

industries as well, is men. Without the necessary manpower to do what is contemplated, works programmes cannot be undertaken. Some members seem to think that as soon as the servicemen are demobilised, we shall have an unmanageable problem of unemployment. I do not think that will be the situation at all. It may well be that in the early months it will be difficult to place some men. I think it will be. Any member who imagines we can take hold of all the servicemen just as we could take so many pieces of wood, stick them in the ground and leave them as everything will be all right, is making a great mistake. These men are human beings. Some of them have gone through dreadful experiences. Unfortunately, many of them, for some years after the war, will be problem cases with regard to employment and probably with respect to other matters as well.

As to the general question of providing employment in this State for our demobilised servicemen, I do not anticipate that there will be any real problem of unemployment for very many years to come. Members can look where they will and consider what industries they may like, and they will find that there is a dreadful shortage of manpower. Listening to the debate today, one would have thought that the only direction in which there is that shortage is in connection with the building of houses. I am sure members representing country electorates know just how severe is the shortage of manpower in rural industries. Members representing metropolitan constituencies know how acute the shortage is in other directions. The mining industry is to revive after the war terminates. In Western Australia I believe we shall find that there will be at least a number of jobs equal to the body of men seeking work. It might even be that we will have more jobs for some years after the war than we will have men to do them. I am not a bit afraid of the general problem of unemployment after the war.

The only feature that worries me to any considerable extent is the feature I mentioned a few moments ago; that is, the few cases for whom it will be very difficult to provide suitable employment. But the Government and private industry together will have to do the best they can in that direction, and I am sure that both will do so. So this amendment is badly founded:

firstly because it is brought forward at a most inappropriate and unfair time; and secondly because the great need of the moment is men to do the things which this amendment declares have not been done and should be done. We can place men in employment as soon as they become available; but we as a Government are not setting out to place every demobilised serviceman in employment. We feel that these men will be best placed in producing actual wealth wherever that is possible; but for the surplus of men available outside of wealth-producing industries the Government will provide employment in regard to the development of public facilities and the public resources of the State. I sincerely hope and believe that this amendment, because it is ill-founded and inappropriate to the present situation, will be defeated.

Amendment put and negatived.

On motion by Mr. Seward, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. F. J. S. Wise—Gascayne): I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. tomorrow, unless the Prime Minister of Australia officially declares before 10 a.m. Perth time tomorrow that peace has been made with Japan, in which event the House stands adjourned till 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 21st August, 1945.

	PAGE
Motions: The War, cessation of hostilities and tribute to the Services	234
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, to disallow bagged-wheat charges regulation	235
Address-in-reply, ninth day	239

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

MOTIONS—THE WAR.

Cessation of Hostilities and Tribute to the Services.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.33]: I would like, with the permission of the House, to move two

motions dealing with the conclusion of hostilities. In conformity with the Standing Orders, I ask leave accordingly.

Leave given.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [4.34]: I move—

1, That, following the recent unconditional surrender of Japan and thereby the complete victory of the Allied Forces, the Legislative Council of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled, expresses its profound gratitude to Almighty God, its deep and abiding loyalty to His Majesty the King, and its great admiration of all those men and women of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the other United Nations who fought and worked to destroy German and Japanese aggression and tyranny; and that His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor be asked to transmit the foregoing resolution to His Majesty the King.

2, That the Legislative Council of Western Australia, in Parliament assembled, desires to convey the deepest thanks of the people of Western Australia to the fighting men of Australia for the magnificent service given by them in the cause of freedom, justice and righteousness. The deep appreciation of our people is also expressed to all those men and women who assisted the fighting men by work and service in the various theatres of war, on the seas, in the air, or on the home front. This resolution to be forwarded to the appropriate Ministers of the Commonwealth.

It is with a feeling of humble gratitude that I am privileged to move these motions. The conflict that has raged for six long years is at last over. Side by side with their great Allies the fighting men and women of Australia have battled their way to victory against the mightiest forces of aggression that the world has ever known. This year has seen the utter defeat and humiliation of Nazi Germany and its satellites, and Imperial Japan, and the end of their implacable and ruthless struggles for world domination. The principles and hopes of peace-loving peoples have been preserved, but at fearful cost.

In practically every theatre of war, on land, on the sea and in the air, Australians have met the enemy and have made the supreme sacrifice. Our heartfelt sympathy must be extended to those who have lost their loved ones, and to those who have been maimed by enemy action. I can but hope on this historic occasion that the world will see no more wars, and that the efforts of those who are seeking to prevent the possibility of further clashes will be successful. The people of Australia have

stinted nothing to gain this victory; thousands of lives, most valuable to the country, have been lost; miracles of production have been achieved; money has been poured into the Treasury, and devotion to the common cause has been the watchword.

However, the war is now over and all our efforts must be concentrated on the re-establishment of normal conditions, together with rendering what assistance we can to the peoples of countries whose sufferings have been much greater than ours. In addition, our gratitude must, of course, be expressed to our great Allies and to the magnificent leaders under whose direction such complete victory has been achieved. Our happiness will be complete when our prisoners-of-war of the Eighth Division, and of other units are known to be safe and have returned to their own country. These words express my feelings on this occasion, and I am sure that the motions I have moved will meet with the wholehearted and unanimous approval of this Chamber.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [4.40]: I shall content myself with seconding the motions. I do not think there is any need to add to what has been said by the Chief Secretary. We are all heartily in accord with his statements.

Question put and passed; the motions agreed to.

MOTION—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST ACT.

To Disallow Bagged-Wheat Charges Regulation.

Debate resumed from the 14th August on the following motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter:—

That new regulation No. 148, made under the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act, 1902, as published in the "Government Gazette" of the 20th April, 1945, and laid on the Table of the House on the 31st July, 1945, be and is hereby disallowed.

HON. A. THOMSON (South-East) [4.46]: I support the motion and hope that the House will again disallow the regulation under which the Fremantle Harbour Trust seeks to impose certain charges for the handling of bagged-wheat. The regulation can be said to have been submitted "for the third time of asking," and I hold

that the evasive action by which the trust seeks to set aside the previous decisions of this House should not be permitted to succeed. The Chief Secretary pleaded with members to allow the Harbour Trust to impose charges that would allegedly cover the actual handling costs incurred. I regret that Mr. Craig is not in the House at the moment for he, as usual, backed up the Government in its desire to impose, through the Harbour Trust, the charges covered by the regulation. In the course of his remarks, that hon. member said that we appointed men to public bodies and should support them in any schemes they put forward, which would cover actual cost of work undertaken. This House has not had any opportunity to appoint a representative on the Fremantle Harbour Trust.

