

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 23rd October, 1951.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Electoral, swearing-in of member	129
Questions : Garden produce marketing, as to dispute and Government intervention	129
Bus services, as to vehicles in service, ordered, etc.	130
Housing, as to homes exceeding 18 squares	130
Water piping, (a) as to road transport from Eastern States	131
(b) as to sea transport from Eastern States	131
Butter, as to increased price charged in Western Australia	131
Swan River, as to accumulation of algae	131
East Guildford Cemetery, as to maintenance	132
Lapsed Bills, restoration to notice paper, Council's message	145
Bills : Perpetual Executors, Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.), Limited Act (Private), Amendment, petition presented, Intro., 1r., referred to Select Committee	129
West Australian Trustee, Executor and Agency Company, Limited Act (Private), Amendment, petition presented, Intro., 1r., referred to Select Committee	129
Co-opted Medical and Dental Services for the Northern Portion of the State, 1r.	132
Supply, £11,000,000, Message, Standing Orders suspension, all stages	132
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, 3r.	143
Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r.	143
Optometrists Act Amendment, 3r.	143
Muja-Centaur Coal Mine Railway, 3r.	143
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, report	143
Library Board of Western Australia, Consideration of Committee's report	143
Inspection of Machinery Act Amendment, 1r.	145
Nurses Registration Act Amendment, 2r.	145
Bunbury (Roman Catholic Old Cemetery) Lands Revestment, returned	162
Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment, returned	162
Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve, (A1162) Council's amendment	162
War Service Land Settlement Agreement, Message, 2r.	162
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply, general debate	146
Speakers on financial policy :	
Hon. A. R. G. Hawke	146
Mr. Marshall	157

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

ELECTORAL—SWEARING-IN OF MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received the return of a writ for a vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. F. J. S. Wise,

showing that Noel Albert Butcher has been duly elected. I am prepared to swear-in the hon. member.

Mr. Butcher took and subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

BILL—PERPETUAL EXECUTORS TRUSTEES AND AGENCY COMPANY (W.A.), LIMITED ACT (PRIVATE) AMENDMENT.

Petition Presented.

Mr. Totterdell presented a petition from the agents for The Perpetual Executors, Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.), Limited, praying for leave to bring in a private Bill for "An Act to amend The Perpetual Executors, Trustees and Agency Company (W.A.), Limited Act, 1922."

Petition received and read.

In accordance with the prayer of the petition, leave given to introduce a Bill.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Referred to Select Committee.

Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Hearman, Hon. E. Nulsen, Hon. J. B. Sleeman, Mr. Bovell and Mr. Totterdell (mover), with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned and to report on Thursday, the 1st November.

BILL—WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR AND AGENCY COMPANY, LIMITED ACT (PRIVATE) AMENDMENT.

Petition Presented.

Mr. Totterdell presented a petition from the agents for the West Australian Trustee, Executor and Agency Company, Limited praying for leave to bring in a private Bill for "An Act to amend the West Australian Trustee, Executor and Agency Company, Limited Act."

Petition received and read.

In accordance with the prayer of the petition, leave given to introduce a Bill.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Referred to Select Committee.

Bill referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. Hearman, Hon. E. Nulsen, Hon. J. B. Sleeman, Mr. Bovell and Mr. Totterdell (mover), with power to call for persons and papers, to sit on days over which the House stands adjourned, and to report on Thursday, the 1st November.

QUESTIONS.

GARDEN PRODUCE MARKETING.

As to Dispute and Government Intervention.

Mr. LAWRENCE asked the Minister representing the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) Has he full knowledge of the dispute existing between the Market Gardeners' Association and the Retailers' Association?

(2) Is it a fact that the grower is not paid by buyers at the Metropolitan Markets for bags and crates used to contain garden produce?

(3) Has he authority under the Metropolitan Markets Act or any other Act to intervene and ensure fair treatment for the growers?

(4) If so, when does he intend to move in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Growers are paid for bags used as the weight of bags is included in the price paid for contents. Crates may be hired from the crate company.

(3) No, but he received a deputation from the Market Gardeners' Association. The position now appears back to normal.

(4) Answered by No. 3.

BUS SERVICES.

As to Vehicles in Service, Ordered, etc.

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

(1) How many petrol and diesel buses are in service on an average per day?

(2) How many trolley-buses are in service on an average per day?

(3) How many diesel and petrol buses are there at the depot?

(4) How many trolley-buses are there at the depot?

(5) How many petrol and diesel buses will be in the fleet when all those ordered have been delivered?

(6) How many trolley buses will be in the fleet when all those ordered are delivered?

(7) When all diesel, petrol and trolley-buses have been delivered, on which routes does the Government intend using them?

(8) How many, if any, will the department have to spare after the completion of all orders?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) 82.

(2) 43.

(3) 102.

(4) 75.

(5) 135.

(6) 90.

(7) (a) Trolley-buses—On all existing trolley-bus routes and on the Newcastle-st. and Bulwer-st. tram routes, which are to be converted and will absorb 10 trolley-buses. Through-routing of Wembley trolley-buses to loop around Wellington Square will require an additional five, while continuation of the Loch-st. Claremont, service along Vaucluse-st. will absorb seven. In addition six will provide regular replacements of trolley-buses withdrawn from service for servicing and overhauls and five must be held in reserve to cover emergencies.

(b) Omnibuses—On all existing routes and any extensions or deviations necessary to keep pace with building expansion. Ten of the buses now on order will replace old models to be disposed of, six will be regular replacement vehicles pending servicing and overhauls and six will be reserve vehicles to cover emergencies.

(8) (a) Trolley-buses—After allowing for disposition of trolley-buses as indicated in reply to Question (7), there will be a balance of 14, but this will not apply in the near future as fulfilment of present orders is subject to progress made by body-builders and will not be completed until 1953. In due course these are to be used to meet increasing demands on existing routes and future deviations or conversions still to be determined.

(b) Omnibuses—After allowing for disposition of vehicles as indicated in reply to Question (7), there will be a balance of 31. As in the case of trolley-buses, this position will not arise until delivery of existing orders is completed in 1953, but even this is dependent upon the resources of body-builders not being transferred to defence production before final deliveries are made. By this time at least some of the 31 will be needed to cover expansion of existing services and others will be required for service on tram routes which may in due course, be converted to omnibus operation.

HOUSING.

As to Homes Exceeding 18 Squares.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) How many persons have been granted permits by the State Housing Commission during the past two years to erect houses exceeding 18 squares?

(2) What was the area authorised in each case?

(3) Have all of such dwellings been inspected for the purpose of ascertaining if the requirements of the permits have been complied with?

(4) In how many cases have buildings in excess of the permitted area of 18 squares or more been exceeded?

(5) In how many such instances have legal proceedings been taken?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Information relating to permits for buildings in excess of 18 squares is not specifically recorded and to supply it would necessitate the examination of several hundred files covering all building permits.

(3) No. The number of inspectors engaged on the work is insufficient to enable all buildings operations to be inspected.

(4) It is not known as it has not been possible to check up on all permits issued.

(5) Since July, 1949, proceedings have been taken in 46 cases for building in excess of authorised area, including two cases for building in excess of 18 squares.

WATER PIPING.*(a) As to Road Transport from Eastern States.*

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Housing:

(1) Were tenders invited for the road transport of the large quantity of water piping from the Eastern States which cost the Government £10,004?

(2) Was Mr. R. O. Williams the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Tenders were not invited as delivery of piping was a matter of extreme urgency and the Minister for Housing was in the Eastern States when he was advised that limited supplies of pipe, so urgently needed, were offering at Newcastle, provided early transport could be arranged. No sea transport was available and as contractor Williams had previously been in touch with Stewart & Lloyds regarding pipe carting, Cabinet approval was given to arrangements being finalised with him, before the Minister returned from the Eastern States.

(2) Answered by No. 1.

(b) As to Sea Transport from Eastern States.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN asked the Minister for Supply and Shipping:

What quantity of water piping was brought by sea from the Eastern States for the State Housing Commission during the past 12 months?

The MINISTER replied:

Inquiries indicate that 4,160 tons of galvanised pipe arrived by ship in this State from Newcastle consigned to the local branch of the manufacturers for issue to consumers on priorities granted by the State Housing Commission.

BUTTER.*As to Increased Price Charged in Western Australia.*

Mr. J. HEGNEY asked the Attorney General:

(1) Has he read the statement on page 1 of "The West Australian" dated Wednesday, the 17th October, under the heading "All States in line on Butter Prices"?

(2) If he has, is he now satisfied that the price charged to consumers of butter in South Australia, Tasmania and Victoria has been 3s. 1½d. per lb., and as from the 17th October the same price will operate in New South Wales and Queensland?

(3) In view of the fact that all States and the Commonwealth were joined in a conference some weeks ago in an endeavour to agree on a uniform local price, and it was subsequently reported in the Press that the State of Western Australia was in line with the three States mentioned in Question (1), will he now give a direction to

the Prices Commissioner to reduce the price now chargeable to consumers in Western Australia (namely 3s. 2d. per lb.) down to 3s. 1½d. per lb. and thus prevent the consumers in Western Australia from being exploited ½d. per lb. more than the consumers in the other five States?

(4) Will he inform the House who authorised the payment of ½d. per lb. above the level price agreed on in the first instance?

(5) Who received the benefit—the producers or retailers in Western Australia, or the producers on an Australia-wide basis?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied:

(1) Yes.

(2), (3) and (4) It was agreed by Victoria, Tasmania, Western Australia and South Australia, in conjunction with the Commonwealth that the retail price of butter should be increased by 1½d. per lb., being the amount necessary to pay to the producers the cost of production of butter as determined by the Commonwealth Government after inquiry by the Joint Dairying Industry Advisory Committee, and this was carried into effect.

In 1946 Western Australia joined the Federal Dairy Products Stabilisation Scheme, and the producers in Western Australia, under the scheme, were allowed an extra ½d. per lb. This allowance has been paid to producers in Western Australia since that time and is still being paid. It is not intended to alter this arrangement.

The retail price of butter is the same in Western Australia, Victoria and Tasmania.

(5) The extra amount in Western Australia is paid to the producers.

SWAN RIVER.*As to Accumulation of Algae.*

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

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a picture in "The West Australian" of today showing a thick bank of rotting algae along the beach near Como jetty?

(2) Is he also aware that yesterday Point Walter bank was in a similar condition?

(3) Will he see that something is done to obviate further pollution in order to prevent the Swan River from becoming just a stagnant pool?

The MINISTER replied:

Yes, I did see the picture. It is one that could possibly be taken every year. I will take whatever action is necessary to have the algae cleaned up, moving in conjunction with the local authority whose responsibility it is.

EAST GUILDFORD CEMETERY.*As to Maintenance.*

Mr. BRADY (without notice) asked the Minister for Lands:

(1) Has the Minister seen references in the daily papers regarding the state of the East Guildford cemetery?

(2) If so, is he in communication with the local governing body, or the persons responsible for maintaining the cemetery in good condition?

The MINISTER replied:

No, I did not see the Press statement, and I have not been in touch with the local governing body concerned.

BILL—CO-OPTED MEDICAL AND DENTAL SERVICES FOR THE NORTHERN PORTION OF THE STATE.

Introduced by the Minister for Health and read a first time.

BILL—SUPPLY, £11,000,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, resolved:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day.

Message.

Message from the Administrator received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

In Committee of Supply.

The House resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Perkins in the Chair.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [4.50]: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the State for the year ending the 30th June, 1952, a sum not exceeding £11,000,000.

Additional supply is required until the Estimates are passed by Parliament. The estimated amount required is £11,000,000 made up of £7,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and £4,000,000 from the General Loan Fund. The high cost of materials and services has greatly increased the cost of administration and the maintenance of development works and services. The expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the three months ended the 30th September, 1951, was briefly—

Special Acts	£1,501,514
Governmental	£3,186,881
Public Utilities	£3,199,047

That makes a total of £7,887,442. Interest and sinking fund, included under special Acts, amounts to £1,226,394. The revenue collected during the three months ended the 30th September, 1951, is made up as follows—

	£
Taxation	2,497,520
Territorial	181,250
Law Courts	39,822
Departmental	687,666
Royal Mint	26,313
Commonwealth Grants	1,305,859
Public Utilities	3,088,161
Trading Concerns	2,605

That total is £7,829,196. The deficit for the three months ended the 30th September, 1951, was £58,246. The expenditure from the General Loan Fund for the three months ended the 30th September, 1951, reads as follows:—

	£
Departmental (salaries and incidentals)	56,404
Railways and Tramways	514,588
Electricity Supply	466,296
Harbours and Rivers	349,556
Water Supplies and Sewerage	536,813
Development of Goldfields	38,039
Development of Agriculture	84,632
Public Buildings	259,184
Other	19,773
State Sawmills	70,000
Purchase of Plant Suspense	45,000
State Brick Works	35,000
State Housing Commission (Advances on account of evicted tenants, etc.)	60,000
Kent River Saw Mill	30,000
Total	£2,565,285

The Supply Bill introduced last session provided for £6,000,000 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £2,500,000 from the General Loan Fund, and £500,000 from Advance to Treasurer—a total of £9,000,000.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [4.55]: I have no objection to the motion before the Committee. Normally there is a debate upon a motion for Supply such as the one now before us, but on this occasion we have the Budget debate right at hand. That debate offers all the opportunities which anyone might need to discuss any phase associated with the financing of the State, either in connection with expenditure from Consolidated Revenue or from the General Loan Fund. In the circumstances, there seems to be no necessity for debate, to any extent, to take place upon this motion or in connection with the Supply Bill which the Premier will introduce very shortly. Therefore, I indicate my support of the motion.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.56]: I am not in such a favourable position as the Leader of the Opposition when he says that nothing should be done. I think the time has arrived when something should be said about the wild spending of the Premier. He seems to be getting more money than he knows what to do with, and I do not think we should agree to Supply to the extent he requires. At least we should take some action later on to cut out an expenditure of £100,000. It appears that the Premier is just running wild, and the Committee should do something now to stop this extravagant expenditure.

The other evening we passed a Bill dealing with the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, and from the Estimates I see that the Premier still proposes to go on with subsidising the road cartage of super. Last year he told us that the estimated expenditure for this subsidy would be £180,000. Not only did the Premier spend that £180,000, but the sum was increased to £240,000. You, Mr. Chairman, would be in a position to know whether the farmers of this country, at the moment, are in need of any assistance, especially when we consider the high prices they are receiving for their wheat and wool. The Premier has budgeted for an expenditure of £100,000 for this work, but I suppose that next year we will find that the expenditure will have been £150,000 or £200,000 and considerable damage will have been done to our roads. As I have already mentioned this session, if the farmers were in a bad way and prices were very low, and the farmers were having difficulty in carrying on, I would be one of the first to endeavour to help them. But this is no time to be helping the farmers and giving them £240,000 from the public purse.

Mr. Marshall: They are about to get a further increase from it too.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN: We should tell the Premier that this Committee is not prepared to go on paying out money to farmers who are receiving such wonderful returns from their products. I notice, too, that there is a large amount set down for exchange. I thought that the member for Murchison might have had a word to say about that. However, I think we should do something to prevent the Premier from carrying out this wild spending of public money. He is helping his friends and they are the people who are making so much money at the moment. Those people, in their wildest dreams, never anticipated receiving the prices that are being paid for their products these days. We should say to the Premier, "You have gone quite far enough. These people can afford to pay for the cartage of their own super." A subsidy of £240,000 is terrific and we should say, "Stop" to that sort of expenditure from public funds.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray—in reply) [4.59]: As the Leader of the Opposition indicated members will have full opportunity to discuss every item on the Estimates, including the matters referred to by the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Hoar: And where does it get you if you do discuss them?

The PREMIER: The hon. member has been here a long time and he should know all about that.

Mr. Hoar: But I do not think you know where it would get you.

The PREMIER: Yes, I think I could tell the hon. member and I am sure he knows it himself.

Mr. Marshall: It got him the Premier-ship.

The PREMIER: When the Estimates are under discussion it is desired to give members all the information they require, and any matters that are brought forward will receive the consideration of the departments concerned. The subsidy referred to by the member for Fremantle on super. is set down this year at £100,000, and I would point out to the hon. member—although he knows it already—that the cost of super. to the farmer has very greatly increased.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: So has the price of his wheat and wool.

The PREMIER: No, there is rather a tendency for wool to come down. An attempt has been made to see that all farmers get their super. at a comparable freight. The railways, of course, are unable to cope with the whole of the traffic offering in regard to super., and they will not be for some time.

Mr. Marshall: They will not be if you give the Midland Railway Co. all our rollingstock.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is right off the track. We are hoping that the railways will be able to carry more than they have indicated to us at the present time. New locomotives are landing at fairly frequent intervals, as is new rollingstock.

Mr. Brady: You will have no train crews if you do not build houses for them.

The PREMIER: We are fully aware of the fact that railway employees are short of houses and every effort is being made to supply them. I think there is already considerable activity in that regard in the hon. member's district.

Mr. Brady: A lot of promises but nothing is done.

The PREMIER: If there is no work going on I am afraid the cause must be the usual one of the shortage of labour and materials. I know that the Railways Commissioners are making every possible effort to get houses for their employees, and we know these are in short supply. The

Minister will be able to give the member for Guildford-Midland information as to the number of houses already erected for those employees, and also the figures of the number under construction. The member for Fremantle said something about exchange and invited the member for Murchison to comment on it. The increase in the exchange rate is due to the fact that we are getting so much material from oversea.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: We are not getting too much steel from oversea.

