned transport system.

Let me take the other point to which this hon. gentleman referred and see where his sympathies lie there. He referred to my attitude in this House in asking a question of the Minister for Housing. Surely I cannot be accused of doing anything secret or under the lap. I asked the Minister concerned a question in this House where full publicity is given to it. In fact, I did not even think of the member for Victoria Park. The thought of that most honourable gentleman never entered my mind. What actually happened was this: That a home which was condemned by the Perth City Council authorities was occupied by a personal friend of mine. All of his family were friends because I have been associated with them for many years.

The father was very well-known to the member for Leederville. He was a man who played a very prominent part in the Labour movement and he unsuccessfully stood as a Labour candidate for political honours. It was quite natural, therefore, that when Butler was told that the home was to be demolished, because it had been condemned as unsuitable for human habitation, he became agitated. The honourable member for Victoria Park, having no interest in it, was never thought of or referred to in connection with it. That was not necessary. I regret very much the absence of the ex-Minister for Housing from this Chamber. I asked that

Minister a question: Whether he was aware of the decision of the Perth City Council to demolish this house and, in view of the acute shortage of homes, would he take any action that lay within his power to prevent the demolition of this home which was providing shelter for a man, his wife and family. This is what the hon. member has taken exception to.

Mr. Read: It was never in question.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is all right for the hon. member.

Mr. Read: It is in your imagination.

Mr. MARSHALL: If it was never in question and the Perth City Council had never taken any action, why was Butler in such a state of agitation? Never mind about the hon. member coming in now with excuses over the situation. Butler is just as truthful as is the hon. member.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Hear, hear!

Mr. MARSHALL: Butler was approached by the Perth City Council and told that he had to get out, and that the place was being demolished.

Mr. Read: That is not right.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am telling the hon. member the facts. If they are not correct how was it Butler assumed this action on the part of the Perth City Council?

Mr. Read: You know.

Mr. MARSHALL: I repeat that Mr. Butler would not have known that the Perth City Council had intended demolishing the home for the purpose for which it was to be demolished had somebody not approached him and told him about it. Of course he would not have had any chance of knowing, but he was approached and told what was happening and what he had to do. What is the use of the member for Victoria Park telling us that was not the intention? Of course it was the intention of the authority that approached Mr. Butler. Whether the Perth City Council was the propelling power behind it is another question. The Perth City Council is not composed of men of 100 per cent. efficiency—so far as its officers are concerned they are no more efficient than those of any other institution. Mr. Butler could never have known what the intentions of the Perth City Council were unless he was approached—which he had been—and told for what purpose the home or the ground on which it stood was going to be used.

All I did was to try to save the situation. I never had any intention of injuring the member for Victoria Park. When I got a reply from the Minister I sent both the question and the reply to Mr. Butler. The hon. gentleman, however, says that it was stuck up by communists in a telephone box and he pulled it down. I know nothing of what happened to the letters, the question or the answer after

they left my hands. What stung the hon. gentleman? Why was he prompted to pull the notice down? What concern was it of his? The fact of the matter is that his conscience pricked him and, to prevent the public from seeing it, he pulled the notice down. He knew all about it.

Mr. Grayden: Perhaps he does not like communists.

Mr. MARSHALL: Then he accuses me of being associated with the communists and of bringing about his downfall politically. What stung that hon. gentleman was that for the first time in his political career his true attitude was being portrayed to the public of Victoria Park. That is what was stinging him—he did not like them to know what was going on. To endeavour to make out a case in defence of himself, therefore, he links me up with the communist party. I have had enough of it. He made a statement that he was always considerate—not of the white collar and tie individual so much—because he had no interest in them—but of the under-dog on the lower strata of life. The very hon. gentleman was not at all sympathetic.

Mr. Read: That is not correct.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will soon find out and ask the hon. member to produce certain documents.

Mr. Bovell: I think the ballot box was the best indication of their confidence in the hon. member.

Mr. MARSHALL: I was championing the cause of the unfortunate individual who had a wife and family and was endeavouring to get shelter over their heads, in preference to making areas available for bowling greens, and because I did that he takes me to task—this great champion of the under-dog! Was the man who lived in that condemned house of the aristocracy?

Mr. Read: It was not a condemned home.