The most amazing feature is that although years ago the principle was accepted that the primary-producing section of the community, which provides at least 75 per cent. of the export commodities handled at Fremantle, was entitled to one representative among the commissioners controlling the operations of the trust, to-day business, commercial and Trades Hall interests are all represented on the trust, but no commissioner is there who might be able to safeguard the interests of the primary producers. In his support of the Government, Mr. Craig said that it was merely fair that the trust should be permitted to recoup itself for actual expenditure. I remind Mr. Craig that he entertains an entirely different point of view when a private concern is affected. In an undertaking in which both he and I are personally interested, each having a small number of shares in it, the company used to carry out the overhauling of boats. It had its own slip and therefore was able to do the work at a reasonable cost. When the company was compelled to use a Government slip, the charges had to be much higher, and we both took strong exception to the charges that were imposed. I presume that would, of course, be quite a different matter; it was looked upon purely as a matter of business! I regret Mr. Craig's absence because I wished to remind him of that and to draw a comparison between his attitude on the bagged-wheat handling charges regulation with that which he adopted in connection with the other matter I have mentioned.

I hope members will adhere firmly to the principles that actuated them previously and adopt a similar attitude regarding the regulation under discussion to that which they did on two previous occasions. At times it seems to be suggested that if the Government persists in submitting a regulation, as it has done in this matter, the attitude taken up by members probably will be, "Well, what is the use of continuing our opposition"—and the matter is allowed to go by the board. I draw attention to the fact that the farmers of Western Australia installed the bulk-handling facilities in this State entirely free of cost to the Government. They did not cost the taxpayers of the State one penny, and the farmers of Western Australia today are in the happy position of owning the whole of the bulk-handling system, which was adopted after much opposition by the Government. The farmers got no support whatever from the Government for the scheme for a number of years. It was only after the late Mr. Angwin had been appointed chairman of the Commission to inquire into the advisability and practicability of introducing the bulk-handling scheme and the Commission had made its report that the Government reluctantly accepted the recommendations and the scheme was put into operation.

Hon. J. A. Dimmitt: The Western Farmers, Ltd., charged enough to meet the cost of bulk-handling.

Hon. A. THOMSON: I presume the company did. Portion of the charges made by it was put on one side and the money so saved subsequently enabled the bulk-handling company to pay for the whole of the cost of the scheme. Not one penny piece is owing on it now.

The Chief Secretary: That was a special toll over and above the company's ordinary costs.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: But the wheatgrowers found all the money.

The Chief Secretary: That is right.

Hon. A. THOMSON: Despite the fact that handling charges were imposed by the company, the farmers of Western Australia today own the bulk-handling scheme. As a result of the practical experience gained by the then general manager of the bulk-handling company—he is now the general manager of the Australian Wheat Board—wheat can now be handled in bulk cheaply in this

State. That has meant a considerable saving both to the farmers and to the people of Western Australia; it has also saved several hundreds of thousands of pounds for the people of the Commonwealth. War conditions have now rendered it necessary to bag wheat to be exported oversea, and this State is in the peculiar position of supplying the rest of Australia with wheat and fodder. War conditions also rendered it necessary to bag wheat being exported to other countries whose facilities for bulk handling were destroyed by the war. It is remarkable that New South Wales, notwithstanding that it has huge concrete silos to receive wheat from sidings, has no facilities for receiving wheat in bulk at the port of Sydney. In normal times it would be unnecessary to bag the greater portion of the wheat exported from this State. I impress this point upon members: It is not the fault of the bulk-handling company nor the fault of the farming community that wheat for export must be bagged in this State.

Hon. T. Moore: A certain number of bags have always had to be used.

Hon. A. THOMSON: A certain number, but so small as to be almost negligible. At one time it was thought to be unnecessary to instal bulk-handling facilities at the port of Albany, to serve the area representing the lower Great Southern, because the bagged-wheat from that port could be used to stiffen the loads of bulk wheat exported from Fremantle and other ports. We should not be penalised because, owing to war conditions, wheat must be bagged for export from Fremantle. It has been said that the wheatgrowers will not pay the additional cost, but that it would be borne by the Australian Wheat Board. It seems to me quite unfair to expect our farmers to pay the full cost of the additional handling. I believe Mr. Miles can bear me out in the statement I am about to make, namely, that after the last war a surcharge of 35 per cent, was imposed on all goods handled at Fremantle and other Western Australian ports. The amazing thing is that that surcharge is still in existence, notwithstanding that it was levied owing to war conditions and because of the necessity for getting increased revenue.

If we agree to this regulation becoming law, then, in effect, we shall be imposing for all time an extra charge on bagged-wheat handled at Fremantle. This House has no

control over the price once it is fixed. As I say, during the previous war, more than 25 years ago, a surcharge of 35 per cent.—if my memory serves me correctly—was imposed and it is still in existence. That shows how dangerous it is to agree to the imposition of the additional charge proposed by this regulation. If the trust were being run as a losing concern, there would be reason in the case submitted by the Chief Secretary that the extra handling costs must be met somehow. The Prices Commissioner is in the happy position of agreeing to the increase, but the farmers are not in the happy position of being able to add the increase to the sale price of their commodity. In the case of stores or any other business the Price Fixing Commissioner says, "Your costs have gone up and I will allow you to increase your charges accordingly so that you can make a profit." That does not apply to primary production, as members are aware. I wish to draw attention to the Auditor General's report and to read an illuminating paragraph in connection with the Fremantle Harbour Trust appearing on page 11 of that document. The paragraph is as follows:—

The earnings for the year (£667,574) were the highest in the Trust's history and were £52,115 in excess of the earnings for 1942-1943 (£615,459). Expenses were also higher, mainly due to the continued increasing costs incurred in the handling and custody of cargo. The surplus (£267,706) exceeded that of the previous year by £5,125. The amount paid to the Treasury as surplus revenue (after the clearance of interest and sinking fund charges) amounted to £91,148, being a decrease of £28,163 as compared with the previous year.