The PREMIER: We are getting many of those articles in short supply, such as steel, cement, locomotives, rollingstock and so on.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They have grabbed the market in Japan and stopped us from getting supplies from there.

The PREMIER: The rearmament programme is of the utmost urgency and is seriously affecting steel supplies. I repeat that full information will be given to members as the Estimates are discussed.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

In Committee of Ways and Means.

The House resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Perkins in the Chair.

The PREMIER: I move—

That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1952, a sum not exceeding £7,000,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and £4,000,000 from the General Loan Fund.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

Bill Introduced.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [5.6]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Issue and application of £11,000,000:

Mr. MARSHALL: I agree with the member for Fremantle in his objection to giving concessions to a section of the community that exists in an atmosphere of prosperity. I take great exception to proposals which

provide that the half million people of this sunny land of ours should be involved in an annual expenditure of £5,000,000 for interest and charges, that are from time to time imposed as fees for the flotation of loan moneys and the exchange on interest payments. What I take particular exception to is that the Budget is so framed that one can refer to one part of it which shows all the borrowings—that is direct borrowings by the Government—and then in another place we find incidental borrowings, such as £500,000 for the East Perth power station, another £250,000 for wire netting, and £10,000 or £15,000 on some other matter.

Interest which we do not see is being paid on all of this. If we want to find out about it we have to go right through the Premier's Department and segregate all these borrowings; we also have to go through the smaller amounts borrowed and the interest paid on them to get a fair idea of the financial position of this State. I will have something to say, in a motion which I propose to move tomorrow, on taxation and inflation. I want to take this opportunity of warning this Government, or any other Government, that places confidence in a professor—or an alleged professor of economics, who is now known as Sir Douglas Copland. If my memory serves me right this man came into public favour many years ago, at which time he was employed in writing favourable articles in support of the present banking system.

The Premier: He was an adviser to the late Mr. Curtin and the late Mr. Chifley.

Mr. MARSHALL: And if I had been in the late Mr. Curtin's position and had his authority Professor Copland would have been the first man I would have dismissed. I am not going to accept Professor Copland as being a fool—I think rather that he is a knave. That is my opinion of him.

Mr. Grayden: That is a very nice aspersions to cast!

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not think it would be very difficult to prove. As I say he received prominence as a writer in support of the present banking system and he secured favourable gazes from a prominent State's member—and I refer to the State of Victoria—by the name of R. G. Menzies.

Mr. Graham: Never heard of him!

Mr. MARSHALL: It was through the good offices of Mr. Menzies that this gentleman became a civil servant in the Commonwealth Government; he was writing very favourable articles in support of the present banking system. That is when he first became prominent so far as the public of Australia were concerned. Later on he was taken into the favoured service of that hon. gentleman—R. G. Menzies—who had then been promoted from the State Parliament of Victoria to the Commonwealth Parliament.

The Minister for Lands: You call that promotion.

Mr. MARSHALL: As a professor of economics that man endorsed what was known as the Premiers' Plan; he sanctioned it and recommended it to the Premiers.

The Premier: Most of them were Labour Premiers.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not going to be side-tracked. I do not care whether they were Labour Premiers or any other Premiers. I hold distinct views on the subject of finance. I am not too favourably disposed to many of the statesmen—if you would like to call them statesmen, actually they are Press-made statesmen, self-styled as such. What statesmanship are we receiving now? The results speak for themselves. Where is their statesmanship in the situation we see around us, either nationally or internationally? If this is the best alleged statesmen can do after 1950 years of Christianity, then all I can say is, "God help us." Professor Copland recommended the Premiers' Plan and, if my memory serves me right, there were two others, namely Melville and Giblin. I am not sure about the latter two gentlemen, but without doubt Copland with characteristic cunning, drew up that financial agreement and got the States to adopt it. They did not call it the Niemeyer plan or the Guggenheimer plan—they called it the Premiers' Plan. As a matter of fact, the Premiers never had a thing to do with it. They had to accept it. Why was that? Does my smiling friend, the member for Nedlands, agree or disagree on that point?

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: He is an economist himself!

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, he is an economist who typifies Copland himself.

Mr. Grayden: That is the most flattering statement you could make about me.

Mr. MARSHALL: Will he agree with the suggestion that if there is a reduction in the purchasing power of the community it will bring prosperity in the course of time, and that the more we lower the standard of living the more prosperous individuals will be? That is the argument that Copland advances.

The Premier: I have here a very good book written by Professor Copland. It is entitled "Inflation and Expansion."

Mr. MARSHALL: I have it, and have read it.

The Minister for Lands: What do you think of it?

Mr. MARSHALL: What I am most annoyed about, particularly in regard to this gentleman, is that he recommended this so-called Premiers' Plan, knowing that the effect would be to starve many thousands of good Australians, that it would force through the bankruptcy court many thousands of small business people and because

of degradation and desperation cause the deaths of many people—all in consequence of this so-called Premiers' Plan. Despite all this, this man could go to America and in the course of a lecture to some organisation there inform his hearers that he knew the Premiers' Plan that operated in Australia would never succeed, but that as he had not formulated it, he accepted no responsibility in that respect. I put it to the member for Nedlands—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. member to connect his remarks with the clause.

Mr. MARSHALL: I may be a bit out of order, Mr. Chairman, and there will be plenty of opportunities to deal with the matter, but I will—

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to keep to the Bill.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Move to reduce the amount and you can talk at length!

Mr. MARSHALL: Reduce! We should reduce the whole of the amount mentioned in the clause because of the inability of our alleged statesmen to see where we are drifting. I have several letters here, including one that was featured in yesterday's issue of "The West Australian," under the heading "Copland's Proposal for Dollar Problem." In the course of that communication it is clear that Professor Copland was inviting the British Empire to dismember itself, and he was asking Australia to get rid of its association with the United Kingdom and to link up with the United States of America. That is your Copland!

The Premier: That is your interpretation of the publication.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is no question about it at all. This man Copland is in the confidence of the international Jews, whose one idea is to bring the countries of the world into one great organisation in the shape of a world federation. This man is no stranger to the international Jew, nor is R. G. Menzies, who returned from abroad only a little while ago. Hence we have the Budget we read about just recently. I agree that my remarks may be slightly irrelevant to the clause, but I have particulars I will place before members and I will have other opportunities to do so. At the proper time I will read the communication to which I have referred and, if any member can place another interpretation upon it, I shall be pleased. To my mind, it represents a very snide method of getting Australia away from the British Empire and linking it up with Canada, which is so closely associated with the United States of America. Copland is a man who would stoop to that sort of thing.

The Premier: That is most unfair.

Mr. MARSHALL: No, it is not. If I had committed the crime that this man was responsible for in 1930 in starving hundreds of thousands of good Australians

when he recommended the Premier's Plan, when he caused many thousands throughout the community to be placed in a most deplorable position due to circumstances that arose owing to the depression, so that they committed suicide, I would think I was a miserable individual. This man knew better, but thousands upon thousands suffered because of his action.

The Premier: You are using most extravagant language, not factual by any means.

Mr. MARSHALL: No language that I could use with reference to this man's crime could be regarded as extravagant.

The Premier: He was adviser to a number of Governments.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not concerned about that at all.

The Premier: No, of course not.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MARSHALL: I do not care what advice he gave or whom he advised.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MARSHALL: I certainly do not agree with the attitude of this man, or with the suggestion that if we lower the standard of living the people will be more prosperous throughout Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must link up his remarks with the clause.

Mr. MARSHALL: We should reduce the amount of money to be voted. It seems to be a policy of borrowing and spending. We could cut off £4,000,000 or £5,000,000.

The Premier: Let us hear from the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am sick to death of this hypocrisy which has caused the people to lose respect for the institution of Parliament and politicians, and to spit in our faces.

The Minister for Lands: They do nothing of the sort.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will have other opportunities to go further with this matter.

Mr. GRAYDEN: We have heard the member for Murchison deal with matters regarding Professor Copland—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow the member for Nedlands to deal with the remarks of the member for Murchison.

Mr. GRAYDEN: But surely if you, Mr. Chairman, allowed the member for Murchison so much latitude, it is only fair that others should receive the same consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must relate his remarks to the clause.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Where has your Bill gone?

Mr. Marshall: Yes, tell us about that.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The member for Murchison was allowed a great deal of latitude and I think that I should be given the same consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: I ruled that the member for Murchison was not in order and that he had to relate his remarks to the clause.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I am surprised that our young economist from Nedlands was so easily beaten on that point. It ought to be clear to him that there are quite a number of ways by which he could have done as he desired without being rude to you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to hear his views regarding Professor Copland.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the member for Fremantle to relate his remarks to the clause.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I could move to reduce the amount by £100,000 and give reasons why that should be done. In the course of doing that, I think I could bring in references to Professor Copland. I could make it clear that we are not prepared to give the Premier his £11,000,000. When our Premier was in charge of the finances he would have danced with joy if he could have obtained £5,000,000, but the present Premier comes along and gets more and more so that he can spend it here, there and everywhere. He told us that he was going to give the farmers £100,000 for the cartage of their super by road. He told us last year that he was going to provide £180,000 for that purpose, but when he presented his Budget he told us that he had spent £240,000 during the 12 months on super carting for the farmers. Let members work that out quickly, and let us know what the amount will be if we grant £100,000 this year.

Mr. Nalder: That expenditure would not have been necessary if the Labour Government had done its job.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I shall be glad to hear the views of the member for Katanning and to have his explanation. If he can convince me on the point, I shall be the first to congratulate him. However, that is one reason why we should reduce the amount we are asked to vote. There are other reasons why the amount should be reduced and it is not hard to find them. For instance, we might ask why the Premier is not prepared to refund the £150 that was taken from men at Fremantle who had committed no crime at all. The Premier has done nothing about recouping them the amount of their fines. He is prepared to recoup the farmers to the extent of £100,000, but he will not recoup the Fremantle workers any of the £150 or so that they were fined. I think we should reduce the Vote to £6,900,000 plus another £150 so that we may recoup men who have been fined although they have committed no crime at all.

The Attorney General: The men have not paid the fines yet!

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: They were not working on the tug-boat.

The Attorney General: You know this matter is sub-judice and that it has not been finalised.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I know these men have not been recouped their fines, if that is what the Minister means.

The Attorney General: You know they are appealing.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: In my opinion, the Minister led us astray on this matter. He said that the Government had not done anything and that it was the Arbitration Court that had acted. But the papers do not show that the court acted on its own but that Mr. Rudderham wrote a letter to the Arbitration Court, and suggested it should go on with the business and have these workers fined. Then Mr. Hardouin, the secretary of the Marine Employers' Association at Fremantle—

Mr. Bovell: What has this to do with the clause?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: —also suggested that action should be taken. So the Arbitration Court sat up and decided to go on with the business. Mr. Bogue then got busy. I have a lot of time for Mr. Bogue because he is a man of common-sense. However, he got pushed around. If he had not been pushed around, he would not have taken the action he did. I think we should amend the clause so as to allow for refunds to be paid to these workers at Fremantle. I tell the Premier that if he does not pay, he will stand to lose a lot more. I will give the Premier some fool's advice and tell him that, if he does not pay, there is going to be more trouble. I do not know how much support I would get if I moved an amendment to reduce the amount to £6,900,000.

Mr. Graham: A lot of them on the other side of the House are with you.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I do not know whether they are. They should be, because the Premier is getting for too much money and does not know how to spend it.

The Premier: Have you looked through the Estimates?

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Members opposite always know which side of their bread is buttered. Notwithstanding that the people I refer to wrote to the Arbitration Court and advised that prosecutions should be launched so that some of their hard-earned money could be taken from the workers, when the same sort of thing happened on the m.v. "Koolinda" nothing was done about it, because the Government thought it would interfere with their friends the wool people and pastoralists in the North.

The Premier: And we did not do anything to the other men either.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Not much!

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: The men on the m.v. "Koolinda" got away with it, but the other workers at Fremantle will have to pay money they could ill afford to lose.

The Minister for Education: But they have not paid the fines.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: They have to pay or go to gaol.

The Minister for Education: The point is that the men have not paid out money they can ill afford to lose.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I warn the Government that the tug-boats may be lying idle if the Premier refuses to refund the fines. If the tugs are idle and in heavy wind a ship should hit the breakwater, Sleeman's dream will probably come true and we will have the harbour constructed outside the river. That is the only good point about it. However, it does not appear likely that I shall receive much support for an amendment, but I will have something more to say on the subject when we are dealing with the Estimates.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 2, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. D. R. McLarty—Murray) [5.29]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. GRAYDEN (Nedlands) [5.30]. During the debate in Committee, the member for Murchison made some very grave reflections on Professor Copland, who is the Chancellor of the National University.

Mr. Hoar: You mean, when he compared him with you?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I was very flattered when he did. I feel that Professor Copland is a very good Australian and has done much to help the Governments of Australia, both nationally and internationally. The member for Murchison implied that he almost directly caused about 100,000 people to starve; that he deliberately and wilfully wrecked our economy and caused people to suicide; and all this because he knew the Premiers' Plan was wrong and yet he did not disapprove of it. In support of all those grave reflections, the hon. member put forward not one jot of evidence. When a member can get up in this Chamber and, without giving facts, can slander a very good Australian like that, the House is falling into disrepute and the standard of debate is being lowered.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Federal member for Swan is a bit like that, too.

Mr. GRAYDEN: I would point out to the member for Murchison that during the depression in Australia, economics was

not quite so far advanced as it is now. That science has greatly advanced because of the experiences of the depression and the facts that we were able to adduce from it. Economics was then in the position that faced medicine a few years ago. It is not so long ago when there were no anaesthetics, and a doctor would cut off a man's leg without using one. At present, anaesthetics are used and medicine has progressed to that extent. Yet who would criticise the doctor of the year 1800 for not giving an anaesthetic to a man, when anaesthetics were unknown?

It is not so long ago, either, when doctors used to bleed their patients and thought they were doing the right thing. Everybody agreed then that they were right. We would not criticise them now for having done something which we are aware was wrong, for they just did not know. That was the stage which economics had reached during the depression. People did not know the right answer.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Are you saying that Professor Copland did not know?

Mr. GRAYDEN: I feel that the Premiers' Plan was misguided. I do not think it had the desired effect at all, but I feel it was not a deliberate attempt to smash the people and starve them.

Mr. Marshall: Why did Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Guggenheim come here? Did they not know?

Mr. GRAYDEN: They tried to have put into effect what they thought was the right course for Australia to follow.

Mr. Marshall: You are an unsophisticated, innocent boy. I would like to have you on the platform at Nedlands.

Mr. GRAYDEN: The hon. member says that Professor Copland deliberately caused people to starve, yet he has produced no evidence whatever to support that claim. I do not think members should take any notice of claims put forward such as that, or any statements made by the member for Murchison which he cannot substantiate.

Mr. Marshall: I will give you substantiation now, you poor, unsophisticated, innocent mug!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [5.35]: I hope the member for Murchison was not speaking to me.

Mr. Yates: He was looking at you.

Mr. Marshall: I would have omitted the reference to innocence if I had been.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I rather think the member for Nedlands has protested far too much in regard to what Professor Copland, and others who acted for him in Australia in 1931, really knew about the economic situation at that time.

Mr. Grayden: It is easy to be wise after the event; that is the point I am making.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am completely clear as to the point the hon. member made. I am not rising to express any doubt or confusion about what he meant by what he said, but I am rising to disagree very strongly with his claim that Professor Copland, Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Gregory, as he was called in Australia—

Mr. Marshall: Professor Gregory is right!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —did not know the results which would flow from the financial and economic policy which Professor Copland then recommended to Governments in Australia, and which Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Gregory compelled the Governments of Australia to adopt. I do not know whether the member for Nedlands remembers—

Mr. J. Hegney: He is too young.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —the attitude which the present Speaker of this House was adopting at that time in regard to financial and economic questions. If he does, he will remember clearly that in those days our present Speaker was condemning very strongly the suggestions and recommendations of Professor Copland and those working with him to impoverish further the general run of people within Australia.

What was the situation in Australia at that time under the financial set-up which then existed? It was that Governments were acutely short of income both in respect of Consolidated Revenue and general loan funds. They were short of revenue because the income of our industries had been reduced to a ruinous degree, partly because of lower prices for export goods and partly because of the banking policy followed in Australia at that time. They were short of loan moneys because those in control of the financial system of Australia then would not make loan moneys available to them. Obviously, the problem was one of shortage of purchasing power in the hands of the Australian people.

The Premier: And in the hands of most people of the world.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The ability of people to buy goods had been cut down to a ruinous degree by a banking policy which was deliberate. The member for Nedlands would have the House believe that the policy of the bankers, whose spokesmen were Professor Copland, Sir Otto Niemeyer and Professor Gregory, was followed through ignorance and without any understanding or knowledge of the results which would flow from that policy.

Mr. Grayden: They knew the results that would flow, but they did not know the alternative.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think the bankers would not appreciate for one second the abysmal ignorance which the member for Nedlands now ascribes to them. I am sure they had a considerable understanding of the results which would flow from the policy which they forced

not only upon the Governments in Australia, but also upon all sections of industry in Australia, including primary industries.