Mr. MARSHALL: It was a condemned home and was to be pulled down. I endeavoured to save the situation for this unfortunate man—this hard-working individual; one of those whom this very hon. gentleman purports to champion.

The Minister for Lands: If he is a very hon. gentleman he would not do a thing like that!

Mr. MARSHALL: That is a matter of opinion. Before the session is over I will show the hon. gentleman things that were not very honourable on the part of those he is associated with.

The Minister for Lands: Let us have it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Because I saved the situation it was taken to be an attack upon the member for Victoria Park. He argues

that he is the champion of the under-dogs and that they have his care and consideration.

Mr. Manning: Did he argue successfully?

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. What is the position therefore in this case? If I were deserv-ing of attack by the member for Victoria Park for doing this, then it would be quite obvious that he wanted that home demolished for the purpose of making a bowling green on the site. It must have been that, for what else could have made him wrathful? Surely it was a matter worthy of congratulation, rather than censure and of being accused of having associations with communists. If the member for Victoria Park was not eagerly desirous of the place being demolished, and if he approved of my attitude in this House—in the public eye—in saving the situation, would he not have congratulated me and gone to Mr. Butler and expressed regret in regard to the whole matter? Oh, no! And yet he says he is only concerned with the individual right down in the lower strata of the community!

So we saw here that I endeavoured to champion the cause of the individual—this autocrat!—whose home was to be demolished while this very honourable gentleman who represents Victoria Park evidently wanted to have the bowling green constructed there so that those he championed could rush home in their motorcars, instruct their wives to get an early tea ready while they donned flannels, white shoes and hats—because they wanted a game of bowls. That is the difference between us. This very honourable gentleman went on to make reference to the fact that I chided him about his very narrow majority at the last election—it was less than 400 whereas previously he could boast of a majority of some thousands. He implied by his utterances that the redistribution of seats represented the main reason for the decline in his popularity so far as his electorate was concerned. Who was responsible for the passage of the Bill? If rumour be correct, then this very honourable member for Victoria Park—this Independent whom you have seen here, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Styants: We have heard of them.

Mr. MARSHALL: These Independents boasted when they first came into this Chamber that they would sit to adjudicate on the merits and demerits of whatever legislation or motion was introduced and would vote accordingly. Impartiality was to be their cloak, and they would never depart from it. But what do we find? Those very Independent gentlemen were dragged into a party meeting and, particularly in one case, when the third degree was applied to him, the hon. member in question agreed to support a Bill that he had never seen.

The Minister for Lands: When was that?

Mr. MARSHALL: It is all right, Mr. Dried-Fruits-Man! You keep out of this. I repeat; he had never seen the Bill.

The Minister for Lands: When was that?

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You are a prune! That is what he is calling you.

The Minister for Lands: Cheap publicity!

Mr. MARSHALL: He went so far with his vote in this House as to rob the unfortunate workers of three representatives. This is the man who talks about his great sympathy for the working class! Yet he voted that way well knowing that he was robbing them of the possibility of keeping their ministerial representatives on the Treasury bench.

Mr. Yates: He must have been responsible for everything, according to you!

Mr. MARSHALL: I like these Independents—when they do that sort of thing!

Mr. Manning: One would not think so.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the position.

Mr. Bovell: At any rate, they still retain the confidence of their electors, and I do not think you can disprove that.

Mr. MARSHALL: That is because they do not know him as I do. If the electors only knew of the behaviour of some members, they would not be satisfied with them. This very honourable member for Victoria Park went out of his way to tell me how it was that I hold my seat. He had the temerity to make some such references. When he can boast of having been a member of this Chamber as I have been for nearly 30 years, during which time I was opposed only twice and those opposing me lost their deposits, then will be time enough for him to tell me how it is that I hold my seat. I hold it by being fair and just and championing the cause of my electors. If he had fought to save the situation for his electorate, as I have had to fight for mine, I would be the first to congratulate him.

I certainly would not attempt to rob a member of his character and charge him with associating with communists. That is the principle upon which I act, and it is because of that that I hold my seat. Scarcely had the sympathetic tears dried on the cheeks of this so very honourable member following upon his outburst of sympathy with the working class, than he turned round and abused that section of the community because of the upward trend in the cost of living. He held the workers solely responsible for that trend and asserted that the cost of living was forced up only because of the increases in workers' wages—and nothing else. There has been enough said on that subject, so I shall be very brief about it.