If members will look lower down on the page they will find that in 1943-44, after paying £143,815 for interest, and providing £24,076 for sinking fund, the Harbour Trust paid £91,148 into Consolidated Revenue. In 1942-43 the trust paid interest amounting to £144,810, contributed to the sinking fund £23,120, and paid into Consolidated Revenue £119,311. At the bottom of the page appears the following interesting paragraph:—

The revenue of the Trust has been affected by concessions in the form of rebates, etc., from the charges fixed by regulations, allowed to the Commonwealth and the Governments of Allied Nations. It is estimated that these allowances have aggregated £96,000, from their inception during the war period. In addition, an estimated amount of £52,000 was rebated during 1943-44 under other regulations.

The Fremantle Harbour Trust was able to make allowances to the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of Allied Nations—I do not take exception to the making of those allowances—amounting to £148,000, and yet was able to make a profit in 1942-43 of £119,311 and in 1943-44 of £91,148. If the Harbour Trust was able to make such big allowances and still show a profit surely it is not asking too much that, because the extraordinary conditions which have been set up through the war have made it necessary that wheat should be bagged, the trust should then say, "Seeing that this is only a temporary condition we will place the handling of wheat in bags on exactly the same footing as has been the case with the Commonwealth Government."

The Chief Secretary: The rebates you speak of have nothing to do with the handling charges.

Hon. A. THOMSON: The report from which I have quoted does not say what they are for. Whatever the reason may have been we know that £148,000 was rebated to the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of the Allied Nations.

The Chief Secretary: Those rebates are Harbour Trust dues. So far as wheat is concerned, it pays nothing at all. It gets the whole lot of the rebate.

Hon. A. THOMSON: These allowances were paid; I do not know for what reason. The report of the Auditor General definitely states that the revenue of the trust has been affected by concessions in the form of rebates etc., or charges fixed by regulation.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It was in a better position to pay than were the farmers.

Hon. A. THOMSON: It was in a better position to pay than was the farming community. I will now read another extract dealing with Canadian exports taken from the "Sydney Bulletin"—

When price control was first introduced it was generally believed that its aim was to restrict permitted price increases to actual rises in costs; to stop profiteering, in short. It has since been made clear that not even compensation for rising costs will be allowed to traders in every case. Canadian trade appears to be subject to much the same sort of restrictions. The following is an extract from the report of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board, Ottawa:—

The determination of the point at which relief (from rising costs) may be given is not susceptible of precise definition and

must depend upon the circumstances of the individual case. Increased costs in themselves do not justify granting relief. The mere fact that an applicant is not earning standard profits does not necessarily mean that relief should be granted. If the price ceiling is to be maintained price adjustments can only be authorised when an applicant can demonstrate real financial need on an overall basis. In reaching a decision the board considers not merely the current position of the applicant but such clearly important matters as the future prospects for sales volume and costs, the nature of the business and its strength and financial resources. Subsidies are not intended to assure profits at pre-war or pre-ceiling level, and the rates of subsidy are determined with a view to providing the minimum necessary relief.

I draw attention to the fact that in reaching a decision on the overall basis, the board considers not merely the current position of the applicant, but such clearly important matters as the future prospects for sales volume and costs, the nature of the business and its strength and financial resources. On the overall basis and on the financial statement I have read, I hope this House will not agree to the handling charges which have for the third time been imposed on the handling of bagged-wheat, contrary to the wishes of the Chamber.

When we look to the future prospects of the wheat industry we must feel that this is not an opportune time to impose additional costs upon it. At the present moment the industry is practically hamstrung. Farmers are supposed to be getting a fair price for their commodity, but that has to be proved. In view of the approach which is now being made by the Australian Workers' Union to the Federal Court for an award, I contend that this is not the time when additional charges of this character should be imposed. I hope the House will support the motion, and for the third time clearly indicate that we disapprove of the action of the Fremantle Harbour Trust in making some minute alteration to the regulations, and again imposing the charges to which so much objection has been raised.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.12]: I support the motion, which is becoming a hardy annual. I do not know whether the Fremantle Harbour Trust is setting out to wear down members of this Chamber, or whether it thinks we will ultimately forget

all about the whole question. I would not be so enthusiastic about the motion if the Harbour Trust were losing money. The amount in question, one-tenth of a penny per bushel, is not a great deal, but the question is one of principle. I do not see why the wheat industry should be saddled with the extra expense involved. The trust should not require to make a profit on everything it handles. Other concerns do not show a profit on every department of their activities.

The argument advanced by Mr. Craig is illogical. He says the trust should not be asked to show a loss on wheat handling, though it might be making a great profit in other directions. Does he believe in the railways making a profit on the carriage of super? The railways are a losing concern and yet are carrying super at a loss. The management knows that although it is carrying that commodity at a loss it will show a profit on other commodities that are carried, on a greater quantity of wheat for instance. The trust makes a considerable profit on the handling of machinery over the wharf. What it loses on wheat it will make up from the farmer on machinery, which costs anything from £5 to £10 a piece to put over the wharf. That is a big tax upon the farming industry. When a farmer buys a tractor and grows wheat that commodity is helping to build up the revenue of the country. I do not think the trust should necessarily make a profit on the little bagged-wheat that is handled.

We who represent the primary producers are not satisfied with the constitution of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Board. It was the accepted practice for many years to have on the trust a man who knew all about the farming industry, although he might not at the time be a farmer himself. What do the people on that body know of the farming industry? I venture to say they do not know very much about it. I believe if the Commissioners included a representative of the farming industry it would inspire more confidence and perhaps, when these regulations came along, we might be prepared to consider there was some reason for them. I cannot think there is any necessity to make this charge on the wheat industry, an industry which today faces many problems. Let there be no mistake about that. The committee from the Primary Producers' Association which recently went into the

cost of production, investigated the problem very carefully. They were all farmers, and one was a chartered accountant, and they put down the cost of production at 5s. 2d. per bushel. This section of primary industry—the wheat industry—is today confronted with the rural workers' log, something which it has never had before. I intend to say something more about that log later on, so I will not dwell on it now. In view of these factors, it is my intention to support the motion for the disallowance of the regulation.

On motion by Hon. C. F. Baxter, debate adjourned.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Ninth Day.