The Premier: Yet their own assets seriously declined.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Their own assets seriously declined in money value for the time being, but they came into possession of a much greater volume of assets than they had before the onset of the economic slump; and subsequently, when they had come into possession of a greatly increased volume of assets that had fallen into their hands because farmers, business people and home-owners by the hundred had been forced to surrender them to the financial institutions of which those bankers had control, the other policy of inflation, or reflation, as it was fancifully called at the time, was set in motion by those institutions as a matter of deliberate financial policy.

The Premier: Oh!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: With the result that the financial institutions concerned more than recovered the depreciation of their assets which they experienced from 1931 to 1934 or 1935. You, Mr. Speaker, were not a banker at the time, nor was I. Nor have we become bankers since. But it was obvious to you and to me, and to tens of thousands of ordinary people in Australia at the time, that the inevitable result of continuing to cut down the ability of people to purchase even the essentials of life could only make the problem worse from week to week and from month to month. Obviously, if a problem has been created in which there is a surplus of goods and people are in extreme and desperate need of those goods to keep body and soul together, the worst thing to do is to make it even harder for those people to buy the surplus goods in the markets by keeping them on 7s. per week per unit by way of sustenance and giving them no other income at all. Yet that was the policy which Professor Copland recommended to Governments, and which the representatives of international finance in the persons of Professor Gregory and Sir Otto Niemeyer compelled the Governments of Australia to accept and put into operation.

The Premier: With regard to those surplus goods you talk about, was not the trouble caused in the main by the fact that we could not get good prices for them outside our own country?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have already explained that and pointed it out as being one of the factors.

The Premier: You cannot blame Professor Copland, or any other of our advisers, for that state of affairs.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not blaming Professor Copland for that state of affairs, but I am saying that, when we have in a country, as we had in Australia

during those years, an abundance of wheat, an abundance of wool and an abundance of every other class of foodstuff and all the raw materials from which clothing is made, it is a crime of the greatest magnitude for anyone in authority to force upon Governments a policy which divorces almost entirely from those essentials of life the mass of the population within that country.

The Premier: Was not the trouble outside more than inside the country?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Certainly not!

The Premier: It was. The price offering for our exportable goods was the difficulty.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have already referred to that and have then asked the Premier to try to comprehend the commonsense realities of the situation within Australia at that time, when we had mountains, as it were, of wheat and wool and large quantities of every other class of commodity and foodstuff, with surpluses in every direction—

The Premier: Only because we could not get them out of the country.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Why did we not do something to enable people within Australia, who were existing on a semi-starvation basis, to get a share of all those things at that time?

The Attorney General: Because the Premiers did not have enough commonsense. That is the answer.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What does the Attorney General suggest they should have done?

The Attorney General: They had all the authority.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What does the Attorney General suggest they should have done?

The Attorney General: They should have done something better. That is what you are suggesting.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Will the Attorney General indicate, in specific terms, what he thinks the Premiers should have done? I will indicate what I think they should have done, which is what I said in 1931, 1932 and 1933. I am trying to find out whether the Attorney General has anything worthwhile to offer to the debate, but it is obvious that he has not. He is just speaking in generalities when he reflects on the Premiers of those days.

The Attorney General: They had the authority and power.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What authority and power?

The Attorney General: They had full authority over the whole economic life of Australia.

Mr. Marshall: Do not be childish; the banking institutions had it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It would be interesting to have from the Attorney General, in specific terms, a statement of the authority and power that the Premiers of the Australian States had at that time.

The Attorney General: They had authority to legislate, just as they have now.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: One can pass all the Acts of Parliament in the world in connection with a situation of that kind but, if those who control the creation and issue of the nation's credit are untouched by that legislation, it achieves absolutely nothing.

The Attorney General: I agree, but they could have been touched.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the Attorney General's present-day knowledge of what happened at that time is as good as he would seem to indicate, he should know that efforts were made in the Commonwealth Parliament to overcome the private financial dictatorship of vested interests in relation to the creation and issue of credit within Australia in those days.

Mr. Grayden: But could you use money printed in Australia to pay overseas commitments?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I always enjoy the humour of the member for Nedlands, even when it is unconscious. I had the privilege of being allowed to write articles to "The West Australian" and the "Daily News" during the depression years.

Mr. Graham: How things have changed!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: During that period I indicated, as did you, Mr. Speaker, in a different form, that at least sufficient bank credit should have been created and made available to Governments to enable them to continue to operate their public works, housing policies, and so on—sufficient at least to have enabled them to employ, on a reasonable basis, the Australian workers and give them and their families each week an amount of purchasing power adequate to their needs, and sufficient to keep up a reasonable demand within Australia for foodstuffs, clothing and the like, so that essential industries would not have to collapse, as they were allowed or forced to collapse at that time as the result of the financial policy enforced upon Governments of all descriptions in this country by the private financial dictatorship that existed within Australia, supported, of course by a similar dictatorship in the international field.

Mr. Grayden: You have still not told us how you would have met our overseas commitments

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We would have met our overseas financial commitments to the extent that we were able to meet them by exporting whatever products we had

surplus to our own requirements, in those instances where overseas countries were willing to purchase what we had to sell.

The Premier: They were willing to purchase, but could not.

Mr. Grayden: And repudiate the rest?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If we are to enter into a discussion about repudiation, I think we will find there is no nation on earth that at some time or other has not, in either a respectable or a non-respectable way repudiated. We know that, as things happened during the last depression, the Australian Government was compelled to repudiate.

Mr. Marshall: Every Government, both State and Commonwealth!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Of course they were compelled to repudiate. We had the compulsory reduction of interest to every bondholder in Australia. Great Britain had to repudiate commitments to the U.S.A., and we know that when any nation is forced down into absolute poverty it cannot escape either repudiating portion of its obligations or obtaining some forgiveness of them because, in a desperate situation of that kind, no nation could possibly continue to meet in full its obligations to all creditors. I therefore say that Professor Copland did know what he was doing in 1931.

Mr. Marshall: I'll say he did!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I say that he and those who acted with him knew the inevitable result of the policy they were putting into operation, because that policy inflicted a further dose of deflation on the Australian people, further reducing their incomes and compelling Governments to dismiss from their employment tens of thousands of people additional to those that had already been dismissed. It compelled Governments, in turn, to tax people and industries more heavily, thus making it even more difficult for those industries, which had survived and had managed to struggle on, to keep going. One could continue speaking on this theme for a long while.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Then continue and teach the member for Nedlands something.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: All I hope is that the member for Nedlands is right when he suggests that Professor Copland and others, who might have a very great influence in formulating policy in Australia in the near future, have since 1931 and the years that followed learned a great deal. I most earnestly hope that the member for Nedlands is right on that point, because it would indeed be a tragedy if those gentlemen had not today much more constructive and humanitarian ideas, as to how problems of that kind should be prevented from arising, than they had then. There is not the slightest doubt that in a country such as Australia, with its great capacity to produce primary products and

foodstuffs, together with the raw materials for clothing and housing the people, there is no financial need for any of our people to go short of the essentials of life.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [5.55]: I desire to make a few observations in answer to the views put forward by the member for Nedlands. I do not know whether he suffers from a form of deafness, but he accused me of making accusations against a most worthy citizen, without putting forward substantial facts in support of the statement. He said that I slandered this particular individual. I am referring to Professor Copland. I thought that while speaking a few moments ago I explained why I said the worthy professor was a knave. I said that because it was he who recommended what has been known as "the Premiers' plan," but which was not the Premiers' plan at all. The Premiers sat in waiting for these professors of economics to draw up a plan. If the hon. member wants to know anything about it—and seemingly he does not—the records of the discussions by the Premiers on the recommendation of those professors are available in this House.

Mr. Grayden: I was asking for proof, and you have not given it yet.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member will know much more about it if he examines these records. He will see that Professor Copland recommended that plan and then went to America and disowned it. When there he said he knew it would fail.

Mr. Grayden: Show us where he said that.

Mr. MARSHALL: He said he knew it would fail but that, as he was not asked to make a recommendation to the Premiers, he did not feel he was responsible for the plan at all. So Professor Copland knew the position all along and yet he used to write articles to the Press, at the time when people were gradually organising against poverty and misery, saying that prosperity was to be found just around the corner and that if people would hang on for another 12 months they would then see prosperity. Can anyone tell me that that man was of any use as a professor of economics, having admitted in America that he knew the plan would fail? What is the use of the member for Nedlands putting forward such a stupid argument? "Repudiation" was what he said by interjection. Let the hon. member read the report of the discussions on the Premiers' plan. It can be found in the pigeonholes of Parliament House. The outstanding Premier at those discussions was he who fought bitterly against what was done, but he was driven out of public life by pressure from the financial institutions, as time rolled on.

The Premier: Who was he?

Mr. MARSHALL: He was the man who advocated the suspension of interest payments pending a recovery of our financial position, and every newspaper and institution with the right to speak immediately yelled "Repudiation." They declared him as a repudiator and yet, when they subscribed to the Premiers' Plan, every contract that the Government had entered into with financial institutions, with contractors, with humble individuals in regard to pensions, grants and compassionate allowances was smashed one hundred per cent., and now the young fellow tells us about repudiation!

Mr. Grayden: I am still waiting to hear proof of your statement.

Mr. MARSHALL: There is no doubt about the intellectual individuals we find around Parliament House! The young man's age! Look at them! Let me tell this to the member for Nedlands: He put forward the argument that these particular gentlemen did not realise what they were doing but, unlike the doctor, he has made no progress, and we should not blame him for not telling us what progress has been made.

Mr. Grayden: And since then the Australian Government has found a way to granting full employment which was not known in 1931.

Mr. MARSHALL: Wonderful! The hon. member will be put up on a pedestal! He will be famous in the same way as the grandfather became famous in Victoria. In fact, the hon. member will outstrip him. Of course, the situation as we see it today is due entirely to war aftermath. It is due to trying to supply the world with goods and services, and the position today is entirely different to what was happening prior to the war, when no-one outside Australia wanted our goods and there was unemployment. Now everyone, the world over, is seeking all sorts of goods and services which we can supply. Naturally, we find the employment situation much improved. But that is not the point I want to get at.

The member for Nedlands said that Professor Copland was unaware of what he was doing. All right! Will he say that this particular gentleman will ever advance by virtue of experience? That is to say, having seen what the depression did in 1930, and what was recommended then; having seen the effects of it, would he say that they are so intellectually dull that they never show any advancement at all? That is what he implies. Now we have Professor Copland backing up the Budget which does the very self-same thing.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is the point!

Mr. MARSHALL: That is the point. Now, Professor Copland has already said he had nothing to do with it. There will be some hundreds of thousands who will believe him.

The Attorney General: I thought you were going to tell us that tomorrow.

Mr. MARSHALL: I will tell it over and over again, as I have done for 20 odd years, until we have some change in the monetary system, and I am going to keep on telling it until the people in our sunny land have some security from the ravages of the Jews. What about Professor Copland now? He recommends the Budget as being good.

Mr. Grayden: It is sound.

Mr. MARSHALL: We shall soon see how sound it is. It is a remarkable thing that the Right Hon. R. G. Menzies has not come back with a double dissolution on this question. Let him come back on this subject. When he thought he had the electors by the throat, it was all right to spin nice phrases and create an atmosphere of panic. Yes, he could come back then! Let him try it on this, and do not forget that electors have a right to vote on it. They have the right to vote in a straight out democratic country or in any other country which practices any semblance of democracy. They should have a right to say whether they should have such an imposition as this placed upon them. Professor Copland has advanced nowhere in the last few years. He believes that if the purchasing power of the people is decreased and the price of goods is increased by imposing further taxation, he will bring about a state of prosperity.

Mr. Grayden: Surely we are not in a depression now.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Premier interjected by saying it was world-wide. Of course it is world-wide! International banking is world-wide. The banking institutions in this country are merely the Australian end of international finance. The whole standard of the world's currency today is regulated by the Reserve Bank of America. That has been confessed by the economists in this country. They do not deny it. How could they, anyhow? Poor little Australia would have suffered in 1921 and 1922 as surely as she was Australia, if it had not been for the then Commonwealth Government of Australia.

In 1922 they had a depression in England by returning to the gold standard, also in 1925 and again in 1932 and we would have suffered a depression here also in 1921, but Dennison Miller said "No". When things looked glum and bad and a representative of the A.L.P. waited upon him, they said, "You raised £270,000,000 to prosecute the war, cannot you do something to save the situation?" He replied, "Yes, I will do my best," and whilst the private banks sold securities he bought them and when they restricted credit he issued it. That settled it! Therefore, they let it go. My

young friend has a lot to learn. Unfortunately, Dennison Miller died in 1923. In the meantime, Australia's noble son, Stanley M. Bruce, had been rubbing shoulders with the international Jews and, taking the opportunity of Dennison Miller's death, he took over the Commonwealth Bank and hamstrung it.

Mr. Graham: The same as Menzies has recently done.

Mr. MARSHALL: So there we have it! And might I tell the member for Nedlands that it was not 100,000 unemployed. The unregistered figure, throughout Australia, was exactly four times that. The figure of 400,000 did not include the men's unfortunate wives and families.

Mr. Grayden: I was only quoting your own figures.

Mr. MARSHALL: Look at the deplorable situation the primary producers were in! The squatters in my electorate were mere shepherds for the banks for years and the unfortunate wheatgrowers were mere serfs to the banks, all because of the retention of an obsolete banking system. As anyone should know, the real wealth of the country is the capacity to produce and real wealth and credit issues should be returned to the State. What happens, of course, is that the banking institutions have used the prerogative of the Government and have issued credit to suit themselves. They have complete control at the moment. They should never have any authority to use the nation's credit as a debt against the nation, and then charge interest on it to service it, and the Government promise a repayment in the course of time. Until there is a change in the banking system, and money is made and issued by the State to equate the production of real wealth, we will never prosper. That is the basis of money issue as it should be. It should be regulated so that it will equate the amount in price value of the real wealth produced each year or for any given accounting period.

Mr. Grayden: You are being very naive now.

Mr. MARSHALL: It should not be arbitrary; it should not be based on the amount of money in a bank's till.

Mr. Grayden: Can you suggest some way in which they can do that?

Mr. MARSHALL: I will overwhelm the unfortunate young professor of economics from the University of Western Australia. He is a great advertisement for that institution! I will now make my final point. At the time the depression appeared and Sir Otto Niemeyer came out here, the then Commonwealth Treasurer was Edward Theodore. This will just show you, Sir, how powerful banking institutions are and how they over-ride Governments.

Theodore introduced a Bill into the House of Representatives providing for £18,000,000 of fiduciary money. If that sum had been distributed amongst the chartered banks to assimilate throughout Australia it would have created a credit issue to the tune of £180,000,000, which would have saved the situation. But no, the anti-Labour Senate of that time delayed the passage of the Bill and asked for it to be sent to a Select Committee. As time was the essence of the contract, the Governments were forced to accept Sir Otto Niemeyer's plan. That was in 1921.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: In 1931!

Mr. MARSHALL: Yes, 1931. Yes, in 1931 £18,000,000 of fiduciary money was too much! We were debasing our currency, but we have issued thousands of millions since to conduct a war. I well remember, in 1914, on the declaration of the first World War, when every bank in England closed its doors after years of unmolesed control over the monetary system. Every one of them closed its doors with the exception of the branch of the Commonwealth Bank. They could carry on no longer. They were bankrupt. The gold standard had let them down. What happened? Asquith and Lloyd George were waited upon by the bankers and it was arranged that the Government would print £280,000,000 of fiduciary money. That was given to the Bank of England for distribution amongst the chartered banks.

Then the cry of "Business as usual" went up. No trouble at all! It saved those banks from insolvency. Lloyd George and Asquith got up on the public platforms of England and said, "Look at them! What are they? They are worthless! A fiduciary pound note is absolutely worthless! But what does it represent? It represents the confidence of the British Empire!" That £280,000,000 of fiduciary money saved those banks from insolvency and when the Government wanted money to finance the war they said, "We will finance that. You can borrow the money from us."

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILLS (4)—THIRD READING.

1. Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment.
Returned to the Council with an amendment.
2. Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act Amendment (Continuance).
3. Optometrists Act Amendment.
4. Muja-Centaur Coal Mine Railway.
Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—LIBRARY BOARD OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Consideration of Committee's Report.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION
(Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling) [7.33]: I move—

That the report of Committee be adopted.

MR. PERKINS (Roe) [7.34]: Unfortunately I was not able to be present on Thursday last when this Bill was before the House and there are one or two matters to which I desire to make some reference.

Mr. Marshall: Are you going to move for the recommittal of the Bill?

Mr. PERKINS: I might do so. Members know that I have been greatly interested in the question of free lending libraries. The first speech I made in this House was on that subject, and I was able to prevail upon the Premier of the day, Hon. J. C. Willcock, to make an allocation of money to enable the scheme to be started by the Government's subsidising such local authorities in country districts as were prepared to set up free lending libraries. A considerable number of local authorities took that action and those libraries have been operating with varying success over the years.

That scheme has served to make clear the limitations that exist in dealing with such a project on a piecemeal basis. Therefore I was very pleased when the Minister introduced this Bill and at the expedition with which the House dealt with it. However, there are one or two points that were possibly overlooked in dealing with the measure in Committee last Thursday. In the provision for the appointment of deputies for members of the board, it is set out at page 6 that the Governor may, in respect of each member, including the chairman, appoint a person as deputy for and to represent the same interests as that member.