There is no union or body of organised workers that can possibly secure from the Arbitration Court an increase in the existing rates of pay until it can conclusively convince the court that the cost of living has gone up. That is the first step. How are they to do it? As an advocate in the Arbitration Court in years gone by, I have had to present the despicable picture of men and even women going to the court and parading their poverty before the public. They produced their accounts and disclosed the payment of every penny that was necessary to enable them to exist.

Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that in a general way the basic wage fixed by the court does not cover more than from 13 to 15 vital items, and all the rest are not allowed for at all. Then when the worker is granted an increase in wages to a figure nearly approximating what the court imagines is the cost of living, we find that, in point of fact, the wages have not actually caught up with the cost of living—and never can do so under the present system. There are thousands of items necessary for supplying the complex demands of everyday living that do not figure in the discussions that take place during the hearing of an Arbitration Court application. That is the position regarding the workers themselves. I agree that ultimately, and spread over a period of time, the increase in wages will have a bearing on the cost of goods and services, but there are other propelling factors that force up the cost of living, quite irrespective of wages. However, that is a subject about which I shall have something to say before the session is concluded.

This very honourable gentleman from Victoria Park said that the workers were responsible and implied that they should be satisfied to remain stationary with their wages pegged, irrespective of what happened regarding the cost of living. That argument does not appeal to me very much. I want to bargain with this most honourable gentleman and wish to know if he will produce, before some independent public institution, the total resources from which he has derived his living over the last 12 months? Will he place those particulars before an independent tribunal like an Arbitration Court judge, and let us see if he has been forced to live on a bare subsistence or whether there has been any exploitation on the part of business people of Victoria Park? Will he produce his last year's income tax returns to let us see whether he has made profits out of the sale of epsom salts and distilled water?

Mr. Read: There are other lines, of course.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes. Will he be prepared to do what the unfortunate worker is forced to do by law—just to prove that he is sympathetically disposed towards the working class? His patronage must come from the working people, and probably a

glance at his taxation returns would show whether he had dealt generously with those people with whom he pretends to be so sympathetic.

Mr. Yates: The member for Victoria Park gave them considerable help during the depression.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will leave that to the hon. member, but I warn the member for Victoria Park of this: He may fairly criticise me respecting anything I say or do, and I shall welcome it and receive it in a friendly way—it is the lot of a public man to be criticised—but if he endeavours to link me with the Communist Party, or any other party of evil, he can prepare for a repercussion. I shall not tolerate that sort of thing from any member of this House or of the public.

I wish to enter an emphatic protest against the manner in which the Government has distributed the portfolios—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Four major ones in the Legislative Council.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes; which is an insult to the intelligence of supporters of the Government in this Chamber. It is tantamount to an admission that the Government has no-one in the Assembly possessed of suitable intelligence and qualifications to hold those portfolios. If I were supporting the Government, I should feel most indignant. This sort of thing would not happen with a Labour Government; it has never happened, and never could happen with Labour in office. If my suggestion is not correct that the Government considers there is no supporter of sufficient ability in this Chamber to handle those portfolios, there can be only one alternative, namely, that the Government has moved those portfolios to another place in order to silence criticism in this House.

Let us consider the Ministers in this Chamber! The Premier is also Treasurer and Minister for Forests and the North-West. The Minister for Education controls, in addition, Child Welfare and Industrial Development, representing a pretty heavy load. Then we have a brand new Minister who controls Works, Water Supply and Housing, and he, too, has a heavy load to bear. But, having mentioned those three, I have said everything possible in favour of the allocation of portfolios. The Minister for Lands also controls Labour and Immigration, but in all the years I have been here, I do not suppose that those portfolios have figured less in our discussions than they do at present. The Attorney General is holding down two other portfolios, Police and Fisheries, and the Minister for Health has the additional responsibility of Supply and Shipping. The Chief Secretary is also the Minister for Local Government and Native Affairs.