Debate resumed from the 14th August.

HON. G. B. WOOD (East) [5.18]: I am very glad today that we meet in happier circumstances than we did last week. We were then in a state of uncertainty as to what would happen. We did not know but that the war would go on for some months. Though we knew Japan was beaten, it was on the cards that the enemy would fight on for some months, with considerable loss of life to our own people. Under the circumstances I would like to make some observations as to what has happened over the last six years. We can call to mind 1939, and the bad years after that, and the terrible mess that we were in at that time. It is a wonder to me that we were able to get out of it, and I often ask myself what we had—the British nation and Australia, too—with which to get out of the mess we were in in those years. We were a sport-loving people and did not think of much else but that.

The people of France thought of little but pleasure—yet we got out of it, and we can only say, at this time, that it was probably due to the great leaders who arose at that juncture. I want particularly to refer to the late President Roosevelt of whom, in my opinion, enough has not been said as regards the great work which he did. When England was almost down and out, and when many of Roosevelt's people were against him, though he had no axe to grind and because he knew civilisation was in the balance, long before America was attacked he came to our assistance. Therefore I say we

must be very thankful for that man, as also for the great Mr. Churchill who, I think, was a gift sent from Heaven, or could have been, to come to our assistance as a great leader to inspire the British nation, the people of England, and perhaps all the people of the world who were again t G many.

In Australia we had Mr. Menzies, who laid the foundation stone of our war effort and, when the danger was great, we had the late John Curtin. I think it is a great pity that at this time, of those four men, two have been taken by death and are not here to enjoy the fruits of victory, while Mr. Churchill—by the vagaries of party politics—is not now leading the nation. I have a idea that future generations will look back on that action of the people of England as something not very creditable—to have turned the Government out as they did. I would be the last person to say that the people of a democratic country should not turn their Prime Minister out when they so desire, but in view of the happenings over the five years before that election, when the populace absolutely worshipped Mr. Churchill, I say it is a blot on the people of England to have done what they did, or a blot on those people who were responsible for it, and I believe future generations will bear me out in that regard. Now we must face the future. We have one task, the war, behind us, but we have a greater task in front of us, and I do not think it will be very easy to cope with.

First and foremost there is the rehabilitation of the prisoners of war and the returned soldiers. When I say that the task will not be easy, I believe that in Australia it will perhaps be harder than in other places, on account of our big percentage of enlistments as against population and also the varied problems, which I will deal with later on, in the primary industries. I feel sure that in spite of the progress of secondary industries in Australia, it will be to the primary industries that we will have to look to absorb most of those men. As regards the prisoners of war we do not know at this moment what they will be like when they come back. I feel that we shall have to be very tolerant with them in setting them up and putting them back into civil life again. Not only will they be shattered in health, but in mind also. They may have a

bitter outlook and I believe their path will be very hard. However, it has to be faced.

I do hope that public opinion, in Australia at all events, will see that the war criminals, who have been responsible for the war, are properly punished. Unfortunately when a war is over people are inclined to become lenient, but I am glad to see that the Commonwealth Government is taking a stand in that matter. We must do what we can to see that the war criminals are punished for the sake of future generations, so that such a war will not be waged again. I spoke about the rehabilitation of returned soldiers. Many people believe that our primary industries today are in a wonderful position, but I tell the House that things are not all they ought to be regarding the profits derived from those industries.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: What about the season?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Mr. Bolton has mentioned the season, and the season today is almost as bad as a drought. When one looks through the various districts one sees crops which have been put in but which will not be any good at all. I am told that round Katanning there will be practically no hay, and in such places as York and Northam the crops are water-logged. It is the irony of fate that we prayed for rain last year, but now there seems to be no end to the rain. As to the hampering methods of price fixing to which farmers have been subject, in the early part of this year, when primary producers were scratching gravel to keep their flocks alive and in good condition, we found that the Price Fixing Commissioner gave them no encouragement whatever as to future prices.

I believe that, though the drought was mostly responsible for the position, the action of the Price Fixing Commissioner had a lot to do with the shortage of meat in Perth and other places. I am positive of that, because the farmers did not know where they were. They were faced with an expenditure of from 5s. to 10s. per head to keep their stock in condition, and they said, "We will not do it, because we do not know how we will be treated." As it happened, when June and July came along, in spite of the Price Fixing Commissioner and what he did, the prices were higher. It was not his fault, because the but-

chers apparently did not take any notice of him. Unfortunately, the farmers did not know that at the time when their stock had to be kept in condition and fattened.

At York a considerable industry has been built up in the production of out-of-season vegetables, principally celery, lettuce and cauliflowers. This industry is subject to considerable expense for water and various other requirements, and it has been doing a great job, as far as the metropolitan area is concerned, in putting certain vegetables on the Perth market when they could not be grown down here. The Price Fixing Commissioner, or Deputy-Commissioner, in his wisdom or otherwise, said, "No, you shall not get 5d. or 6d. for your lettuces. You can only have 4d." He did not take into consideration the extra cost of water, though I know of men who were paying up to £300 per annum for water in that area. The Deputy-Prices Commissioner gave no consideration to that or to the fact that these vegetables had to be taken by motor truck from York to Perth, and when I went to him as a deputation, together with a representative of the Metropolitan Markets—a man who represents the consumer—and told him that people wanted this stuff, he turned the proposal down and would not do anything about it. I venture to say that instead of expanding, this industry will remain static, as it is at present.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It has been killed.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I would not say it has been killed, but there is a lot of loss there, and I have been told by people in the business that there is room for ten times as much out-of-season vegetables as are available at the moment. I believe from the questions I asked and the answers I got from the Agricultural Department the Government is sympathetic towards these people, but apparently it has no control over the Price Fixing Commissioner, who can do what he likes. I say he does not know what he is talking about, and I do not think he takes the trouble to find out. When we went on this deputation to him we put up a lot of figures as to costs in order to disclose the position. Later on, through wet weather, many of the growers lost from 25 to 30 per cent. of their crops. That may not happen again, but it did happen on this occasion.