A little further on the Bill provides that the board, when constituted, shall appoint a chairman. There seems to have been an oversight in that no provision has been made for the board to appoint a deputy chairman. If there were provision for the appointment of a deputy chairman, possibly the point would not arise, but in regard to the clause providing that the Governor may appoint a deputy in respect of each member including the chairman, a legal opinion has been given that the provision could be interpreted to mean that when the Governor appointed such a deputy, irrespective of the board's considering that some other member might

be more suitable as chairman, the board would have to accept the deputy appointed by the Governor as chairman of the board.

To give an illustration: Suppose the first officer mentioned in the Bill—the Under Treasurer—were appointed as chairman by the board when it first met! If he became ill and were unable to carry on as a member of the board and the Governor decided to appoint some other officer of the Treasury, he undoubtedly would be entirely capable of interpreting the Treasury point of view but might be quite unsuitable to be chairman of the board. If that interpretation is correct, it seems to constitute a serious flaw in the drafting of the Bill.

Before moving for the recommittal of the measure—and that is the only way to deal with the matter—I should like to hear what explanation the Minister has to offer as to the Crown Law opinion on this clause. It is not necessary to move for recommittal at this stage because there will still be an opportunity to do so, on notice, when the third reading is moved tomorrow. Therefore I should like to hear what the Minister has to say before I take further action.

Another matter I should like to mention is in regard to the rating. I suppose it is necessary to have some provision limiting the rating that any authority may make for the purpose of implementing the measure, but I am afraid that whatever action is taken will result in the rating being inappropriate for the proper functioning of the board. As members are aware, the basis of valuation for rating varies greatly amongst local authorities. Many of them adopt the valuations of the Taxation Department; others use a valuation based on those of the Taxation Department plus some percentage and others less some percentage; others again use a separate basis of valuation arrived at by their own valuation. Therefore it is clear that the maximum rate in the pound as fixed would not bear any very direct relation to the total amount of money that should be available from the rating of any local authority. It may vary greatly in the sum per head in the different local authorities who decide to co-operate in the implementation of the measure. I would rather have seen that particular provision deleted, though I am not adamant on the point. I realise that if it be found that the provision is not operating satisfactorily, an amendment may be made at a later stage.

I am particularly concerned that the library board should be set up so that it may make some examination of the task confronting it, and it is desirable to get the Bill passed to permit of the Government's getting the board established. The first provision I mentioned is an important one affecting the constitution of the board and I should like to hear what

the Minister has to say. I hope he will be able to agree that those three words in line 24, page 6, "including the chairman" should be deleted. I had in mind to move for the deletion of those words so that the measure would provide that the Governor may appoint a deputy in respect of each member of the board. Then it would be left to the board to elect its own officers. In order fully to carry out that intention, it would be necessary to provide at the top of page 7 that the board shall elect a chairman and a vice-chairman. Then the question of the possibility of a deputy appointed by the Governor becoming chairman of the board would not arise.

One other point I should like to mention. Some remarks were made by the member for East Perth regarding the Perth Public Library.

Mr. SPEAKER: The third reading is not the time for this.

Mr. PERKINS: It is only a word, and I shall not mention it again. The Perth Public Library is a reference library and is there to provide books of reference to be consulted on the spot. It does not make any provision for the lending of books. The member for East Perth referred to deficiencies in the library. I agree with him that a good many improvements could be made to it, but unfortunately finance has been the limiting factor for many years. In fact, until the present Government took over the Treasury bench, the annual grant to the institution was £8,500 a year, and it has now been stepped up to £22,500 which has enabled some improvements to be made.

Mr. Graham: That includes the other two institutions as well.

Mr. PERKINS: Yes, it includes the public library, the art gallery and the museum. Unfortunately, that sum is entirely insufficient to put the institution on a proper basis. Many things, which the member for East Perth mentioned, have been asked for from different Governments, but not granted. To give an idea of the limitations which finance is imposing on the provision of a proper service, I might mention, taking the year 1949-50, that the Adelaide library, excluding the lending service, had a staff of 57 compared with a staff of 14 at the Perth Public Library. In the same year the expenditure at the Adelaide library, again excluding the lending service, was £28,600, whereas in Perth the library, museum and art gallery all had to be maintained out of a sum of £17,800. We cannot make bricks without the raw materials.

Mr. Marshall: What is the difference in the population of the two cities?

Mr. PERKINS: Adelaide is somewhat greater, but not proportionately greater than the disparity in the figures. For the same year the following additional comparisons are also submitted:—For library

services only, including lending departments, Queensland spent £40,000; Tasmania, £46,000; South Australia, £48,000; and Western Australia, as I have already mentioned, £17,800. If money were available, many improvements could be effected, but in fairness to the trustees who are responsible for the institution, many of the improvements which the member for East Perth says are necessary, have been requested but not granted by the Governments of the day.

THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. A. F. Watts—Stirling—in reply) [7.48]: I do not regard the points raised by the hon. member as of so much importance as he does, but nevertheless they have been raised since the second reading of the measure in the Committee stage by others, and I am prepared to give them consideration. It seems to me at first sight that all that is required to meet the objections of the member for Roe is the appointment of a vice-chairman, but I do not say at the moment that that is all that is necessary.

It appears to me extremely unlikely that any hiatus would ensue so that the deputy of any member would be required to take the chair if a chairman and vice-chairman were appointed by the board, because then, if the chairman were absent, the vice-chairman would take his place. It would be only on rare occasions—and perhaps not at all for many years—that any person other than the chairman or vice-chairman, so appointed, would need to take the chair. Anyway, I undertake to give the matter further consideration to find out what amendment should be suggested, and I shall seek to have it inserted in another place.

Question put and passed.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—INSPECTION OF MACHINERY ACT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Council and read a first time.

LAPSED BILLS—RESTORATION TO NOTICE PAPER.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that, as requested by the Assembly, the Council had agreed to resume consideration of the following Bills:—

Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment and Continuance.

Bunbury (Roman Catholic Cemetery) Lands Revestment.

Country Towns Sewerage Act Amendment.

Hospitals Act Amendment.

Law Reform (Common Employment).

Main Roads Act (Funds Appropriation).

Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment.

Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve (A1162).

Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment.

Prices Control Act Amendment (Continuance).

Real Property (Foreign Governments).

Trustees Act Amendment.

BILL—NURSES REGISTRATION ACT ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver—Subiaco) [7.53] in moving the second reading said: This is a short Bill, and I do not think it will cause much discussion. At present, in order to qualify for the midwifery nursing certificate in this State, persons who already hold a certificate for general nursing are required to undergo a period of training of nine months. Those who have no previous nursing training must train for a period of eighteen months. For a number of reasons this period is inadequate. Amongst these reasons are the following:—Firstly, the training period has been found to be too short to allow of a sound and complete training in all branches of midwifery. Secondly, the introduction of the 40-hour week had a very severe impact upon the time spent in training. This tended to reduce the standard of training.

In other States and countries the same circumstances have arisen, with a result that in Great Britain and New Zealand the period of training has been extended to 12 months for a trained general nurse, and two years for a person not previously trained in nursing. The nurses registration boards of New South Wales and Victoria have followed suit, and other States are contemplating similar action. This action has a very severe effect upon the ability of our training schools to attract trainees. Countries or States which require the extended training period no longer recognise the certificate issued by the Western Australian Nurses' Registration Board as being the equivalent of their own, and therefore require an additional period of training to be undertaken before a midwife from this State can practise. The result has been that trainees have gone to other States to obtain the higher qualification rather than commence training in this State for a certificate which is not recognised elsewhere.

The effect of this upon the ability to provide staff for the King Edward Memorial Hospital, which is our largest

training school, can clearly be seen. Unless this State falls into line with the United Kingdom, New Zealand and the other States of Australia, we shall continue to lose recruits for our training schools and, therefore, find ourselves unable to provide the essential staff for the King Edward Memorial Hospital which is, to a great extent, comprised of trainee midwives. The Bill seeks to amend Sub-section 5 (b) of Section 5 of the Nurses Registration Act by altering the training period for persons holding a trained general nurse's certificate from nine to 12 months, and for persons, not so qualified from 18 months to two years. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Styants, debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1951-52.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 16th October on the Treasurer's financial statement and on the Annual Estimates, Mr. Perkins in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £4,955:

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam) [7.58]: Judging by the remarks made by the Treasurer early in his speech, this could very well be described as a doubt, hope and fear Budget. For instance, the Treasurer expressed considerable doubt about his Government's ability to face up to the situation by saying—

The need to curb Government expenditure as a means of counter inflation, therefore, poses very real problems for a State Treasurer. It has to be recognised, of course, that if inflation is not checked the ultimate results could be disastrous to our economy, but I am sure all State Treasurers must long for a day when conditions are stable.

In regard to the hope portion of his speech, the Treasurer said—

While not anticipating that there will be any overall relief this year from the cost increases that have been pressing so heavily on budgets during the last 12 months, I am none the less hopeful that their peak will have been reached before 1952-53.

Mr. Marshall: Arthur Fadden in disgust!

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Treasurer continued—

There have been several recent developments which will undoubtedly tend to relieve the present inflationary situation, notably the reduction in export incomes and measures being taken by the Commonwealth Government to discourage demand.

The fear portion of his speech reads—

Rising costs affect all sections of our expenditure, but the main avenue of revenue available for adjustment to meet these rising costs is that of the charges imposed by our business undertakings and public utilities. A substantial increase in such charges must either impose an unduly heavy burden on a section of our people who cannot pass on the burden in the sale price of their commodities, or be passed on by those who can do so and thus add to the inflationary uplift which we all so earnestly desire to avoid. Because of its inflationary effects, a large revenue deficit is also most undesirable. I am, therefore, caught between the need to balance the budget without increasing charges and the effect of rising costs and expanding commitments.

I propose, a little later in my speech, again to make reference to some of the extracts I have just read from the Budget. The actual revenue for the 1950-51 financial year was approximately £28,156,000, with expenditure at approximately £27,997,000, the result being a surplus of approximately £159,000. The financial result finally achieved during the year was £644,000 better than the estimate made at the time the Treasurer delivered his previous Budget, when it was expected that there would be a deficit for the year of £485,000. That improvement appears to be spectacular. On the surface it certainly is a spectacular result but, as the Treasurer explained, it was brought about by the fact that the Commonwealth made a special grant to the State of £1,000,000 to enable it to meet increased expenditure due to the rise of £1 a week in the basic wage, which was granted by our State Arbitration Court on the 17th December, 1950.

It would appear that the special grant of £1,000,000 was much more than the State really needed to enable it to finance the additional costs imposed upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund during the period when the £1 per week increase in the basic wage operated; that is, from the 17th December, 1950, to the 30th June, 1951. If that be so, then the State of Western Australia was treated very generously by the Commonwealth's making a special grant of such a big amount, and we have some reason to be thankful for the fact that it did not investigate the situation as closely as is usually done by Commonwealth authorities when they are proposing to hand over any large sums of money to a State Government.

In the total revenue of £28,000,000 received by the State during the financial year to which I refer, approximately

£14,000,000 came from the Commonwealth. That shows that almost one-half of the total revenue received by the State during the year came from Commonwealth sources. The £14,000,000 made available by the Commonwealth was made up in the following way:—

	£
Taxation reimbursement	7,176,000
Disabilities grant as recommended by the Grants Commission	5,839,000
Special grant (£1 increase in the basic wage)	1,000,000

It will be seen from those figures that Western Australia is depending very heavily upon grants made available by the Commonwealth, and this increasing dependence of the State upon Commonwealth grants of one kind or another is a situation which could create for any Government in this State in the not distant future extremely serious and, indeed, very embarrassing financial problems. However, I will make further reference to that point later on.

The estimated expenditure in this State for the current financial year is approximately £33,000,000, which will represent an increase of £5,000,000 in our total expenditure this year compared with the total expenditure from the Consolidated Revenue Fund last year. This is indeed an extraordinary increase in the expenditure of a State like Western Australia in one year. It is no wonder that the Treasurer expresses serious concern and some fear regarding the heavy rate at which expenditure is increasing, so far as payments from the Consolidated Revenue Fund by the Government are concerned.

The Treasurer anticipates receiving from Commonwealth sources during the current financial year approximately £16,000,000, which is an increase of only £2,000,000 on the amount received from these sources during the last financial year. It will be seen that while the total expenditure from Consolidated Revenue during the current financial year will be higher by £5,000,000 compared with the last financial year, the increased amount available from Commonwealth sources will be only £2,000,000. That indicates that the Treasurer will have to find an additional £3,000,000 from what might be described as local sources of income, from local taxation fields which are still available directly to the State from increased revenues which might be earned by public utilities, and from the few other local sources from which revenue is obtained by the Treasurer. Undoubtedly, during the current financial year, the Treasurer will have an extremely difficult battle to live within the estimates that he presented to this Chamber last week.

The Premier: I realise that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Unless much more revenue is received from Commonwealth sources than is anticipated at the

moment I rather think the Treasurer will have no hope at all of living within the estimates, and I will make further reference to that later. In spite of the criticism which the Treasurer justifiably received and probably suffered in connection with the prophecy he made three years ago regarding inflation, which prophecy was falsified completely, we find him straying again this year into the field of prophecy and making a statement much along the same lines as the one he made when he delivered his Budget in 1949. In October, 1949, the Treasurer prophesied that the inflationary spiral, which was then continuing merrily upward, would cease to operate by the 30th June, 1950. As we all know, the 30th June, 1950, came and went and there was no cessation of the inflationary spiral; there was no reverse movement in inflation as the Treasurer had recklessly prophesied there would be a few months previously.

The Premier: Not recklessly! There were a number of prominent men who made the same prediction.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, but I would hate to name them. However, I can mention one, and I think it was Professor Copland.

The Premier: Do not wake up the member for Murchison!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The 30th June, 1951, came and went, and the prophecy of the Premier in October, 1949, had not come true even by that date. As a matter of fact, it had been refalsified completely by that time, and the inflationary spiral still continues merrily upwards.

The Premier: The indications are that I shall be nearer the mark this time.

Mr. Rodoreda: If you go on prophesying from year to year, you must be right some time.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Treasurer appears to possess an abundant amount of hope. I make bold to suggest, as I did in October, 1949, that his prophecy regarding the date on which expenditure will cease to rise and the inflationary spiral will come to an end will be falsified as completely on this occasion as it was on the previous occasion. Actually, the Treasurer gave very little of substance to support his prophecy on this occasion. I admit that on the previous occasion, in October, 1949, he gave no reason at all in support of his prophecy. This time he mentioned the reduction in export incomes and also the measures being taken by the Commonwealth Government to discourage demand. It would be interesting to know exactly what the Treasurer meant, and still means, by the words—

and measures being taken by the Commonwealth Government to discourage demand.

The Premier: They have certainly taken off some excess spending power, have they not?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think the reduction in export income to Australia could have some effect on the inflationary spiral. In my opinion, however, the reduction in export income during the next eight months, or even during the next 18 months, will not be substantial enough to affect the situation within Australia to an extent sufficient to bring the inflationary spiral to an end. The steps being taken by the Commonwealth Government to discourage demand will certainly not discourage it sufficiently to affect the inflationary spiral. As the Treasurer knows, the recent Commonwealth Budget proposes to do a lot of things in addition to discouraging demand. Many of the things which it will effect will make the inflationary spiral worse. We know that additional taxation is to be imposed upon individuals and upon industry by that Budget; we know, too, that the effect of increased taxation upon individuals and industry will be to increase the cost of production.

Mr. Marshall: Menzies says no.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We also know that industry recovers its increased costs of production by increasing the prices of the goods it produces.

Mr. Marshall: Of course it does; industries are not philanthropic.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Therefore, those who buy from factories will have to pay them more for what they buy; those who buy direct from warehouses and other agents will also have to pay more for what they buy. The retailers in turn will have no option but to increase prices to the consumers, and Prices Commissioners in the various States will have to authorise those increases because they will be based upon legitimate increased costs to the producer, to the wholesaler and finally to the retailer. As prices continue to increase so the cost of living as a whole will go up. Arbitration Courts will have no option but to grant further increases in the basic wage when each quarterly adjustment, in relation to the cost of living, is being made by them.

So, while there may be some indications on the one side of factors developing which will in their operation tend to reduce the spiral of inflation, we have, unfortunately, on the other side more important factors still which will in their operation more than counterbalance those factors that may operate to reduce inflation. In my view the net result will be that inflation will continue. My frank opinion is that inflation in Australia under the existing set-up—financial, political or otherwise—will continue to the stage where industry will be unable to operate profitably upon the basis on which it operates today. I think we will find a lot of smaller industries going to the wall—

Mr. Marshall: Without any doubt.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —because of their inability to shoulder the increasing costs of production that will be put upon them. I also think a number of the smaller businessmen will go to the wall for the same reason. Let us take the increase of the basic wage in this State as an example! According to the employers' representative in the State Arbitration Court, Mr. McKenna, the basic wage in this State has increased by £2 19s. 2d. a week, including the special increase of £1 a week, in the last ten months. It does not need very much imagination on the part of members for them quickly to grasp the terrible significance of that situation. We have an increase in the basic wage in this State in a period of ten months of almost £3 a week!

Mr. Griffith: It is not peculiar to this State.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Of course it is not peculiar to this State, but that in no way affects the picture I am trying to place before members. The picture is one that will indicate to members the alarming situation into which our economy has been driven by the factors which have been allowed to operate so freely and with so little organised restriction, especially during the last two years. Now, if this £3 a week increase in the basic wage that has taken place in the last ten months were the final increase that would take place, then we might, as members of this Parliament, face the future with some degree of confidence; if that were so, we might be able to say, with some solid reason for saying it, that increased expenditures by the Government and the inflationary spiral would cease to operate as from the end of the current financial year. In my opinion, we have no warrant whatsoever for thinking that no further increases in the basic wage will take place.