When we look at the portfolios held in the Legislative Council, however, we find that one Minister is charged with the responsibility of Transport, Railways and Mines, which constitute three of the most important portfolios. They are held in the Legislative Council where Estimates are not discussed and no criticism is involved. The department in which members from the rural districts are specially interested—Agriculture—represents another important portfolio held in the Council, making the fourth major portfolio in that House. Consequently, when the Estimates are brought down, if we are not again gagged on this occasion, we shall be unable to interrogate Ministers on four portfolios entailing the major work of administration. The Chief Secretary was previously Minister for Works and Water Supply. What has happened to the Country Party that it could not retain some of the major portfolios? Whereas the Chief Secretary once carried great responsibilities, he is now like a child in a nursery garden playing with a rattle, a doll and a few other things.

When we were in office, the portfolio of Chief Secretary was invariably given to the Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council. This was done for a specific purpose; he had only a small office to administer and that allowed him ample time to deal with the volume of legislation introduced by the Government in this House and sent on to the Council. When we consider that between 50 and 70 Bills are passed by the Assembly each session, we can appreciate the responsibility devolving upon the Leader in the Council to handle all those measures. Consequently, the Labour Party always allotted the portfolio of Chief Secretary to its representative in the Council because of the lightness of the administrative responsibilities entailed, which allowed him time to consider the legislation introduced in the Assembly and sent on to the Council.

Apart altogether from that, the Labour Party always had an Honorary Minister in the Council who, I think, took the very two portfolios that the Attorney General has, those of Police and Fisheries. I know that the late James Hickey, M.L.C., as Honorary Minister, had those two portfolios for some time. That is how important they were considered to be; and we know that they do not involve a great deal of responsibility in administration. But now we have four of the major portfolios being sent to another place, thus preventing members in this Chamber from being able to interrogate the responsible Ministers on the spot. Instead we have another Minister here representing the Ministers who have those portfolios in the Council. But what does he know about the administration of those departments? He has to wait until he can

convey our views to the Minister concerned and then return to this Chamber with information when it is old and practically out of date. It is an absolute insult for this Government to rob members on this side of the House of the right to interrogate Ministers holding big and responsible portfolios.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That was their idea.

Mr. MARSHALL: There can be only one of two reasons for it, which I have mentioned. It is either one or the other. It seems to me that the Country Party has been robbed of the portfolio of Minister for Works. The Country Party member who had that portfolio had one of major importance and, so far as I know, he did his job particularly well. But he seems to have been denuded of administrative responsibility.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They have slipped badly.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not know whether this is because of his attitude regarding the major water scheme that was introduced by my colleague, the member for Northam—because of his failure to continue with that and his introduction of a smaller scheme; or whether it is because he had something to do or say by way of objection to taking away from the State Electricity Commission its rightful ownership of the Black Diamond leases. It might have been either or both.

The Chief Secretary: It would please me if you made some inquiries on those lines and let the House know. I would be content with that.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am trying to prompt the Minister to tell me why he has fallen into disfavour.

The Chief Secretary: No, I am willing for you to find out and tell the House.

Mr. Styants: He is an oyster.

Mr. MARSHALL: I would rather the Minister made open confession.

The Chief Secretary: It is not a question of confession.

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not think it is fair for a Minister to serve a three years' apprenticeship in the administration of major portfolios like those of Works, Water Supply and Electricity and then on the return of the Government, to be found sitting with an infants' play-yard and a few toys.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He was probably sacrificed to meet the demands of the outside Liberal Party junta.

Mr. MARSHALL: He has done something to offend, evidently.

The Chief Secretary: You might be right there, too.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: He has been promoted downstairs.

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, he has slipped back. Well, if there is any satisfaction in a member's being a Minister with nothing to do, the hon. member is all right.

The Chief Secretary: There is a lot you know nothing about, evidently—a very great deal.

Mr. MARSHALL: On that score I enter an emphatic and bitter protest against this sort of thing. There can be no more logical way of allocating portfolios than to allot the minor offices to the Minister and the Honorary Minister in the Council, where no Estimates are dealt with. In that Chamber there is only one Committee—the Committee of the House. The Council has no Committee of Supply and no Committee of Ways and Means. Therefore it does not deal with the Estimates at all. To give important portfolios to Ministers occupying seats in the Legislative Council is to deny fair criticism of the administration of those departments to members of this House, particularly those on the Opposition benches. It is a very wrong principle to adopt; and I protest bitterly, as one interested in mining and in the other portfolios, of which I have some knowledge by virtue of being an ex-Minister concerned with their administration.