Another hampering action taken by the Commissioner was with regard to his unscientific price-fixing in connection with rabbits. For a time the trappers were getting 1s. 6d. per pair for rabbits at the country towns but, strange to say, when the rabbits became scarce a couple of months ago, the Price Fixing Commissioner reduced that price to 1s. 3d. These trappers are doing a great job, and in the Avon valley today there are fewer rabbits than I have seen there at any time in the last 20 years. Rabbits are retailed in Perth at a price which makes them a cheap article of food, costing only about one-third of the price per pound charged for poultry. Retailers are only allowed to charge 1s. 3d. for three or four pounds of rabbit. What is at the back of the minds of the people who do these things? Why cannot there be some sort of appeal from these decisions, or why cannot we have someone who knows something about the business? Why cannot investigations be made into the cost of production? If anyone were making undue profit out of growing vegetables, raising stock or killing rabbits, it would be all right, but the department does not seem to worry about that.

I wish now to deal with the control of tyres. The people of the country engaged in primary production have not had a fair deal in the matter of the allocation of tyres. I intend to give some instances of the haphazard methods adopted. There is a man who has a couple of farms three or four miles apart but only one truck. He uses it for transport for killing rabbits, for seeding, for carting water and for doing all his crop dressing. In fact he did practically everything possible with it on the farm.

Hon. T. Moore: Did you say he caught rabbits with it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: When a man goes out trapping rabbits, he must have a conveyance. This man could not walk from one farm to the other. He asked for one tyre for a back wheel of his truck. The people running the show in Perth said, "You cannot buy a tyre for your truck. You had better buy a secondhand military truck, which will cost you £350." They also brought up the question of his having a car, and he said he would not ask for tyres for the car provided he could get one for his truck. The request was turned down.

Here is another instance and not a very pleasant one. A taxi-driver in York wanted two tyres for his car. He is the only taxi-driver there. On two occasions his request was recommended by the local representative of the Liquid Fuel Control Board, who agreed that the tyres were essential. He is the only man available in the town to take maternity cases to the hospital. The people in control in Perth, however, turned down the request. They would not take any notice of the recommendation of the local representative of the Liquid Fuel Control Board. This man went to the Minister for Works and quickly got the tyres he needed. I am very glad he got them because he deserved to have them. But why should the man have been turned down in the first place? The Minister for Works was not in a position to judge whether the tyres were essential or not, but the local representative of the Fuel Board was, and he recommended that they should be supplied. It seems to be an extraordinary state of affairs that a man should be turned down in this way and then be able to get his requirements through a Minister.

Here is another case for which I can vouch. A person living 14 miles out of a country town had a little car and wanted a couple of tyres for it. The board replied, "No, put the car away and use your three-ton truck." This man had to use his three-ton truck and incur all the consequent wear on tyres and consume petrol in order to run into the town. I could mention other people who are compelled to use their trucks for the same reason. I know that tyres have been scarce, but some people in the metropolitan area, who do not deserve consideration as much as do primary producers, have received a much better deal than the people in the country. Talk about producing food and that sort of thing! What chance have they to produce when such hampering regulations are imposed? I do not know whether the regulations are to blame; one could be excused for thinking that we have a lot of little Hitlers down here, judging by the way they talk. My car was stuck up in Perth and when I went to the department, for a new tube, I was asked, "What are you doing in Perth with your car?" I replied, "I am here on public business because the train cannot get me here quick enough." That is the sort of thing we have to put up with.

I repeat that I know there is a shortage of tyres, but I do not think that those available have been allocated fairly and justly. Let me give another instance. I made an application for some rope reins and was told I would have to go to the Department of Shipping and obtain a permit. I was informed that I could get plenty of cotton rope, such as I understand is used by yachtsmen, but I wanted rope for reins. I went to the Department of Shipping and got my permit. No question was raised about granting it. But why should we have to obtain a permit in such a case except to keep a woman in a job? There is plenty of rope available—tens of thousands of yards of it. Some regulation might have been necessary two years ago, but it is not necessary today. When I told the young lady that I wanted 50 ft. of rope for reins for my team, she merely asked whether I was engaged in primary production, and when I assured her that I was, I got the permit. One has only to say it is needed for primary production and one can get it.

I wish to speak about the prisoners-of-war labour made available to farmers and the "roughie" that the Commonwealth Government put over us. If ever there was a "roughie" put over the farmers, it is this one. Prisoners-of-war have been employed by farmers at £1 a week and their keep.

Hon. W. R. Hall: Are they worth it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Definitely not. I had a man for three months and put him off because he was not worth £1 per week. The Commonwealth Government was told by the unions that the farmers were getting cheap labour, and it decided to put up the rate to £2 a week and keep.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The rate is £1 a week.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: No, it is £2 a week; the hon. member is wrong. I pay £6 every three weeks for the one man I have.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I am just as definite that you are wrong. I will show you my figures.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I do not wish to get into an argument with the hon. member, and to offer to bet him would be highly disorderly. At the same time, I should like to bet him later on. The present position is anomalous. A prisoner-of-war works for a farmer for which a payment of £2 a week has to be made, plus keep, equal in all to £3 5s. a week, but the prisoner-of-war gets

only 1s. 3d. and keep for himself. What an extraordinary position that is! It is not right that anyone should have to work for that rate; yet we have to pay the Government £2 a week for prisoners-of-war and supply their keep, which is worth 25s. a week. Representations were made to Mr. Holloway, and he told us we were lucky to be getting this cheap labour. It is not cheap labour. But for the scarcity or non-existence of other labour, all these prisoners-of-war would be thrown back on the hands of the Commonwealth Government.

Hon. T. Moore: Not all of them.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I admit that, but the good ones are few and far between. I have had experience of these men. About eight of them used to congregate at my place every Sunday and I had an opportunity to study them. They consisted of a priest, some barbers, and people of that sort.

Hon. W. J. Mann: No politicians?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Such men do not know anything about farm work. Yet Mr. Holloway told us that now these men had learnt the language, they were worth so much more. Learnt the language! I know more Italian than my employee knows Australian. I have brought this matter forward because I am of opinion that the Commonwealth has acted unjustly towards the farmers by adopting this attitude.