The Premier: I did not say that no further increases in the basic wage would take place.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I can tell in an instant that the Treasurer is a bit uncomfortable, because I have made not the faintest suggestion that he said that there would be no further increase in the basic wage. I am dealing at the moment with the strong point the Treasurer made in his speech in connection with inflation and increasing expenditures when he said—

There have been several recent developments which will undoubtedly tend to relieve the present inflationary situation, notably the reduction in export incomes and measures being taken by the Commonwealth Government to discourage demand.

But another statement he made in his speech reads as follows:—

While not anticipating that there will be any overall relief this year from the cost increases that have been pressing so heavily on Budgets during the last twelve months, I am none the less hopeful that their peak will have been reached before 1952/1953.

That is before the 1st July next year. It is as clear as the noonday sun to me, and I am sure to most other members, that there will be substantial increases in the basic wage in the final quarter of the present calendar year, and also in the first and second quarters of the next calendar year. Those substantial increases in the basic wage will undoubtedly throw a very heavy burden financially in the way of expenditure upon the Government and upon the Budget.

The increase made in the basic wage in the Arbitration Court on Monday was an amount of 9s. a week for the metropolitan area, and I understand each shilling a week increase in the basic wage represents a total increase in expenditure from Consolidated Revenue of £66,000 a year. To get the significance of Monday's increase of 9s. a week in the basic wage, all that members have to do is to multiply £66,000 by nine to find out how much extra it will cost the Consolidated Revenue fund in a full year to meet that 9s. a week increase. As the member for Canning pointed out a few moments ago, this situation is not peculiar to Western Australia; it is uniform throughout all the States of Australia. So, in all the States there will be increasing burdens upon Consolidated Revenue as a result of this factor alone, and there will, of course, for the same reason be greatly increased expenditure upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Commonwealth Government.

In the face of that situation, how the Treasurer could bring himself—or allow himself to be brought, if that was the case—to making the prophecy he made the other day, is quite beyond my understanding and even beyond my imagination. Without hesitation, I say that the Treasurer will on this occasion, as on the previous occasion, be proved to have been completely wrong—completely wrong! It is most unfortunate that any Treasurer can bring himself to make prophecies of this description which are completely out of touch with the major realities of the situation. It is unfortunate because it does not treat an extremely grave economic situation with the seriousness with which it should be treated. How can there ever be any hope of taking hold of the situation—if it is not already too late to grasp it effectively—if Treasurers are to make prophecies based on hope and far-removed from realities?

The Premier: Did you read what the professor of economics at the Sydney University said today?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes, I read his remarks in today's paper. The fact that a professor of economics says something does not impress me, unless his references have some relationship to realities.

Mr. Marshall: And facts.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Professors of economics have been proved more often wrong than right.

Mr. Marshall: I'll say they have!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: After all, they are, to a very great extent, removed from the practicalities of human existence. They have not in any way relationship with the hurly-burly of life. They obtain their knowledge in the main from books written by others in previous years and sometimes in previous centuries. There is nothing exact about economics.

The Premier: Yet economists advise Governments—all classes of Governments.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Of course they advise Governments; and to the extent that their advice is based upon common-sense and realities, notice should be taken of their advice. But woe betide the Treasurer who swallows holus bolus what professors of economics tell him, because he will suffer from the most grievous bout of mental and financial indigestion that any individual in this world could suffer. He will find himself more often than not in that situation if he relies on them. It is all very well for a professor of economics, sheltered within some university, to say that by such and such a date—

The Premier: Are they sheltered?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —the process of inflation will ease or come to an end. As the member for Murchison stated earlier, if the Treasurer goes on from year to year, remains Treasurer long enough and continues making these prophecies year after year, he is bound to be right some day, even if that day be 10 years hence! I would suggest to the Treasurer that he uses, as the basis for his hopes and prophecies in the future, his own practical experience, his own knowledge of the facts that are so closely under his control in relation to the expenditure of money from both Consolidated Revenue and the General Loan Fund. If he does that, and treats with considerable caution the prophecies made from time to time by professors of economics, he will be closer to the facts as they will apply in the future than he has been heretofore, or is likely to be on the occasion of his present prophecy.

The failure of the Treasurer to face up to the realities of the situation, although regrettable enough, is not to be compared with that of the Ministers of the Commonwealth Government. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister and his col-

leagues did not know there was an inflationary problem of any consequence confronting Australia until the Federal basic wage went up 13s. a week about six months ago. At that stage, the Prime Minister and his colleagues went into a tailspin and made all kinds of alarming public statements regarding the situation. The Prime Minister, in his usual polished but unpractical way, called a conference supposedly representative of all the important sections of the Australian people. The Prime Minister made a highfalutin' speech to the conference, which, in fact, meant nothing at all.

The representatives at the conference all said their piece and the conference finished—and that was that until the Prime Minister and his Treasurer, Sir Arthur Fadden, prepared the Budget which was thrown at the people of Australia some two or three weeks ago. That Budget was supposed to be calculated to reduce substantially the inflationary processes within the Commonwealth. As I said a few moments ago, the effect of the Budget will be the exact opposite; it will intensify the inflationary process, making it worse than it is today.

The Premier: There you have one of the difficulties. You have the authorities all disagreeing.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I do not know about the authorities.

The Premier: I am classing you as one of them.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I feel very grateful to the Treasurer for his action in offering me one of the few compliments I have ever heard him express in this Chamber, but I do not pose as an authority at all. In my opinion once we, as members of Parliament, start to pose as authorities, we immediately commence to lose touch with realities. We start to float about in the clouds and even in the stratosphere and, as a result of our feet leaving solid earth, we are likely to be misled by professors of economics or any other person who, from time to time, may come forward with statements and prophecies that are far removed from the practicalities of the situation and far removed from what is likely to happen in one, two, or three years' time.

When the Federal basic wage was again increased throughout the States the other day by an average of 10s., the newspapers informed us that the Commonwealth Ministers were again very surprised and perturbed at the latest increase. Evidently they are advised completely by professors of economics or by some other individuals who have not their feet firmly upon the earth with respect to this problem. How in the name of commonsense could the process of inflation come to an end with the main factors in its existence and in its acceleration continuing to progress unchecked?

I have heard the Treasurer and members who support him in the political sphere argue at various times that the wages and salaries problems taken together are the major factor in the cost of production. I do not necessarily agree with their claim. However, if their claim is correct—and they are always very emphatic about it—how can the process of inflation come to an end, or even ease, when continuously the cost of production and the cost of living are going up and up and up?

We know very well that the adjustments to the basic wage are always three months behind time. We know that the basic wage increase of 9s. per week granted by the State Arbitration Court last Monday was not based upon the present cost of living figures at all but upon the cost of living figures in this State as averaged during the period from the 30th June, 1951, to the 30th September, 1951. This latest increase of 9s. per week in the basic wage will automatically increase the cost of production to every industry within the State.

In addition to the direct increase in the cost of production because of this factor, there are the indirect results which further add to the cost of production, and out of that there come, of course, further increases in prices and further increases in the cost of living, which will compel the Arbitration Court to grant another increase—and a substantial one, I prophesy—in the basic wage when the court, early in January next year, has to make a decision and a declaration based upon the cost of living figures then available for the quarter covering the 30th September to the 31st December.

Members of the Committee are very well aware of the attitude I have always taken towards this problem. For three years in this place I have hammered away at the problem and issued warnings as to what would be sure to happen unless drastic steps were taken to control inflation and to stabilise our economic situation, as far as it can be stabilised in a post-war period. From time to time I have made suggestions as to how that very desirable and necessary objective might, to some extent at any rate, be attained. All of what has been said has apparently fallen upon deaf ears in respect of those who are in authority.

For what it is worth, I say again tonight that there is no escape from the present inflationary situation but economic collapse, if the methods which have been adopted during the last two or three years to deal with the situation are continued. If those methods are continued, undoubtedly there will be an economic collapse in Australia within 12 or 18 months, or perhaps two years. How long does the Treasurer think that we can go on burdening industry with greatly in-

creased costs of production which, in turn, keep in operation the vicious circle of wages chasing prices? There is no escape from that situation, but ultimate collapse.

The Premier: I think you are taking a very pessimistic view.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: When it is necessary to take a realistic outlook I will take it, irrespective of whether my outlook is regarded as being pessimistic or otherwise. I am not the least worried or concerned at being described as a pessimist or at any of my outlooks being described as pessimistic. It is a great pity that there has not been a great deal more pessimism of the same kind in Australia during the last two or three years. If there had been, we would not be facing the dangerous situation economically which our industries and our nation are facing today.

I know it would be quite an easy matter for me and for those who work with me on this side of the House to adopt a hopeful attitude, but to do that we would have to shut our eyes completely to what we know to be the facts of the situation. We would have to refuse to measure one factor against another in the economic field, as we know they should be measured. We would be recreant to our trust to the people who sent us here if we failed to consider these problems and to draw from them the only deductions which, in my opinion, can logically be drawn from them. I am not prepared to stand up in this Chamber and paint in bright colours a situation which, in my opinion, is most forbidding, a situation which contains a great deal of menace to the industries of, and to the people who make up, our nation.

To some extent ever since the war, and to a very great extent during the last two years, we have carried along in Australia on the basis of "business as usual." We have lived as a nation and as a community from day to day. I know that the Treasurer has often interjected when we have been speaking upon these problems to say that the people of Australia have never been better off. If we take a very short-term view of the situation, that is completely true: the people have, indeed, never been better off. But if we are prepared and are courageous enough to take a long-term view, we can see the end of this present period of superficial national prosperity; and the end, in my opinion, is economic collapse, because we will find that the pressure of increasing costs of production upon our industries and the increasing expenditure of our Governments will become so heavy as to make it impossible for industries to carry on except under most restricted conditions, and impossible also for our Governments to carry on along the lines to which we have been accustomed in recent years, and to which we are accustomed at present.

The time is long overdue when Governments in Australia should decide that business is not as usual. Instead of granting prices to manufacturers, wholesalers, agents and retailers upon the basis of normal calculations, the time is overdue when those in authority should make drastic moves to reduce the cost of production, and certainly to reduce the charges made at various stages between the initial point of production in regard to a particular article, and the point at which it is ultimately sold to the consumer. If the Treasurer of this State, and those in authority in the other States and in the Commonwealth, want to give to the business interests of Australia a short glorious holiday, speaking in the financial and the profit sense, then they are on the right track at the moment, but at the end of the short glorious holiday for business, generally, there will come the collapse to which I referred earlier.

The Premier: Do you think controlled prices would bring about greater production?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think that controlled prices could bring about greater production.

The Premier: They could retard production, as well.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: What we should aim at is not so much the fixing of prices, based upon all the costs with which industry at some point or other has involved itself, but rather a drastic attempt to control the costs of production at every possible point along the way. The Treasurer knows as well as I do—even better—that there is today, and has been since the war, a great deal of extravagance in the conduct of many industries and businesses; and a great deal of inefficiency at the top, too. I have on previous occasions mentioned that these practices have grown out of wartime and post-war happenings.

We all remember the cost-plus system which grew up during the war, and we know how it was exploited by some of the big business interests in Australia. We know what happened in many business undertakings in regard to taxation, especially when the late Mr. Chifley was Treasurer of the Commonwealth. Many concerns slackened off considerably for the last three months of the financial year in order that they would not work, simply for the purpose of paying more taxation to Mr. Chifley, as they were pleased to express it. When practices of that kind become general within a nation, they have a most unfortunate result on the community as a whole. I believe they had such a result upon those employees who saw what was happening during the periods to which I have referred.

We know individually, from our own practical knowledge, how the cost of producing an article for sale to the Commonwealth during the war, did not mean a thing to many factories and workshops.

because the greater the cost of producing the articles, the greater the cost-plus profit obtained by those owning and controlling the particular industries or workshops. I would think myself that the cost of producing much of what is produced in Australia today is much higher, at many points of production, than it should legitimately be. We also know what happens in many industries from the time some article is produced or manufactured until it is finally purchased by the consumer or the user.

We know how many people there are at various points between production and ultimate sale. We know, too, how much many of them, who play little or no part in the distribution of these articles, take for the small service they do give. Yet, all of these charges are allowed as legitimate charges in the final price to be paid by the purchaser; and all of these things go to force up prices and the cost of living, and so have a direct or indirect effect in the pushing up of the basic wage further and further as each quarter comes and goes.

The total revenue raised in Western Australia last year was £12,000,000 short of the total expenditure. In other words, the revenue raised within the State gave us an amount which was £12,000 short of our expenditure. That goes to show how greatly we are dependent upon the Commonwealth for our financial existence. I know that the Commonwealth raises all taxation within the income field. If the State were raising its own taxation within that field, then the amount of £12,000,000, would be much less, because on the basis of existing incomes, the State taxation authority if it had access to a reasonable proportion of the income tax field in this State would probably raise a considerable sum of money—at least £5,000,000 or £6,000,000 I should think.

The question which worries me about this matter is: What will happen to Western Australia and to the Government of Western Australia when the taxation capacity of the whole nation shrinks? The Treasurer told us in his Budget speech that income from Australia's exports overseas had been reduced somewhat this calendar year as compared with the previous calendar year. It may be that that tendency will continue, and to the extent that it does, so will the Commonwealth Government, in the field of income taxation, find it more difficult to raise the colossal sums of money which it is now raising to finance, first of all, its own commitments from Consolidated Revenue and, secondly, the commitments from Consolidated Revenue of the six Australian State Governments.

I have no doubt that the Treasurer has given some serious thought to this potential problem because it could leave Western Australia, when it comes to pass, in an impossible position financially. I am

sure the Treasurer knows, from his studies, that in a period of that kind revenues fall much more quickly than does expenditure. That would, of course, make the position even worse and the Treasurer would find himself with large revenue deficits, and would be faced with the fact that the Commonwealth Government was not in a financial position to make special grants to him and other State Treasurers to enable them to meet those deficits. The only way of meeting them would be from loan money and, to the extent that there was less money available to provide for public works and, through them employment, the Treasurer would be in difficulties.

It is not hard to visualise what the Commonwealth Government—especially the present and probably any kind of Commonwealth Government—would do in a period when it found its income from taxation and other sources falling because of some worsening of the economic situation. Those making up the Commonwealth Government would, as might be natural to them in the circumstances, regard Commonwealth requirements as more urgent and important than those of the six States. At Premiers' conferences and Loan Council meetings the Commonwealth representatives would argue that Commonwealth requirements were of greater urgency and importance than those of the States if at that time Australia as a nation was still spending huge sums of money annually on defence and rearmament. In such circumstances undoubtedly the Commonwealth Government of that day would have a very solid argument.

The Premier: Yes, and of course they could use to their advantage the argument that they had direct handouts such as pensions and so on, whereas our handouts with regard to education, etc., are not direct.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have such faith in—or should it be fear of—Commonwealth representatives in circumstances of that kind as to believe that they would be able to put up all kinds of arguments—

The Premier: They could.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE:—some of which would be legitimate and some perhaps not so legitimate, to justify them in taking a far greater share of the reduced revenues available to all Governments from the various fields of taxation within Australia. I would not like to be the Treasurer of Western Australia at that time because, when that day comes, he will not know where to turn to obtain sufficient money with which to finance ordinary departmental activities within the State and continue, on any worthwhile scale, the programme of public works that is proposed for the future. I would like to know whether any loan fund of substantial

character has been placed into reserve for use by the States when a period such as that which I have envisaged comes about.

The Premier: We have the Commonwealth-State plan of national works, and you know all about that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know very well that there is a Commonwealth-State plan of national works, but that is not sufficient. One can have all such plans that one cares to draw up but, if the loan funds are not available to finance the putting of them into operation, those plans are not worth a snap of the fingers. Plans alone will not enable works to be undertaken and will not make available employment opportunities for men who, in such times, might find themselves being dismissed from their employment in private industry. I want the Treasurer to tell us whether there is, in actual fact, being built up a reserve loan fund for the purpose of meeting a situation such as I have indicated. If there is not, then I suggest to the Treasurer that he raise the matter at the first opportunity. It is a question of transcendent importance in regard to planning safely for the future.

I know—or I think I know—what attitude the financial experts, so called, will take in the circumstances to which I have referred. I think I know what line most of the professors of economics will follow on that occasion. If the control of finance in those days is to any large extent within the hands or under the influence of private bankers within Australia, it will be a very bad look-out for State Governments and, indeed, for large numbers of workers in all the States of Australia. We will then be told that there is this difficulty and that difficulty—both real and alleged—and the experts will use every argument and excuse possible, as they did in 1930 and 1931, to fasten upon the people of Australia an economic and financial situation similar to that under which so many hundreds of thousands of men, women and children suffered grievously from 1930 till about 1936.

The Premier: Your suggestion is that the Commonwealth should create this reserve?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Yes. My suggestion is that our Treasurer should press the Commonwealth to establish, beyond any shadow of doubt, large reserves of loan funds for use in a time such as I have envisaged.

The Premier: As the hon. member knows from his own experience when in office, there was drawn up a national works scheme running into hundreds of millions of pounds, to meet an emergency such as he has suggested might arise. I presume that the Commonwealth has

some ideas in regard to financing those works—both the past Commonwealth Government and the present one.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am extremely hopeful that such is the case, but I have some doubts about it.