What is the use of my talking about railways and transport when the man concerned with the administration of those portfolios is probably at Timbuctu? What is the good of my talking about the development of the great mining industry? May I say at this juncture that I find there is no Ministerial inspiration in the Mines Department under this particular form of administration. We are on the verge of great possibilities in mining. It is impossible for us to assess the volume of wealth that lies hidden in the bosom of Mother Earth in this State.

When I was Minister I did my utmost, and would have continued, to have geological surveys made, followed by deep diamond drilling in order to obtain an assessment of the value of the wealth that lies dormant in Western Australia. The countries of the world are looking for certain minerals which this State possesses, although we do not know the value of the deposits. But to whom am I talking now? I might as well be addressing the Minister for Health, who has never seen a deeper hole than a post hole.

The Minister for Health: I have never seen a bigger misfit than you.

Mr. MARSHALL: I sympathise with the Minister. Her blindness must have been of lengthy duration. The Government has

taken away from members here any possibility of voicing effective and constructive criticism of the departments I have mentioned and has done it in this contemptible way. The members who sit behind the Government, particularly the young aspirants for political honours, had better have a quiet little chat on their own and then talk to the members of the Ministry. There is ample room for the exclusion of some portfolios and ample argument could be advanced for the return to this Chamber of the major portfolios I have mentioned.

It had been my intention to deal with what I consider to be a most important matter; but in view of the fact that time is limited, I will deal with only one other subject and leave till later the discussion of inflation, of which we hear so much and concerning which there is so much political expediency in order to further the political interests of different individuals and alleged statesmen, particularly Press-made statesmen. I think it is time I expressed my views on the propelling factors in the upward trend of the cost of living. Members will note that I have had nothing to say in regard to increased prices because I hold firm convictions as to the factors instrumental for increases, and I challenge any possibility of alteration from an upward trend, unless a change is made in the direction I am prepared to enunciate at a later date.

I noticed in the Press some time ago that the matter of meat was receiving a great deal of publicity, and that the Government had made up its mind to send to Canberra and get a gentleman known as Copland to come here and go into the ramifications of the meat business in Western Australia. I suppose the intention was to get a report as to the best means of handling this vexed problem. It came as quite a shock to me to know that the Government would bother about Professor Copland. Seemingly there are members and Ministers who have very short memories. This individual, as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, first found himself under the public gaze as an adviser to or writer-up for the private banks. He was the champion in Australia of the international financial Jew. I think he was appointed as financial adviser to the Government by the present Prime Minister, but I am not quite sure about that. He may have been appointed by "Call me Arty" when he was Prime Minister, but it was one of those leading statesmen—I don't think—who did appoint him. He is a professor, I believe, of economics.

Mr. Grayden: And a good one.

Mr. MARSHALL: I well remember the part this particular gentleman played in 1930; the results of his advocacy are indelibly fixed in my mind. This fellow Copland is without conscience. I will always forgive a man who advocates something

which he conscientiously believes to be correct, or the solution of a problem. But what happened with this gentleman? As I say, he sprang into popularity because of his ever-readiness to champion the interests of private banks. Daily, in the Press, there were letters of eulogy in that connection.

When the depression came in 1930 the Premiers were called together to formulate a plan; and notice the cunning and guile here! The Premiers had nothing to do with the plan other than to accept or reject it! That plan, although it was named the Premiers' Plan, was the plan of Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Gregory, two German Jews. Gregory's name is Guggenheim. That plan was no more the Premiers' Plan than the Bretton Woods Agreement was the outcome of a gathering together of international Prime Ministers or politicians. The Bretton Woods Agreement emanated in Wall-street, the home of the international Jew, and, so powerful is the international Jew, that a condition precedent to Great Britain's receiving a loan from America was that she should sign that agreement.

But let me get back to Copland. He and two others, Melville and Giblin, reviewed the Premier's Plan, so called. No doubt the Premiers were anxious for advice as to the possibility of the success of the plan, and so these three gentlemen were called in and they recommended it. Almost everyone, of an age at all, will remember the tragic circumstances that prevailed through giving effect to the Premiers' Plan. Here were professors of economics telling the Premiers that if they reduced the purchasing power of the people by 50 per cent. we would have prosperity, and they would be able to balance their budgets. Of course, there were never bigger deficits. There were no avenues of taxation, and hundreds of thousands of good Australian people stalked this sunny land in search of work while their wives and children eked out an existence by begging assistance by way of the dole from the Government.