Now I wish to deal with the Railway Department and the matter of the carriage of superphosphate. Some discussion has taken place in the newspaper and in another place about the carriage of superphosphate, and some remarks have been made by the Commissioner of Railways. Two or three months ago I was amazed on reading almost a column in "The West Australian" containing a statement by the Commissioner as to the great job the department had done in the carriage of superphosphate. I repeat that I was amazed to read it. The railways did a very bad job in the carriage of superphosphate this year. I am not going to blame anyone in the department, but I wish to point out to the department that the farmers were very dissatisfied, and it can try to make amends next year. There might be factors operating beyond the control of the department; I do not know.

There is also the matter of the carriage of crude oil. On the 25th May I approached

the Petroleum Pool on behalf of a number of farmers asking whether anything could be done to expedite the carriage of crude oil to the farmers. I was informed that representations had already been made to the Railway Department, and perhaps I could influence the Transport Board to get the stuff carted by the hundreds of trucks that were returning empty to the country. I undertook to approach the Transport Board. On the 25th May, 129 truckloads of crude oil and grease were at North Fremantle awaiting transport to the country, and the Railway Department supplied only 19 trucks. I went to the department and said, "This stuff has to be sent out; the farmers are waiting for it." I was told that it would be sent out in trucks that otherwise would have gone to the country empty. I have a letter from Mr. Allingham which says—

Since your interview with the Transport Board and the Railway Department, we have received a steady flow of railway trucks, the total for the three days being 85 trucks.

So the people who wanted crude oil found their wants supplied. But there is something behind this that does not meet the eye. Unfortunately, many of the 85 trucks were taken from the people who wanted superphosphate carted to the country. At the time there were dozens and perhaps hundreds of big trucks being sent to the country empty. According to the Railway Department, those trucks were not permitted to carry crude oil. The department would not allow these trucks the high rate for crude oil. I admit that the Railway Department was faced with difficulties. It was carting water and many engines were worn out; but why could not a great percentage of the super have gone back to Northam, York and Goomalling in the road trucks? I venture to say that no country in the world would have permitted trucks to go back empty in that way when farmers were calling out for super. I believe that a little went back; but if I had been on the Transport Board I would have said, "You are not going on the roads with chaff and oats, and so on, at high freights unless super is taken back." That was not done. I do not suppose thought was given to it.

Talk about transport co-ordination! There is not much co-ordination when that sort of thing occurs; yet the Commissioner says a

great job was done! A lot of super got to the country as late as the 26th June, and most of it is in the sheds today. Thousands of tons of super are in the sheds because of the floods that occurred and late delivery. I do not say that all the super could have gone back in those trucks, but a tremendous proportion of it could have done so. Tons of wheat and hay were carried on semi-trailer conveyances; and I spoke to some of the men about bringing up my super. They said they would do so. No-one, of course, expected it to be brought up at railway rates. But that very day I got a card from the Cresco Super Works saying that my super had left the works. That super did not arrive at York until 12 days later.

It was 12 days coming from Bassendean to York! That was by rail. Yet the Commissioner says that the Railway Department did a great job, and the Minister backs him up! One argument put up was that the department carted more super this year than last. I pity the poor farmers next year with extra allocations of super unless something is done about the matter. I view the position very seriously. There is talk of super being transported by December, but it will be no good in six months' time. I had to borrow three bags from a neighbour, and it took me a long time to break it up.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: I agree with you in that respect.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I am glad the hon. member agrees with me about something. Last year I referred to the need for opening up Nauru Island. Some members threw up their hands in horror to think I should mention such a subject. They talked about interfering with the Navy, and all that sort of thing; but if something had been done last year, when we had control of the air and sea, we would not be in the sorry position we are in today. I do not think anything has been done in regard to that island. All the machinery has to be prepared; but although I have made inquiries, I cannot obtain any information that preparations along those lines have been made. It will be a couple of years before we can get the phosphatic rock which is so badly needed. Western Australia is crying out for it. Tens of thousands of acres of land are starving for want of it.

Hon. L. Craig: The machinery is being prepared.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I hope the hon. member is right, but I cannot obtain any information. I know that the State Government cannot do anything about the Navy, but representations should have been made 12 or 18 months ago to the Commonwealth Government to use its influence with the Americans or the English. Of course, the Americans would not be very interested unless a proper proposition were submitted.

Hon. L. B. Bolton: The Phosphate Commission has the matter in hand and is doing everything possible.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I made inquiries three or four months ago from the manager of the firm of which I believe Mr. Bolton is a director, and he told me he did not know anything about it. He said that other interests were at work and that the stuff had to be brought from Egypt, or somewhere else. The war is over now, and we need thousands of tons of super in Western Australia; but we do not see much hope of getting it. The phosphatic rock we are obtaining is not up to standard. Mr. Hamersley, by interjection, says it is not worth buying. It is said to be of 17 per cent. quality; I do not believe it is as much as that, judging by the response of pastures and crops to it. This question of super is vital to the whole world, which is crying out for food; it is particularly vital to Western Australia. I hope the State Government will make suitable representations, because this matter means much more to Western Australia, with its light land, than it does to any other State. If the Government has already made representations, let us hear about them, so that confidence will be engendered in the country.

A question which is exercising the minds of many people in the Avon Valley is that of spark arresters. People around Northam, York, Beverley and Armadale are concerned about the numerous fires caused by Collie coal. I believe that, on account of the inferior quality, the engines seem to throw out more sparks than ever before. We never appear to be able to get anywhere with these spark-arresters. The Government says it is pretty keen on one—the Coxon—but we do not seem to be able to get a report about it. If we could obtain information about the

spark-arresters that have been tried, people in the country would perhaps be reassured. I examined one at Armadale that was invented by a policeman named Fletcher. Mr. McLarty and I looked at it one day, and it seemed quite good. I feel inclined to move, later in the session, for a Select Committee to go into this question with a view to finding out what has been done. Some people say that enginedrivers throw open the spark-arresters, and they are not used. We want to know if something can be done in this matter. People are becoming very perturbed about the frequent fires that occur. A good deal of farmers' time is taken up in chasing trains; and even then fires get away!

I turn now to the wool industry, the outlook for which is bad, since there are 10,000,000 bales of wool in the world that cannot be disposed of. In the circumstances, the increased rates for shearers and shed-hands are iniquitous. I thought wages were to be pegged during the war, and I do not know how these workers were able to obtain additional amounts. I know that when certain people wanted to secure increased salaries for nurses, they were told that nothing could be done; yet this strong union of shearers appears to be able to get away with it and have rates increased. If North-West members are awake, I should like them to listen to what I am going to say. The Arbitration Court is considering an application for increased rates for workers in the pastoral and farming industries. If anything is going to ruin the pastoral industry—and other rural industries—far more than taxation is likely to do, it is this new log, which is the most amazing of which I have ever heard.