The Premier: It is no use having a great scheme of works drawn up if you cannot finance it.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: As we all know, there were, back in 1930 and the succeeding years up to the outbreak of war in 1939, great public works requiring to be put in hand in Australia, and it was during that period that the basis for our existing shortage of housing became well established. All we were without during the depression years was the money with which to finance public works—

Mr. Marshall: That is the point; money always.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —with which to finance the building of houses, the making of furniture and all the rest of it. That was all that we were without. There was no shortage of labour as we have it today. Labour was allowed to remain idle in those years, and almost allowed to rot, because those who controlled the financial resources of Australia would not make any money available—or at least money worth speaking about—to finance public works, the building of houses and the carrying out of other necessary undertakings within the Commonwealth.

Mr. Marshall: What lawful authority have they to issue the nation's money?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: So I not only want the Treasurer to press the Commonwealth Government to establish these loan reserves, but I also want him to press the Commonwealth to establish them as credit reserves to the various States. In other words, I do not want the Commonwealth to have absolute control over these loan fund reserves when the period to which I have referred comes to pass, if it comes to pass. I want the States, at that time, to have the unquestioned right to come into possession of these loan funds and not to be fobbed off by a Commonwealth Government at that time saying "We are very sorry, but these loan funds, which are our reserves, cannot now be made available because Professor Copland has advised us that it would be the wrong thing to do at this period."

The Premier: I think the views you express are commendable but at the present time we cannot get enough funds, by way of loans, to do current work.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I very much doubt that.

The Premier: You saw the result of the last loan.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I saw the result of the last loan and no other result could possibly have been expected because the

Federal Treasurer put what was, in effect, a confidence trick, or tried to put a confidence trick, over the Australian investors.

The Premier: He saw the loans dropping in value.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We know how he would see the loans dropping in value; we know that the step he took was thoroughly unjustified—there was not the slightest justification for it whatever—and that loan was doomed to failure from the very moment it was first launched. Even so I doubt if the Treasurer, this current financial year, will expend the whole of the loan moneys available to him.

The Premier: We have big commitments overseas.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know the Government has big commitments overseas. I know, too, that it labours under considerable disabilities within the State in its efforts to get works carried out. Most of the Government's expenditure from loan funds would doubtless be in the purchase of and payment for materials, far more than in paying for the labour which it employs upon works financed from loan funds. In any event, I suggest that the Premier give careful and serious consideration to the suggestions I have made to him during the last few minutes. They may need some smoothing out, some rounding off and some polishing up here and there, but within them I think there is a germ of an idea which would be of tremendous value to our people and to the mass of people in every other State, if it could be acted upon.

I was very surprised to find that the basic wage for males on the Goldfields, and in the outback areas, is only 5s. 3d. a week higher than the basic wage for males in the metropolitan area. I was under the impression that the basic wage for males on the Goldfields and in the outback areas was in the vicinity of £1 a week higher than the basic wage for males in the metropolitan area. I am at a loss to understand why the difference is as small as it is unless the rent factor has a considerable amount to do with it.

My experience on the Goldfields and in the outback areas in regard to purchasing commodities covered by the basic wage is not at all extensive, but I was under the impression that the cost of living in those areas was at least £1 a week greater in relation to commodities covered by the basic wage, than in the metropolitan area. It might be that the rent factor makes a substantial difference the other way. The average rentals in the metropolitan area for four- and five-roomed houses might be so much higher than similar rentals on the Goldfields and in the outback areas as to counteract the big difference which there must be between the prices of commodities in those areas and similar prices in Perth.

The Premier: What would be the difference in, say, the price of meat and vegetables on the Goldfields and in the metropolitan area?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I could not say.

The Premier: I do not know either.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I merely state the problem—

The Premier: I do not think there is much difference.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —in the hope that Goldfields members, who are personally closely acquainted with the problem, will, during the course of this debate, give us as much information as they have in their possession about this matter. On the surface it appears to me that workers in those areas are not receiving a basic wage to which the increased cost of commodities in those areas would entitle them.

The Treasurer made reference to Commonwealth-State financial relationships, and expressed a hope that there might be some improvement of those relationships in the not distant future. He appeared to base his hopes on a report presented by State and Commonwealth Treasury officials to the Commonwealth Government. I understand that officials of the six State Treasuries and the Commonwealth Treasury met in conference and discussed from every possible angle existing Commonwealth-State financial relationships. Out of their discussions they arrived at certain conclusions, which were included in a report, and recommendations which were later presented to the Commonwealth Government.

The Premier: I do not think it is any use trying to consider a report such as that at a Premiers' conference. The only hope that you have of ever coming to any conclusion is to have a special conference convened by the Prime Minister for that purpose.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I quite agree that that is the most effective course to follow. However, my hopes in this matter are not very deep. As I pointed out earlier, the Commonwealth itself is shouldering greatly increased financial commitments, especially in relation to defence. In my opinion the existing economic situation is getting worse, and will continue to get worse because of the increasing cost of production and the consequential increases in the basic wage, all of which intensify the vicious circle and make inflation worse as each quarter comes and goes. It seems to me that within a comparatively short period of time it will not be so much a matter of the Commonwealth and the States taking a larger slice of the pudding, but of having a much smaller pudding from which to take slices. In other words, instead of the Commonwealth and the State Government representatives being cheerful and happy about

the slice which each takes from the whole financial pudding, they will all be quarrelling considerably amongst themselves because there may not be enough pudding to go round to satisfy the reasonable needs and requirements of each Government. However, if the Treasurer of this State and the Treasurers of the other States can prevail upon the Prime Minister to establish better principles for financial relationships between the States and the Commonwealth in the future we will freely congratulate him, and join with him in the pleasure and satisfaction which that will bring to all the people in Western Australia and doubtless, too, to all the people in the other States.

Mention has been made of the super subsidy. As pointed out this afternoon by the member for Fremantle, the estimate of expenditure from Consolidated Revenue for the last financial year on this subsidy was £181,000. When the Treasurer gave us that estimate a year ago most of us thought it was unduly high. Some members, on both sides, thought it was far too high to be properly justified in a period when primary producers' incomes were higher than they had ever been previously in the history of the State. As pointed out by the member for Fremantle today, the actual expenditure for the last financial year exceeded the estimate by £61,000.

Instead of the Government's spending £181,000 in subsidy for the transport of super by road, as estimated, the total expenditure during the year was £240,000; almost a quarter of a million pounds to subsidise the transport of super by road to farmers throughout Western Australia and, as I said before, at a time when farmers were far more prosperous than ever before in the history of the State. I have no doubt that the Treasurer was extremely alarmed when the total actual expenditure for the last financial year was made available to him. In the circumstances one could quite understand him putting both feet down and saying, "This has to come to an end." Then, no doubt, his Country Party colleagues in the Government prevailed upon him not to bring it straight away to an end so the Treasurer, in his Budget, provides for an expenditure of £100,000 for this purpose as against £240,000 actually expended during the last financial year.

The total estimated expenditure this year is extremely high; extremely high indeed. If this £100,000 to be expended on this subsidy during the current financial year is expended to help farmers not so well off; those who for some reason or other are in financial difficulties; those, who, perhaps, are in the more outback and less settled areas, then there would not be the same complaint about it as there could be if it were used to benefit farmers in the better areas where they could easily afford to pay the cost of transport involved.

There are two or three other matters to which I want to make some brief reference. One has to do with the question of establishing a steel industry in this State. The Government has had 4½ years to do something practical along the lines of establishing an industry in Western Australia for the manufacture of steel. Up to date nothing practical has been done. I understand the Government has been negotiating, in more than one direction, with various people in the hope that something of a practical nature might be achieved, but nothing ever seems to happen to indicate, beyond any shadow of doubt, that a steel industry of some magnitude is to be established in our State. There is every justification in the world for the establishment of such an industry in Western Australia. There is every justification on the basis of the defence of this portion of Australia alone. If for no other reason than that, there should be a steel industry in our State.

We know how much in modern times defence depends upon steel. At present in Australia, as everyone knows, there is only one steel industry which is located at Newcastle on the coast of New South Wales; quite vulnerable, I would say, to successful attack by modern aircraft if Australia again became engaged in war with Japan or any other country not so very far removed from Australia. So it seems that on the basis of defence requirements alone there should be a second steel industry in Australia. The logical strategic place for the establishment of such an industry would be, I should think, without any doubt, Western Australia.

It was pleasing to hear the Treasurer refer so glowingly in his speech to the progress made at Wundowie where there is in operation a socialised industry producing pig-iron, acetic acid, methanol and sawn timber. The Treasurer not only told us that this industry had been operating very successfully, but also that plans were well advanced to raise the production of pig-iron to 16,000 tons annually as against 13,000 tons, which is the rate at which pig-iron is being produced at that centre at the present time. When our Government, during the war, prepared plans for the establishment of these industries at Wundowie, and indeed commenced their establishment, the major purpose we had in view was to use them as a basis upon which subsequently to construct within the State a major integrated steel industry not only for the purpose of producing the whole of the State's steel requirements, but also for the further purpose of having an export surplus of steel available for sale to other countries of the world.

I trust that is the policy of the present Government. It would be very interesting to me, and, I am sure, to all members, to have some further information from the Treasurer as to what prospects there now are of the negotiations which the Government has been con-

ducting being brought to a successful issue this year, or at least reasonably early next year. If this industry is not established in Western Australia within the next year or two, I am afraid we might find the steel industry in eastern Australia expanding to such a great extent as to make it difficult for any State Government in the future to prevail upon the Commonwealth Government to assist financially—and very substantially too—the Government of Western Australia in the establishment of a local steel industry in co-operation, if necessary, with private enterprise. There are many other items about which I shall have something to say when the Estimates of the individual departments are being discussed.

The only other matter about which I wish to speak now is one related to the production of cement within the State. We all know that local supplies of cement have been chronically short for a considerable time. I asked some questions in Parliament a few weeks ago as to whether the Government had any intention of trying to establish a second cement industry in Western Australia. The information given to me was most unsatisfactory and the answer I received simply said that the matter was under consideration. That was of no satisfaction to me, and I am sure it was no satisfaction to the general public, especially that section that is either paying very high prices for imported cement or is unable to obtain cement of any kind, either local or imported. I think Western Australia requires a second cement industry and I should hope it would be possible to have one established somewhere in the country.

The Premier: Yes, I wish it was.

Mr. McCulloch: What about Kalgoorlie?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Premier says he wishes there were a second cement industry in Western Australia, preferably in the country. What I want to know from him is what is the prospect of this actually happening in the reasonably near future? Has the Government done anything about it?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: To the extent that the Treasurer can make information available to the Committee, I hope that at some later date he will take members into his confidence as far as possible in this regard. I know it is not always possible in these matters to give members all the information the Government has in its possession. It may very well be that the Government is still negotiating with certain interests in connection with the possibility of establishing another cement industry. But I would appreciate it very much if the Treasurer could at some later date give us more information than has been given to date about the matter. In the "Daily News" of the 22nd October this year there was

a paragraph which surprised me; I think it must have horrified a lot of people. It was headed, "Releases of Cement Cut Severely." The paragraph went on to read—

Releases of cement to merchants had been cut to a total of about 200 tons a week. It would be two or three weeks before stocks built up sufficiently to permit the normal release of about 450 tons, a Swan Portland Cement Co. spokesman said today. For some time releases of cement had exceeded production and this had reduced stocks. Hopes that installation of a new kiln would be completed early next year to increase by about 30,000 tons the annual production were jeopardised by a shortage of labour. About 18 general labourers and builders' labourers were needed to start immediately if the kiln were to be completed as hoped.

When this kiln was completed, it should lift annual production to more than 100,000 tons, said the spokesman. It was planned to install another kiln, the fifth, later next year.

It would be very interesting to know whether the company has made any approach to the Government in relation to its inability to obtain 16 general labourers and builders' labourers. Evidently the company requires 16 more workers—general labourers and builders' labourers—to start immediately on the completion of a kiln that the company is anxious to complete and which it has apparently partly completed. I notice the Minister for Housing is very vocal in this House whenever he has a point which can boost the Government in regard to housing and the production of building materials. I know he is prepared to misrepresent the position occasionally, if not often, to give members and the general public that impression.

Mr. Bovell: He would not go that far.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the Government has been approached by the company in regard to obtaining this small amount of labour required by the cement company, and it has failed to do anything to make that labour available to the company, then in my opinion the Government deserves to be very severely criticised. I remember only too well the propaganda which the present Premier issued against our Government during the 1947 election campaign. On that occasion he misled the people generally in this State by charging our Government at that time with having no labour and no materials. Our Government was supposed to be securely and hopelessly bound up with cobwebs of all description.

The Premier: We have wiped those away, thank goodness.

Mr. Hoar: That is a matter for laughter!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Treasurer very jokingly says, "We have wiped those away."

The Premier: Not jokingly.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am sure every member of this House, except those on the front ministerial bench, could show the Treasurer correspondence from their constituents that will indicate that not only have the cobwebs which might have existed then not been wiped away but that this Government has spun quite a number of its own. I receive letters frequently from the Treasurer and his Ministers expressing regret that this thing, that thing and a hundred and one other things cannot be done in my district owing to lack of labour and materials.

Mr. Ackland: There are not many cobwebs on soldier land settlement.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It would be interesting to know whether the Treasurer and his Ministers send letters of the same sort to the member for Murray as are sent to me.

The Premier: The member for Murray?

Mr. Nimmo: He is here.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He may not be all here. I should like to know whether the cement company has approached the Government to have these 16 workers made available so that the production of cement from the beginning of next year may be substantially increased.

The Premier: We are trying to get men all the time for key industries—cement, timber, coal and all the basic industries.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Apparently, despite all the efforts of the Government, it cannot recruit the 16 men required by the cement industry, and they are not skilled men, either. I suppose it may be assumed that builders' labourers are semi-skilled and probably the company needs eight semi-skilled and eight unskilled labourers, and the Government, which in 1947 promised the people that all shortages of labour and materials would be overcome, cannot scrape up even 16 men for an industry so vital to the State as is the cement industry.

I trust that the Treasurer will treat this matter seriously. It should be treated very seriously because, if the recruiting of these 16 men will achieve the great improvement that the company says it will, the Government could sacrifice 16 of its own employees, say, one from each department engaged in work of this sort, and ensure that this partly constructed kiln at the Rivervale works is completed in the shortest possible time. In conclusion I express the hope that the Treasurer will give consideration to the suggestions I have made because it seems to me that

amongst them there may be one or two that are deserving of his serious consideration and might very well be worth acting upon.

MR. MARSHALL (Murchison) [9.44]: I desire to offer some comment on the shortcomings of the administration of various Government departments. For years I had abandoned all hope of accomplishing much in the way of assisting my electors by adopting the parochial attitude of annually reminding the Government of the various requirements so urgently needed in my electorate, because I found that each Government claimed to be doing its best in the circumstances, having regard to the fact that we are always endeavouring to cram within a chronic shortage of money the work so necessary for the development of this country.

We are always governed, not by the requirements of the community and the urgent need for doing that which is so necessary for the people, but by the need for considering everything in the light of the L.s.d. available. Consequently we find ourselves in the most deplorable position, and what troubles me more than anything else is that members do not seem to mind. We juggle with the shadow. Members complain of what the Government has not done in the electorates, but do not trouble about the factors that cause the Government to neglect entirely or do in a temporary way the things that are so urgently needed, particularly in the outback centres, to make the people comfortable and satisfied with their lot.

The people living under such irksome conditions over a period of years become tired of it and gradually migrate to the city. We hear the cry of decentralisation, but little encouragement is extended to the people who are prepared to go and live outback. As a matter of fact, we find a great deal of discouragement, even though we hear so much about decentralisation.

So I have come to the conclusion that I must fall into line with those members who constantly complain of the shortcomings of administration by various Governments, and must voice some of the urgent needs of my electorate. I want Ministers to appreciate that I now hold the proud distinction of representing over one-third of the area of the State. When the electoral boundaries were altered, those responsible for making the alterations flattered me, but I accept the flattery because I consider that I am the only member who could represent such a large electorate. A lot of towns are distributed over that vast area and they require urgent attention.

I believe it would be reasonable to criticise the Government severely on its railway administration. For some reason unknown to me, we never seem to be able to get our trains to run on time, and

that is one of the bugbears that people in the isolated areas have to suffer. For years we were stalled off with the excuse that the late running of trains was due to inferior coal, and then it was lack of locomotives or something else. On each and every occasion, some excuse was advanced by way of justification.

I should like to know what is at present in short supply, or of inferior quality, or of lower efficiency that justifies the running of trains so much off schedule. If it were only a matter of trains running a few minutes late occasionally, there would be very little justification for my holding up the Committee and complaining bitterly as I am doing tonight. It is only those members who have had experience of these outback areas who realise the great inconvenience that the people there suffer when trains are off schedule.

It is no hardship here to arrive at the West Perth station or the Leederville station or any of those little stations around the city and find that a train is not running to schedule, because there is shelter and accommodation, even if it is dilapidated and in a most deplorable state for want of a coat of paint. The little shed at West Perth reminds me of an oriental opium den when I look at it. I do not think it has had a coat of paint for 30 years. However, shelter and accommodation are available at suburban stations; and, moreover, the people in the metropolitan area have other modes of transport which they can substitute for trains.