That plan was ordained by Professor Copland who kept telling us all the time, "Prosperity is just around the corner; do another 12 months, and then another 12 months." Eventually the position became so critical that a change was made in the fiscal policy, and credit issues commenced to expand. If there is any young member in this House who imagines that Governments control the flow of money in and out of the pockets of the people in this country, he should disabuse his mind immediately, because they do not.

Mr. Grayden: Chifley wanted it, but they would not let him have it.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of the money that goes into circulation in Australia, 99 per cent. is created by the banks and one per cent. is legal tender money. I would not

be so severe in my criticism of this particular gentleman if it were not for the fact that after the dreadful circumstances the Premiers' Plan imposed upon the people of Australia, on his recommendation, he went to America and, when speaking to his colleagues there, the international Jews, he said that he knew the Premiers' Plan of Australia would not be a success, but as he was not asked to formulate a plan he took no responsibility for its dreadful effects. He knew all the time, as we know now only too well, what would be the results of his advice as a professor of economics.

I would have thought the very first job that the late John Curtin would do would be to dismiss that gentleman. I would never feel comfortable in taking his advice. But I find that he is now chancellor of a mythical university in Canberra. He will remain there to carry on his nefarious practices against the people of Australia until another crisis arises—then woe betide most of us!

I will leave the question of inflation to a later date and make one more brief observation before I conclude. I do not wish it to be thought that, because I do not propose to deal today with departmental administration or the requirements of my electorate, everything is O.K. I want water supplies, schools, roads and a multiplicity of other things for my electorate, but I would rather confine my remarks this evening to the subject to which I have given a lot of study and about which I possess a great number of facts and a lot of evidence. I state definitely that unless there is a material change in our monetary system there is very little hope of real progress ahead, either in Australia or in the world as a whole.

At a later stage of the session, as opportunity presents itself, I will deal with the urgent requirements of my electorate. For the present I say only that in the matter of railways and transport generally the Murchison area has always been treated badly. On every occasion when the Government or the Railway Department sets out to economise in this direction it is the Murchison electorate that is singled out for attention. That area has received worse treatment than any other in the State throughout the years that I have been in this House. I hope that there is a change looming on the horizon because we, of the Murchison area, have just about reached the point where we can stand this treatment no longer. I support the motion.

On motion by Mr. W. Hegney, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.3 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 5th September, 1950.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Motion : Medical Act, to disallow specialist rules	532
Address-in-reply, tenth day	535

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

MOTION—MEDICAL ACT.

To Disallow Specialist Rules.

Debate resumed from the 9th August on the following motion by Hon. J. G. Hislop:—

That new Rules 22 to 29 inclusive, and Form H, made under the Medical Act, 1894-1946, as published in the "Government Gazette" on the 21st October, 1949, and laid on the Table of the House on the 1st August, 1950, be and are hereby disallowed.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (Hon. C. H. Simpson—Midland) [4.35]: Dr. Hislop, in submitting his motion for the disallowance of these rules, which provide for the definition of the term "specialist," presented a very clear and cogent argument. These rules were prepared by the Medical Board, which, as members are aware, is appointed under the Medical Act to advise and assist the Government, and is comprised of six eminent and experienced medical practitioners.

The necessity for the rules came about as a result of an agreement reached between the Western Australian branch of the British Medical Association, the Fire and Accident Underwriters' Association of Western Australia and the State Government Insurance Office, which administers the Workers' Compensation Act. This agreement, which was finalised on the 1st April, 1950, and which came into operation on the 1st July, 1950, laid down general procedure, and adopted separate schedules of fees to be paid to general practitioners and to specialists. The Advisory Council, which recommended these provisions, was composed of three representatives of the Underwriters' Association and three members of the B.M.A. One of the recommendations was—

A specialist shall be defined as a medical practitioner who, either by special qualification or experience, shall be entitled, in the opinion of the Medical Board of Western Australia, to be enrolled on a special register kept by that board.