We have had an award for the dairy industry. We thought that was a bit hot but it has nothing on this one! The union claims a 44-hour week. I intend to spend a little time on this matter in order to show hon. members how serious it is. If the union gets what it wants, I assure members the situation will be very serious indeed. The claim is for a basic wage of £4 16s. Before a margin for skill is awarded, an amount of 6s. is tacked on, bringing the total to £5 2s. a week. I would point out that this award is claimed by the A.W.U. It embraces banana-growers, planters, pickers, packers, etc., about

whom I do not know very much. I am chiefly concerned with the rates applying to farm workers. A ploughman is to get a margin for skill of £1, which brings the figure to £6 2s. A ploughman who has to feed his horses and a man who feeds ten horses—which is a common enough team—is to be awarded an extra £1. Do members realise the significance of that? Although the ploughman has £1 above his prosperity loading and everything else, he is to obtain another £1 a week because he has to feed horses. That is for a 44-hour week. Those hours are to be worked between 7.30 a.m. and 5 p.m. I contend that no ploughman can work those hours and do the job properly. At a moderate estimate I suggest he will have to work three hours outside of that range. For the first two hours extra he works he is to receive time and a half, which is 9s. 9d.; for the third hour, the figure is 6s. 6d. That brings the wages to the rate of £2 2s. 3d. a day.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that being applied for?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes; and if we in this State do not fight against it, the union will get away with it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Why did you not bring this out before the election?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: This is a most serious matter. If a man works three hours' overtime, he is to obtain £2 2s. 3d. per day. In addition to this, he is to enjoy nine public holidays on full pay and to have 12 days' annual leave on full pay, and a day off for every election, in order that he may be able to vote. And there may be three elections in one year: a Federal election and two State elections! I have worked this out in hours. I find that 52 weeks at 44 hours per week gives a total of 2,288 hours, less about four weeks off on full pay. That brings the figure to 2,112 hours for the year.

Another matter is that of "smokes." He is entitled to 10 minutes in the morning and 10 minutes in the afternoon at full time. It does not matter if he fills his pipe every time the machine stops he still gets this 20 minutes a day. These things reduce his time for the year down to 2,024 hours, or an average of 39 hours per week. For anything beyond that period he gets overtime, which is pretty hot! In addition, he is allowed six days sick pay per annum. Imag-

ine a man coming in from the town recovering from the night before! He could easily say he was sick without needing a doctor's certificate.

In the dairying award the spread of hours is 56, which is not so bad. The tractor men are in a rather worse position than the horse men because some farmers spent £700 to £1,000 in purchasing a tractor. Because a farmer has spent that much money he must work two or three shifts, seeing that it would not pay him to have a tractor unless he did. At least one shift has to be done at overtime rates, which amount to £12 a week. If that is not going to ruin the industry I do not know what is. We can imagine a man with a tractor paying one of his hands £6 2s. per week for eight hours a day, and the other two hands £12 a week.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: It will stop wheat growing.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Of course it will. I said something just now about stockmen. Under the station section the stockman gets £5 2s. with a margin for skill of £1 10s., making a total of £6 12s. a week. Imagine all the work on a sheep station being done between the hours of 7.30 a.m. and 5 p.m. I worked on a station for a number of years, and we used to get up at 3.30 a.m. and knock off in the middle of the day for a few hours if it was very hot, and would sometimes work all night if it was a moonlight night. All that will go by the board if the A.W.U. gets away with this log. There is absolutely no provision in this award for pensioners and old men on farms. Many farms, particularly in the Avon Valley and other old settled areas, employ old chaps who are very glad to remain at 15s. or £1 a week. These people will be thrown on to the State because the award holds out no hope for them. They must be paid the full amount or be put out. I hope members realise that this is a serious matter. We must fight this award as hard as we possibly can to prevent its being foisted on the primary industries. I mentioned the outlook for wool. I believe it is not very bright today.

Hon. H. L. Roche: I do not agree with you.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Well, I am very glad because the hon. member might know more about the subject than I do. But I can-

not see any grounds for optimism when to-day there are 10,000,000 bales of surplus wool in the world. Mr. Roche may talk about the position after the last war when there were only 2,000,000 bales. At that time England was not impoverished, and neither were other countries as they are to-day. I do not know how we can dispose of these 10,000,000 bales. If we send them to China and other places what sort of price will we get? I believe that the greatest caution should be exercised, on that and other counts, in regard to soldier settlement. The capital cost will have to be kept well down. I was very taken with Mr. Seddon's remarks on a certain matter of taxation. While perhaps his reasons were a little far-fetched in bringing the wife into the question of splitting the income to make the rate lower, I am very grateful to him for bringing it up because I believe that in the primary industries, particularly that of farming, the wife plays a very important part in producing the income. Sometimes the wife takes the place—I would not say of a farm-hand—

Members: She has taken the place of two farm hands since the war!

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I did not like to put it that way, but she is, perhaps, worth at least two farm hands. But no allowance is made for what the wife does in that way. Mr. Seddon's suggestion is a good one. Practically 50 per cent. of the farmers' wives play a very important part in producing that income, and I think something should be done. While on the subject of taxation, I wish to mention two matters. A man at Moora employs a governess for his two children. He is, therefore, saving the State a certain amount of money, and I have taken the matter up for him with the Taxation Department to get a deduction. He does not get any deduction on account of the governess. It seems to me extraordinary. I do not know who makes these regulations, or whether they are entirely in the hands of the Commissioner of Taxation. But something should be done in an instance like that. A day or two ago another case was brought to me involving a girl who is wholly maintaining her blind father. He is completely dependent on her. He has no money, but she gets no tax deduction because of what she does.

Hon. L. Craig: She would get a deduction if he is entirely dependent.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: She does not.

Hon. G. Fraser: Has she claimed it?

Hon. G. B. WOOD: Yes. I said to her, "Your father is entitled to a pension." She said, "He is too proud to take it." However, the point is not that he should get a pension and the girl pay her full taxes, but that she is entitled to a definite deduction.