In the North, however, the situation is different. In most places in my electorate, particularly on the Murchison side, the sidings are unattended. People travel many miles to meet or join a train which is supposed to arrive at midnight or from 1 a.m. to 4 a.m. But there is nobody to tell them if it is late. Sometimes the weather is bitterly cold, and there is not a stick of wood anywhere with which to make a fire, and no accommodation is provided by the railway authorities. There the people sit or stand or walk about—men, women and children—almost perishing on cold mornings and with no idea when the train is likely to arrive. Sometimes it is hours late. I have waited in those circumstances myself, and have tried to scrape up pieces of coal from the railway line and get them alight in order to warm myself and others.

That is a deplorable state of affairs, and it is little wonder that people say, "We have a motorcar so we will not bother about the train at all. We will go to Perth by car." There are, however, people who have no car, and they are unable to do that. The Minister for Railways should make a special effort to see that the trains, dilapidated as they are and outmoded and dirty as they often are, at least reach their destination on time. Of course, we

are told there is no labour and no material, and even if there were labour and material there would be no money. That is the experience we have had over a number of years. Nevertheless accommodation should be provided for people at those centres and it should be looked after.

At some sidings there is a little shed, open as a rule, with a bit of a seat around it, and this is mostly occupied by natives. It is never cleaned out, and never swept year in and year out. It is dirty and dusty, with paper, rubbish and all sorts of muck in it. To put it in mild language, it is a damned disgrace, and no concern is evidenced by the railway authorities regarding it. Look at the position at Cue! That is 18 miles from Big Bell, which is a big centre. Quite a number of people constantly travel between there and Big Bell. The train arrives from Perth at midnight and there is none to Big Bell from Cue until about 4 o'clock in the morning, so people who want to travel to Big Bell have to wait until that hour. A little bit of a shed was erected, after years of argument and wrangling, and in that one can sit; but there is no fire and no other means by which people can warm themselves. It is bad enough for people to have to wait for a train for three or four hours without their having to do it under such conditions.

We did at least have a refreshment room at one time, where passengers could obtain a cup of tea; but even that has been closed, and I have failed in my efforts to persuade the Minister that he has no justification for taking over refreshment rooms which are profitable and abandoning the idea of doing anything to provide refreshments for people in places where there is no hope of a profit being made. If the people to whom I have referred do not want to wait for a train, the only way they can get to Big Bell is to hire a taxi to take them the 18 miles. That costs from 7s. 6d. to 10s. per head, which is exorbitant when one has a family to provide for.

Consequently we find people sitting about waiting for the train. There is no train at all from Big Bell to Cue to join the Perth train. Every person who wishes to travel from Big Bell to Perth has to pay 7s. 6d. or 10s. for a taxi. People have the satisfaction of knowing that at Cue there is a station master who can give them some idea of where the train is, but people who travel by taxi reach Cue at 7 o'clock in the evening and the train does not normally arrive until 1 o'clock in the morning. The result is that men, women and children have to parade the Cue streets. That is not a very pleasant prospect because, as times goes on, the town becomes particularly dull. Hotels and business places close down, and consequently intending train passengers have

finally to go to the station and sit in the dark for hours to wait until the station master arrives to open the ticket box in anticipation of the train's arrival.

Those are some of the conditions under which we ask people to live in the North. That is the way we encourage people to go outback, simply because we limit the provision of their requirements by the amount of money we have, as though money were a divine gift and came down with the rain, instead of being manufactured by banks by writing figures in a ledger, a costless creation. I am making these complaints because I want some attention given to them.

The provision of refreshments along the Murchison line has been the subject of correspondence between the Minister and myself for years. When Wiluna was enjoying an era of prosperity, we had a fair number of refreshment rooms along that railway, but since the decline of Wiluna, we have lost the one between Wiluna and Meekatharra. There was also a refreshment room at Meekatharra for a while, but it also closed down. The same applies to one that was established at Cue and another at Mt. Magnet, with the result that we have to wait until we get to Yalgoo before it is possible to obtain a cup of tea or anything else. Passengers leave here at 8.30 p.m. and do not obtain a meal until they reach Mullewa at 2.30 the next day. Yet people are told to go outback! Passengers have to wait from teatime on the Wednesday evening until halfpast two on the Thursday before they can get a meal. Lovely, is it not! Great treatment! It is encouraging to people to go outback and live under those conditions! So I ask the Premier, or whoever represents the Minister for Railways, in this higgledy-piggledy Government—

The Premier: You know who represents him.

Mr. MARSHALL: The Minister for Housing took the portfolio for a time here.

The Premier: No, the Deputy Premier represents him.

Mr. MARSHALL: Well, all I can say is that he is making a poor job of it. I want some provision made in regard to refreshments. I do not care whether a buffet car is put on or not; and I do not give a continental what the cost may be. I want something done. Again, take the carriage by rail of perishable goods such as fruit, fish and vegetables, to these centres in the summer months. We have been promised a refrigerated van for, I suppose, 25 years, but each Government has given some excuse. During my own period as Minister for Railways, we had neither men nor materials with which to do anything. But even since then we have been promised the van, because goods such as butter, fish, fruit, vegetables and the like which are consumed by the people, immediately on arrival, land there in a deplorable state on occasions.

When the Big Bell supply arrives, it is thrown on to the platform from the train, and lies there until it is re-loaded on to the train for Big Bell, and members can imagine how, due to the processes of handling, the commodities arrive at their destination. But the people have to eat them. It is not fair treatment. Those people are entitled to better consideration. If they do not get it they will soon feel like many others, that any excuse is sufficient to leave, and the women will decoy their husbands back to the city. We cannot blame them. As work is available in the city, there is every inducement. If they can scratch up accommodation they migrate to the city, so that we have centralisation rather than decentralisation.

I wish to complain further about the promised dental service for the Murchison and other isolated areas such as the North Coolgardie Goldfields. Here again I feel the people are being unjustly treated. It might be said that the reason for the departmental neglect in supplying this urgent and necessary service is due to the fact that the Government has no money. The reason advanced, when one approaches the Minister for Health on this matter, is that dental experts or officers are difficult to obtain.

The Minister for Health: So they are.

Mr. MARSHALL: Of course, and why?

The Minister for Health: Because we have not got them. They are not in the State.

Mr. MARSHALL: They are difficult to obtain, if the Minister would be reasonable on the matter, because the remuneration or financial reward for going out to these places is insufficient. That is the real reason. It is not to be expected that a professional man, be he a medical man, a dental man, or an expert in any other line, will leave the city or other big town where he can earn, say, £1,500 a year, to go outback for £800. In years gone by, when competition in the city was so keen that these professional men could not earn a big reward for their services, numbers of them were travelling, per motor, between Perth and the North-West.

We would have two and three dentists a month pass through Meekatharra; and a local dentist there, too. But the picture has changed. These men can now earn an annual income of £1,500 to £2,000 in towns like Geraldton, Bunbury, Albany and Perth, and probably Kalgoorlie, so the Minister cannot expect them to accede to the Government's request to give the services I have mentioned. The Minister for Health would not do it herself. If the Minister lived in the environment of the city, with an income of £2,000 a year, she would not be so philanthropic as to sacrifice her living conditions and income, and go to the Murchison and travel through the heat and dust there in the summer.

The Minister for Health: You do not know me.

Mr. MARSHALL: I say to the Minister for Health that if the Government would consider subsidising professional men situated in Geraldton to do periodical trips through the Murchison, and those in Kalgoorlie to do the same through the North Coolgardie district, it would get them. These men would do the trip occasionally. It is not sufficient to say, "We cannot get them. They are not obtainable." The Minister goes occasionally to the North-West, and she is sympathetic to the people there. She is charming, and wins their confidence, and they expect her, being a lady, to see their viewpoint and do something for them. But the Minister fails them dismally.

Sympathy is no good when a person wants dental treatment for his children; and a promise to provide a dental service is no good unless it matures sooner or later; and it looks to me as though it is never going to mature while the circumstances prevailing today continue. I suggest to the Minister that she tell the Treasurer that there are thousands of children who do not live in Pinjarra or who are not within the same easy reach of Perth as are the children there. The people in the isolated country towns are entitled to more consideration, and they can receive that consideration if the Treasurer or his Ministers or the Government have the care of these people sufficiently at heart to subsidise a professional man to do the trip once or twice a year in a mobile unit. A subsidy of £100 or £200 would be necessary, but if the Government simply sits back in this regard the people to whom I have referred will never get the service that they are entitled to. I come now to the question of education. Unfortunately the Minister representing that department is absent for the moment.

The Premier: Leave it until you have the opportunity of speaking to the Vote.

Mr. MARSHALL: The member for Beverley also is not present. If he were, he would tell me that this House is an institution of frustration and that it is little use trying to do anything for the people one represents. I would remind the member for Gascoyne of the position. It will be a delightful experience for me to sit idly here for a time and see how he gets on, because I have been at this game for over 30 years and can tell him that, although I have done the best I could to influence Governments to see my point of view on behalf of my electors, up to date I have not been very successful.

The Premier: Your electors cannot think that.

Mr. MARSHALL: As far as my electors are concerned, I have little to complain about, from a personal point of view.

Mr. Grayden: Are they both happy?

Mr. MARSHALL: I did not catch the interjection and must therefore let it pass. I can, however, boast—very few other members can say the same, and I guarantee that the young member for Nedlands will never be in a position to do so—that I have been here for 30 years and have been opposed only twice, on both of which occasions my opponents lost their deposits.

Mr. Hoar: I think you must have heard what the member for Nedlands said.

Mr. MARSHALL: When he can boast of a record such as that, it will be different, but he got in under a misapprehension and then betrayed his electors. He went in as an Independent, unendorsed, and was elected as such, but it was not 24 hours after he was elected that he dived into the first Liberal pothole he saw. Let the hon. member try to talk his way out of that. When he can boast of being here for 30 years and can say that his only opponents have lost their deposits it will be time enough for him to reflect upon me.

Mr. Grayden: I did not reflect on you.

Mr. MARSHALL: The hon. member can do so if he likes, but if I hear him do it, I will come straight back at him.

Mr. Grayden: Had you heard what I said you would not be carrying on as you are now.

Mr. MARSHALL: The people I represent seem to be well satisfied and members know my record. I was trying to point out to the member for Gascoyne that, notwithstanding my efforts in this House to get some changes brought about in Government policy, I have not been too successful. I do not think many of the followers of the Government will be successful in getting very much for their electors in that way either.

One of the worst features of education in the outer Goldfields areas is that once children reach the sixth standard they are finished. They cannot go on to the seventh, eighth, ninth, junior or leaving standard. When they have reached sixth standard their parents, if they desire those children to take their education further, are forced to send them to the city or some other centre to attend a high school. I again appeal to the Minister for Health in this regard. Recently at Mt. Magnet a mother complained bitterly to me, saying, "I have a daughter of 13 or 14 years of age and just now, when she needs my care and guidance, and when I would like to have her with me, she must leave me." That girl's father was an employee of the road board and was a valuable citizen but, after one year's experience of sending their child away to school, he and his wife left the district on that account.

I suppose the Government will advance the argument that it has no money but, if it earnestly wishes people to remain in the outback, the present policy must be changed. One cannot expect parents to be

happy about sending a son or daughter of perhaps 14 years of age away to school in some distant centre. Surely the children of the outback are as much entitled to take their education beyond the sixth standard as are the children of the cities. We should, in the outback, have the continuation classes that we had years ago. If that service was available, the children could continue until either they had proved themselves incapable of benefiting by higher education or their parents could not carry them further. It is a dreadful thing for these boys and girls to be handicapped as they are at present, and yet we wonder—or say we wonder—why people flock to the city.

Some of the school buildings in the more remote centres are in a deplorable state. I do not wish to seem over-critical in this regard, but I have on a number of occasions mentioned how dilapidated many of the school buildings are. I challenge the right of the Government to allow the present state of affairs to continue much longer. One of the worst features of these outback schools is their dirtiness.

The Premier: What do you mean by "dirtiness"?

Mr. MARSHALL: The Premier should not rush bald-headed into things. He should not get hasty. I recently inspected the school at Meekatharra and I think that building was erected before I was born.

The Premier: Impossible!

Mr. MARSHALL: It is a very old building.

Mr. Hutchinson. It must be.

The Minister for Lands: It must be really ancient.

Mr. MARSHALL: What I most object to about that school is that all the desks and benches and other appointments of the school are in a filthy condition. Ink of different colours has been spilt on them over the years and, in such a dusty climate, it seems to have become ingrained until all those appointments are absolutely dirty. All that is required in those cases is that a carpenter should go along with a jack-plane and occasionally clean off the dirt. The appointments of schools in my electorate, except the new schools, are absolutely dirty. Yet we demand impudently, by regulation, that mothers shall send their children to school in a clean condition. That means that children have to go in a clean state to dirty schools.

The Premier: I am sure there are very few dirty schools, and I have been in a lot of them.

Mr. MARSHALL: I want the Premier to understand that I visit these places, and what I say is true. The lavatories, too, are not very clean. I do not know who is responsible for that. I asked a school-master and he said, "That is the situation. These appointments cannot be any cleaner unless we get a carpenter to clean up the

desks with a jackplane or have the timber replaced." I am not exaggerating the condition of these buildings. In all the old schools the same conditions exist, and if I could take the Premier throughout my district he would see the same state of affairs in all the older schools. I do not care where he goes, Cue, Meekatharra or any of the old schools in my electorate, he will find the conditions I have outlined. I will give £5 to the Children's Hospital if he can find any case of where my statements in that regard are untrue. Other members, too, who have schools in their electorates which are of the older type will find that what I say is correct.

Mr. Bovell: This Government has done an enormous amount towards the progress of education in this State. You cannot deny that.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not talking about what this Government has done; I am talking about what it has not done. I have not said anything about what the Government has done. Good God Almighty, how long is the hon. member going to sit there in complete ignorance of what I am talking about?

The Minister for Lands: You say that these schools have only become dirty since this Government came into power!

Mr. MARSHALL: I will leave the Minister for Health for the time being and refer to some matters connected with the department of the Minister for Works. There are any amount of opportunities for his department on the main North-West-road. I am given to understand by officers of his department that they intend to bituminise sections of the North-West-road where it passes through the various towns and also the road to Hill 50 at Mt. Magnet. That will be most acceptable, when the work is done. Because of the mining of strategic metals in the North-West, a considerable quantity of material has been transported by road, and the roads in that area are in a particularly deplorable condition. We also have the goldmine which is now being developed by the Big Bell Co., and the new manganese deposit about six or seven miles further out. The people concerned are carting large quantities of ore from that manganese mine which is 83 miles from Meekatharra. Also, large quantities of goods are being transported over the same road to the North-West.

I saw one road train leaving Meekatharra with over 30 tons of goods on board. There were three or four trailers attached to the prime mover, thus forming a road train. The drivers tell me that the road is in bad condition and urgently requires attention. Therefore I would be pleased if the Minister would make inquiries, through his departmental officers, to see what progress is being made. It is difficult to say what time of the year would be the best to do this work because we do not know just when it is going to rain. But immediate

attention is urgently necessary because transport drivers tell me that the road is worse than it has ever been. I ask the Minister to look into this question to see what can be done.

The Minister for Works: You appreciate the need to police the tonnage being carried on this road. You mention the carriage of 30 tons of goods, which is about ten tons overload.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not hostile to the theory the Minister is advancing but that 30 tons was spread over four or six axes; it was not all placed on one truck. It was quite a lengthy train and that would assist without doing a terrific amount of damage to the road. There are about five or six propositions in the North-West which are being speedily developed and, owing to the infrequent shipping service, a large amount of material is being hauled over this road. I am not altogether hostile to that either, because it is beneficial to the town of Meekatharra where mining has subsidised to a material extent. It is quite a busy town now, even though there is no mining activity apart from a little prospecting. However, the road is in a bad state and I trust the Minister will endeavour to do something about it.

I now come to my final remarks for tonight. I want to speak in eulogistic terms of the Yankee companies that have come to Western Australia to develop our goldmining areas. These companies have been particularly generous, especially when we compare them with some of the older companies. These newer companies have provided amenities such as night-like-day tennis courts, cricket pitches, swimming pools, etc. But at some of the older places, like Meekatharra, there are no such amenities. I understand the Government has been giving consideration to subsidising local authorities, and local parents and citizens' associations, for the provision of swimming pools. I believe, particularly at Meekatharra, that the Government is formulating a policy to give some financial assistance towards the establishment of swimming pools, where these are not now in existence.

The Chief Secretary: Not to the parents and citizens' associations; only to local authorities.

Mr. MARSHALL: I am not in the slightest degree concerned through what avenue the money comes, so long as we get it. As long as we get the money, we do not care how the Government sends it, whether by train, road or aeroplane. I want to appeal to the Minister to get the Government to come to a decision on this policy, because I know it is over 12 or 18 months since it was first discussed. My reason for pressing for an early decision is that at Meekatharra there is a certain gentleman who has fairly big interests a few miles out of the town. He is prepared to give a substantial sum towards the establishment of a swimming pool, and

the parents and citizens' association and the local authority concerned are anxious to take advantage of that offer. If it is long delayed, the offer from this worthy gentleman may be withdrawn, or he may say, "I gave you the offer and you were too long in accepting it. I did not say that it was to be put up in perpetuity." It might be withdrawn at any time.

The local people have been pressing me to get a decision on this most important point so that they can accept this offer and have a swimming pool established. This town has had to exist for 50 years without a swimming pool and it would be of considerable benefit to the people in the district if one could be established. I would ask the Government to give some consideration to that.