Hon. L. Craig: She is entitled to it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I have not taken this matter up myself, but I did deal with the other one. Anyway, she has not got that deduction so far.

Hon. G. Fraser: There is some reason for it then.

Hon. L. Craig: You will fix it.

Hon. G. B. WOOD: I want to say something now about Parliament House. The first year I came here Mr. Craig raised the question of completing the building of the House. I do not say that we can afford to do that at the moment, or for some years to come, but there are certain improvements that would be a decided asset to the House and to the outlook of Perth. I refer particularly to the end balconies. It would not be necessary to interfere with the existing temporary buildings in order to build those balconies. Coming along Hay-street we see a half-finished building, which is a disgrace. The Parliament Houses in the Eastern States make us feel that we must be a poor old crowd in Western Australia. I am not advocating the spending of thousands of pounds, although that would help considerably, but merely the completion of the balconies at each end of building. That would not hurt anybody; it would not hurt the Treasury, and it would create employment later. I hope it will not be too long before it is done. I did not mention it while the war was on.

Perhaps some of the disgraceful buildings in the middle could be pulled down, or some plan made to deal with them. I do not suggest that the whole building should be completed, but I do believe the improvements I have suggested could be carried out without involving very much expenditure. In regard to our country schools, the whole trouble is lack of money. We have been kidded for years that there is no money, but in the paper the other day we read

where Midland Junction is to get a high school, a technical school and some other school the nature of which I forget for the moment. I do not know how much is going to be spent there—perhaps tens of thousands of pounds—yet I assure members that today there are children in the country who are getting no education at all, except by correspondence, because amounts of £200 and £300 are not being spent on schools. The other day I asked questions about area schools, and from the replies it seems that the Government has no plans at all to establish area schools in any of the districts where I think they are desirable and necessary. But this money can be spent at Midland Junction! I know where there are children who are not receiving any education.

I am going to refer to a case I took up on behalf of the Manmanning people for a bus service into Cadoux. At Manmanning there are 23 children going without education, and although the Education Department has approved of a bus service to Cadoux I am told that the Cadoux school will not accommodate them. That sort of thing is going on all over the place. I could tell members about the children who desire to attend the York school. There is one bus service there, and two schemes are held up because the Wesley Hall is not quite ready to take the overflow. The way the country has been treated in these matters is a disgrace. I asked questions last year about the Northam High School which is still in the process of being built. Goodness knows when it will be finished. Promise after promise has been made, but it will be fortunate if the school is completed by next year. I would not have mentioned these matters had I not seen what is intended to be done at Midland Junction.

I wish to mention another point, namely, future travelling and traffic in Perth. I think Mr. Cornish will bear me out in this. I live in Mt. Lawley, and I can assure members that even now I have the greatest difficulty in getting into the city along Beaufort-street because of the heavy tram traffic and motor cars. Unless something is done very soon there will be a tremendous amount of congestion, which should not be the case in a city like this. I believe that one tramline should be taken from Beaufort-street and a single line laid in Stirling-street.

However, that is for experts to decide. But the bottle-neck from Bulwer-street to the city causes considerable and many delays. What I have mentioned concerns only one area. This traffic question must be faced. Before the war the city experienced a lot of traffic congestion which has been relieved because of the war. However, as the position will arise again in the near future the people concerned should take the matter in hand and do something about it before it is too late. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. H. L. Roche, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.15 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 21st August, 1945.

	PAGE
Motions: The War—(a) Cessation of hostilities	248
(b) Tribute to the Services	252
Questions: Lands, as to settlement west of Mt. Barker	253
Railways—(a) As to trucking yards at Carbarup	253
(b) As to Officers over 65 years of age	253
(c) As to loco. spark-arresters	253
Abattoirs, Kalgoorlie, as to modernising	254
Goldmining, as to survey of Coolgardie field	254
Buildozer, as to use for land clearing	255
Migration, as to State and Commonwealth action	255
Infant Health Centres, as to status of nurses	255
Address-in-reply, ninth day (amendment, withdrawn)	255

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

MOTIONS—THE WAR.

(a) *Cessation of Hostilities.*

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. R. G. Hawke—Northam) [4.32]: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the indulgence of the House, I desire to move, on behalf of the Government, the following resolution:—

That, following the recent unconditional surrender of Japan and thereby the complete victory of the Allied Forces, the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia in Parliament assembled expresses its profound gratitude to Almighty God, its deep and abiding loyalty to His Majesty the King, and its great admiration of all those men and women of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the other United Nations who fought and worked to destroy German and Japanese aggression and tyranny and that His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor be asked to transmit the foregoing resolution to His Majesty the King.

The recent unconditional surrender of Japan, following the previous unconditional surrender of Germany, brought the war to a complete end. Not only was this world-war the most terrible of its kind in human history, in regard to the destruction which it brought to the world, but it had an unusually destructive feature which had been associated only to a small extent with previous wars. I refer to the death and destruction which it brought to civilians, and to property of all kinds, in countries that were not actually in the , firing-line, in the old sense in which that term was always used. So we have every reason, I think, to feel grateful that this terrible conflict between nations has at last come to an end.

Some people might feel that the war was decided entirely by the weight of arms, by the weight of numbers, by the work of scientists, and of men and women in the factories and in the production of food-stuffs and similar necessities, but I think we would be foolish if we were to overlook the fact that the nations ranged on one side were fighting in a righteous cause, whereas the nations—such as Germany and Japan—on the other side were waging a cause that was entirely unrighteous and completely cruel and tyrannical in the purpose for which they were carrying on that struggle. Therefore it seems to me that there is always operating a supernatural influence which plays a tremendously important part in deciding, sooner or later, that righteousness and justice shall prevail over all the forces which oppose those principles, no matter how powerful the opposing forces might be in the early stages of the struggle, and no matter how spectacular and devastating the progress of those forces might be before the other nations have time to prepare themselves for the struggle and to meet, with equal and indeed superior strength, the strength which the aggressor nations were using.

I think it is most appropriate, too, that we should, as a Parliament, express our loyalty to His Majesty the King, because by doing that we are expressing our loyalty to the people he represents and to everything associated with the life and work of the people of Great Britain and the other British Dominions. We know that during this war the people of Great Britain—especially the people of England