I will deal with other matters, which I have in mind, as we progress through the departmental Estimates. I sincerely hope that the Minister for Health will take notice of the proposal I put forward in the hope that she will induce some of the members of the dental profession to render service in that very important outback area. It is a vital matter, and I feel sure that the women and children in that district will have her name indelibly fixed in their memories if they can get this service which is so urgently needed by them.

Progress reported.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

1. Bunbury (Roman Catholic Old Cemetery) Lands Revestment.
2. Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Act Amendment. Without amendment.
3. Parliament House Site Permanent Reserve (A1162). With an amendment.

BILL—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

Message.

Message from the Administrator received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 18th October.

HON. J. T. TONKIN (Melville) [9.33]: This Bill, I believe, is necessary to do the things which the Minister has said have to be done, namely, to validate a number of matters which have been dealt with under legislation, but which are now of doubtful validity because of a High Court decision. Also, it is necessary to reserve to the Midland Railway Company certain mineral rights which it possesses because of a grant of land and, further, to enable the Government to permit soldier settlers in the future to acquire the fee simple of the land upon which they are settled.

We on this side of the House do not object to the principles contained in the Bill. We agree that it is necessary that these things should be done. Nevertheless, we object to some of the provisions in the Bill and we will seek to have an alteration effected to put the matters in the way that we think they should be put. The Minister did not make it clear, when dealing with the Bill, whether there had been agreement between the Commonwealth and the States with regard to the way the land will be valued when the time comes for the settler to acquire the fee simple.

The Bill provides that the value shall be determined by the Minister and he mentioned that he would have regard to the cost of development. But what about the cost of the land? Will the purchase price be the cost of the land when it was acquired or the cost at the date when the fee simple is to be obtained? There could be a very substantial difference.

The Minister for Lands: Yes.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister did not make that clear, and I would like to know whether this aspect has been discussed with the Commonwealth and whether any agreement has been reached in regard to it.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, it has.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then I think the Minister ought to tell us what the proposal is.

The Minister for Lands: It is practically the proposal of the Commonwealth regarding the valuing of the property when freeholding it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then we can take it that the point has been thoroughly discussed and agreement reached that the value of the land will be fixed when it is sold.

The Minister for Lands: I understand that is the position and I understand also that the Commonwealth will not accept any alteration as to the decision.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister knows all about it, but we do not know.

The Minister for Lands: I think the value would be based on the cost of the freeholding of the property.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister has mentioned that, but has said nothing as to the valuation of the land. When he arrives at the final decision there can be no argument as to the cost of development, but there can be considerable argument about the cost of the land. Will the cost of the land be the price at which it was acquired, or will it be the value of the land at the time the settler is about to acquire the fee simple? If the value of the land appreciates the situation could easily arise, say, in 10

years time, which is the shortest period a man must wait in order to acquire the fee simple, when the settler might be called upon, in some districts, to pay a greatly enhanced price. I would like to be clear on that.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, I will clear that point up for you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then, too, we must have some regard to the fact that there is a big difference between the possibilities in dairy farms and in wheat farms. I think it would be imposing too great a burden on dairy farmers to expect them to pay the whole of the cost of development, because development in the dairying areas is so much greater than it is in the wheatgrowing areas that it would be quite conceivable for there to be such a load of debt on a property that it would not be an economic proposition for the purchaser to buy it at the price of the land—whatever price may be decided upon—plus the cost of development.

It seems to me that in those cases we have to contemplate a fairly substantial writing down of the cost of development in order to give the dairy farmers an equal opportunity with farmers in other parts of the State. What does the Minister think about that aspect? Has that been considered? If it has not, then we want to do something with the Bill to ensure that it will be considered. On the face of it, it is not a fair proposition to require a person in the heavily timbered areas to pay the whole of the cost of development when we know full well, from previous experience, that farms, in these conditions, will not be economic propositions. We have as a guide the group settlement scheme.

A very substantial writing down had to take place—more than once, too—in order to make it possible for those farmers to have a reasonable chance of earning a livelihood. If we are to require the farmers in the dairying areas to pay the whole of the cost of development then I would say without any hesitation whatever that such farms would not be economic propositions for those settled upon them.

The Minister for Lands: Of course, as I explained, we are not going to make it easy for these men to freehold. That would be a matter of policy for the future, because we are not allowing them to freehold for ten years. So it will be difficult to arrive at the economic value of that property in ten years time, will it not?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It might be difficult to arrive at the value now as to what it will be in ten years' time, but it should not be difficult to do so in ten years' time.

The Minister for Lands: Oh, no! It will be a matter of policy and arrangement. I feel that everyone will get a fair go.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, but they would not if it were determined in this Bill that they had to pay the whole of the cost of development, and I think the Minister said that somewhere in his speech.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, that is quite correct. I did.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister referred to the fact that under the agreement with the Commonwealth between the States of Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia, no limitation was to be imposed with regard to the value of the land acquired except that the value should be the value approved by the Commonwealth. The Minister then went on to say that it should not be at any economic written-down figure. In regard to land in the dairying area, I think it is necessary that we should contemplate that it will be at some written-down figure. I had some experience in the early years of the group settlement and I saw what it cost to clear that heavily timbered country. It is true that the methods were more difficult then than they are now and that they were much more costly than they are now, but I think the same contrast remains, that is, that the clearing in the heavily timbered areas is a much more costly proposition than in the wheat belt.

The Minister for Lands: I agree that, taking the position as it is today, the dairy farmer would require special consideration. But in ten years' time he may be handling quite a different market altogether.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I cannot believe that the price of butterfat could ever reach a figure in any circumstances whatever that would make it possible for the settlers on these limited areas to be able to make an economic proposition of a farm which they had to purchase at the cost of the land, plus the whole of the cost of development. Let us take the figures the Minister mentioned as an example. I think he said it had cost about £8,000,000 already.

The Minister for Lands: That is overall.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That is only on half the properties.

The Minister for Lands: That is dealing with half the applicants. In the dairying section, of course, we have just about completed the list.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It looks to me that by the time the whole job is done the cost will be well over £17,000,000 and it is perfectly plain, I think, that the most costly development has taken place on the dairy farms. The proof is this: Where we have been able to allow settlers in the wheat areas to commence on their perpetual leaseholds we have not been able to do that, I understand, on dairy farms, because their development was not at a

sufficiently advanced stage to permit of its being done. That is an indication firstly of the difficulty of developing these farms and bringing them to a productive stage and, secondly, of the high cost involved in carrying out the necessary work.

The Minister for Lands: But development of the dairies is varied. We have bought quite a number of improved properties that do not require much development.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: They will probably be all right because we will not be loading on to those values the high cost of development. But in those areas where considerable developmental work has had to be done it is inevitable that the cost will be high, and I am sure—in fact, I have not any room for doubt whatever—that in those circumstances, if we were to ask settlers to pay the whole of the cost of development, we will be asking them to do something that will make their farms uneconomic propositions, and it would not be fair to expect it. It has not been expected before in those areas and the system will crash there if we attempt to do it in this instance.

Mr. Manning: Would not the high cost of development be offset by the low cost of the land itself originally?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No.

Mr. Manning: If you were purchasing a high development farm alongside a non-development one I should imagine the final cost would be about the same.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: That all depends! It could be that one would have to pay a lot more for developed farms if one allowed people to profit too much out of the sale; they could be more costly than the ones developed by the Government.

Mr. Manning: I would think that the final figures would work out at about the same.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It would depend entirely upon the circumstances. But this much is certain, and we have the experience of years behind us, that we had to write millions of pounds off the group settlement scheme because the farms could not carry the debt, and I am certain that we will be faced with the same position regarding a number of these farms being developed in the heavily timbered country. The cost of development in schemes such as this is always much greater than when the individual is developing his farm. If we load the whole of the cost on to the land I think we will be placing in front of the settlers an uneconomic proposition. But the Minister has assured me that he appreciates the position and that when the time comes for valuation that will not be overlooked.

The other point with which I desire to deal is this: I do not like the principle of amending existing Acts by issuing regu-

lations under a new Act, and that is what it is proposed to do under this Bill. Paragraph (c) of clause 6 of the Bill states—

where anything relating to tenures is required to be provided for, in order that the scheme may be carried out or given effect, but cannot conveniently be provided for, pursuant to the provisions of the Land Act, the Governor may, notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and without limiting the generality of the provisions of subsection (3) of the last preceding section, make regulations in respect of the requirement as fully and effectually as if the power conferred by this paragraph were expressly included in such of the provisions of that Act, as authorise the making of regulations for carrying out and giving force and effect to the objects, purposes, rights, powers and authorities of that Act.

It means that if the Bill is passed in this form, somebody, perhaps a lawyer, wishing to find out at some future date what can be done under the Land Act, looks at that Act and the regulations and says, "There are the powers," and goes ahead accordingly. Suddenly he finds that some regulations were made under this measure that over-ride the Land Act and therefore he would be wrong in his first opinion. That is bad legislation; it is legislation that should not be encouraged, but should be resorted to only when there is no other way of dealing with the matter. The way to do it is to amend the Land Act. If the Minister wishes to do something that the Land Act will not permit, let him amend the Land Act so that it will be clear to anyone reading that Act just what can be done with regard to land.

The Minister for Lands: Do you think it would be advisable to amend the Land Act?

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I am saying it would be advisable to do so.

The Minister for Lands: I do not agree, because this measure deals with soldier settlement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think it is a bad principle to amend an existing statute by introducing another measure and giving the Governor power under that measure to make regulations to over-ride the existing Act. If that were permitted, we would not know where we were. The legislature passes certain Acts in the belief that what those Acts contain will be the law of the land on the subject but, if this sort of thing is resorted to, we shall find that the laws purporting to deal with certain subjects do not do so absolutely because of power being taken in some other statutes to make regulations to over-ride those laws. I am doubtful whether this can be done.

The Minister for Lands: I assure the hon. member that a tremendous amount of work and thought have been given to this matter.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But that does not reassure me on this point. I am not satisfied that it is competent to pass a law and take power to make regulations under that law and by those regulations over-ride existing Acts. It certainly should not be allowed, because it is very bad legislation.

Mr. Hoar: What part of the Land Act do you think you may require to deal with?

The Minister for Lands: The point is that something may arise that will necessitate making regulations so that we can do certain things under the soldier settlement scheme.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then that makes it worse.

The Minister for Lands: No, it does not.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It makes it infinitely worse because, if the position is as the Minister states, he has not anything in mind at the present time that is contrary to the Land Act and he wants Parliament to give him power to make regulations in the event of something arising that is contrary to the Land Act. If that is permitted, Parliament will have no opportunity at all to consider the matter or decide whether the Land Act ought to be amended or not, but the Minister will make a regulation that will over-ride the Land Act.

The Minister for Lands: Parliament will have every opportunity to disallow such a regulation, as you well know.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Minister knows full well that many regulations are tabled, and they slip through unless somebody has reason to be watching what is happening and draws attention to them.

The Attorney General: It would not slip through you.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The Attorney General flatters me.

The Minister for Lands: No, he means that you are always on the alert where these matters are concerned.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I would not claim that I see all the regulations that are tabled. Many hundreds of regulations are tabled, and it would be a physical impossibility for any member to keep track of all of them.

The Attorney General: You would not miss out on any dealing with soldier settlement.

The Minister for Lands: Or any dealing with agriculture.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This is a very bad method of legislating.

The Minister for Lands: I shall endeavour to get an explanation as to why it is desired to do things in this way.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It seems to me the proper way would be that, if and when something occurs that needs to be done

and the Land Act will not permit to be done, the Land Act should be amended to enable it to be done.

Mr. Marshall: It might not be necessary to amend the Land Act. The Government could make a regulation under the Land Act.

The Attorney General: This deals specifically with soldier settlement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I do not agree. The proposal is to give the Minister power under this measure to make regulations that will over-ride another Act.

The Attorney General: So far as it relates to soldier settlement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I say that is bad legislation.

The Minister for Education: All soldier settlement has been dealt with in special Acts and they have affected the Land Act. That has extended over 30 years.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This is the first time.

The Minister for Education: There are the Acts of 1918 and 1919 that affect the Land Act very much.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But we specifically set out in what way we were impinging on the Land Act, which is a very different proposition. The Minister says that something might arise in future that the Land Act will not permit, and he wants the power to do it by making a regulation to over-ride an existing Act. I cannot approve of that, and I do not think it is competent to provide for it.

The Minister for Lands: I can assure you that there is no desire to put anything over Parliament in this matter.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I would not say that the Minister has any ulterior motive. I am complaining of the method he proposes to adopt. In my view, the way to do it is this: If the Land Act circumscribes the Minister and will not permit him to do what he desires, he should amend it to permit of what is required regarding soldier settlement. It makes no difference to me whether soldier settlement or any other settlement is concerned; it deals with land, and the Land Act is there to deal with land and settlement.

The Attorney General: Soldier settlement deals with land for soldiers only.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then make all the special provisions required in the Bill. If something is contemplated that the Land Act will not permit, amend the Land Act to permit it, but do not ask for power to make regulations to over-ride the Land Act as may be desired.

The Minister for Lands: I feel that there may be matters that will be required for soldier settlement and that would not be done under the Land Act.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Cannot the Minister amend the Land Act accordingly?

The Attorney General: It would be very inappropriate to do that.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: On that we differ. It would be far more inappropriate to proceed in this way.

The Attorney General: This specialises in land for soldier settlement.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: What a mess we should find ourselves in if we followed that principle generally!

Mr. Marshall: We would not know where we were.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: There would be a harvest for the lawyers, because one would be likely to get a different opinion every day in the week.

The Attorney General: If you wanted to look up anything about soldier settlement, where would you go? You would go to the Soldier Settlement Act, not to the Land Act.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: But the proposal is to give power to do something which the Land Act will not permit to be done.

The Attorney General: Only so far as this relates to land for soldier settlement. It may be necessary for Crown Land not to be thrown open to the selection board. That is one thing you can envisage straight away.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Then the Minister wants power by regulation to over-ride the Land Act to do that. Is that it?

The Attorney General: Insofar as it relates to soldier settlement land it wants to be dealt with in this Act. There may be special methods of selection.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: Yes, but the Minister says he does not know what this might be.

The Attorney General: That is one example.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: So he wants an open cheque with regard to regulations, not only to deal with what is in this measure, but to over-ride the Land Act as well. I do not think that is the type of legislation which should be encouraged. I know it has probably been done before, and I suppose it will be done again.

Mr. Marshall: Never since I have been here. We have amended one Act in another Act, but never made regulations.

The Minister for Lands: It is too far back; you cannot remember.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It seems to me a very bad principle and can only lead in the ultimate to a chaotic state of affairs, because we would have Acts over-ridden by regulations made under other Acts, and persons who wanted to see what the law was on a certain subject and consulted the Act could never be sure, under these conditions, that the position was as

shown in the Act, since there might be in existence a regulation under some other Act which over-ride or purported to over-ride the provisions of the Act.

The Attorney General: It only means that insofar as regulations have been made under the Soldier Settlement Act and in respect of soldier settlement land, they shall not be void because of something in the Land Act. That is all it means.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: It says in the Bill—

(c) Where anything relating to tenures is required to be provided for, in order that the scheme may be carried out or given effect, but cannot conveniently be provided for pursuant to the provisions of the Land Act, the Governor may, notwithstanding the provisions of that Act—

The Attorney General: Make them under this Act.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: No; make regulations.

The Attorney General: Make regulations under this Act.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: The provision continues—

—notwithstanding the provisions of that Act and without limiting the generality of the provisions of Sub-section (3) of the last preceding section, make regulations in respect of the requirements as fully and effectually as if the power conferred by this paragraph were expressly included in such of the provisions of that Act, as authorise the making of regulations for carrying out and giving force and effect to the objects, purposes, rights, powers and authorities of that Act.

I definitely do not like it and when the opportunity occurs I intend to endeavour to have that paragraph deleted.

On motion by Mr. Hoar, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 11.4. p.m.

Legislative Council

Wednesday, 24th October, 1951.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Chapman River bridge, as to repairs and cost	168
Migration, as to number of arrivals and homes provided	168
Bills : Supply, £11,000,000, Standing Orders suspension	167
2r., remaining stages, passed	170
Vermis Act Amendment, 3r.	163
Prices Control Act Amendment (Continuance), 3r., passed	168
Real Property (Foreign Governments), 3r., passed	168
Law Reform (Common Employment), report	168
Feeding Stuffs Act Amendment, Assembly's amendment	168
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment, Assembly's amendment	169
Library Board of Western Australia, 1r.	169
Petroleum Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	190
Muja-Centaur Coal Mine Railway, 2r., Com., report	190
Building Operations and Building Materials Control Act Amendment and Continuance, 2r.	191

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

BILL—SUPPLY, £11,000,000.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT:
I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Supply Bill to pass through its remaining stages at any one sitting.

The PRESIDENT: It is necessary to have an absolute majority to carry this motion.

Hon. G. FRASER: I would like to ask the Minister whether, if the motion is carried, it is his intention to go right through with the Bill. Today is only Wednesday, and I do not see that there is need of any great rush to pass the Bill before tomorrow. I would like to ask the Minister whether he would take the second reading stage today and allow the Committee stage and the third reading to remain over until tomorrow so that if any members wish to study the Bill more closely, they will have the opportunity to do so.

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT (in reply): I would like, if possible, to have the consideration of the Bill completed today. In the main, as members know, it is a formal Bill. There is no desire to restrict the right of any hon.