

our movement but of every movement with which he was connected. I support the motion.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.12 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 27th August, 1947.

	PAGE
Questions: Pioneer Bus Service, as to increase of fares	428
Harbours: (a) as to scheme for Bunbury development, etc.	428
(b) as to proposals for Albany development	428
Railways: (a) as to refrigerator vans for butter	429
(b) as to loop lines to serve butter factories	429
T.B. examinations, as to basic wage for bread-winner patients	429
Wheat, as to capacity and cost of bulk facilities, Fremantle	430
Forrest River Mission, as to tabling report on health of natives	430
Motor Traffic, as to accidents and prosecutions	430
Milk, as to treatment licenses for current year	430
North-West, as to arrangements for securing medical officers	431
Jetties, Swan River, as to control of children	431
Address-in-reply, tenth day, conclusion	431
Point of order	468
Bills: Child Welfare, 1R.	468
Road Districts Act Amendment, 1R.	468
Rural Relief Fund Act Amendment, 1R.	468
Crown Suits, 1R.	468
Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1), 1R.	468
Constitution Acts Amendment (Re-election of Ministers), 1R.	468
Fatal Accidents, 1R.	468
Public Trustee Act Amendment, 1R.	468
Public Service Act Amendment, 1R.	468
Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance), 1R.	468
Closer Settlement Act Amendment, 1R.	468

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

QUESTIONS.

PIONEER BUS SERVICE

As to Increase of Fares.

Mr. MARSHALL (on notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

(1) Is it a fact that sanction has been given to the Pioneer Bus Service, operating between Perth and Bassendean, to increase the fares chargeable on that route?

(2) Upon what grounds was the sanction to increase fares on this particular route granted, and does he concur in such increase?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) To assist in restoring the financial stability of the company which has deteriorated over the past years mainly through operating at fares lower than those on comparable routes. As this is an essential in the rehabilitation of the service generally the increases approved by the Transport Board were made with my concurrence.

HARBOURS.

(a) As to Scheme for Bunbury Development, Etc.

Mr. MURRAY (on notice) asked the Minister for Works:

In view of the decision by the previous Cabinet on the 7th October, 1946, in regard to a major scheme for Bunbury Harbour development and associate works:

(1) Does he intend to fully carry out this plan?

(2) What financial provision has been made in this year's estimates for this work?

(3) Has the plan been submitted to Col. Tydeman, as promised by the previous Minister for Works and later by himself?

(4) If so, how much of Col. Tydeman's report is he prepared to make available for perusal?

(5) Will he arrange for an inspection and report from Col. Tydeman on the desirability of re-opening "Boat Channel," the effect of closure being covered in P.W.D. Plan dated the 30th June, 1898, prepared by Mr. W. E. Wood, and also by subsequent events?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) Subject to Mr. Tydeman's review, yes.

(2) £80,000 provided on draft Loan Estimates. This will cover preliminary work at Roelands Quarry, provision of equipment, etc.

(3) Yes.

(4) Mr. Tydeman will commence his review of the Bunbury Harbour Improvements scheme shortly.

(5) Yes.

(b) As to Proposals for Albany Development.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (on notice) asked the Minister for Works:

(1) Do the proposals put forward by the Director of Works to the Wise Government

—and which were approved by that Government—in connection with the development of the Albany Harbour provide ultimately for 4,990 or 3,650 feet of berthage accommodation?

(2) Is not the first of the three stages of the proposals divided into two sections, namely 1a and 1b?

(3) Did the Director of Works and Engineer for Harbours and Rivers discuss the proposals at Albany with local interested organisations on or about the 21st March, 1947?

(4) Has he any present intention of altering the proposals in any major respect, as recently advocated by the member for Albany?

(5) If so, in what respect?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The proposals provided for 5,100 lineal feet quay frontage.

(2) Yes.

(3) No.

(4) Mr. Tydeman will shortly review the proposals and submit a report to the Government.

(5) Answered by (4).

RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Refrigerator Vans for Butter.*

Mr. MURRAY (on notice) asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of repeated statements favouring installation of refrigerator vans for the transport of butter—

(1) Has the design and specifications for these vehicles been received?

(2) What is the estimated cost for each vehicle?

(3) How many vehicles of this type does he consider necessary for this service?

(4) If answer to (1) is no, when does he expect to receive same?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No designs or specifications for refrigerated trucks are at present in hand in this State but developments elsewhere with such vans are being closely watched, notably in Queensland, where the refrigeration unit is paid for by the consignee and the question of refrigerated trucks, as distinct from insulated vans, will be gone into in the light of the experience of that system. In West-

ern Australia butter is conveyed in cold storage trucks.

(2) Answered by No. (1).

(3) It is estimated that 25 single vehicles would be required in the peak period. 22 EA cold storage vans in service have been reserved exclusively for use in the transport of butter, and these are supplemented with Class E cold storage vans as necessary.

(4) Answered by No. (1).

(b) *As to Loop Lines to Serve Butter Factories.*

Mr. MURRAY (on notice) asked the Minister for Railways:

In view of the statement to "The Daily News" of the 19th August, regarding construction of a loop line, near the butter factory, Manjimup:

(1) Does he propose recommendation for the construction of similar facilities for all factories?

(2) What is the estimated cost?

(3) Which butter factory managers expressed themselves "Very pleased with service being supplied?"

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) No. The main railway line passes by the butter factory, and therefore, the installation of a loop line on which to shunt butter trucks would enable such to be stationed within 50 yards of the factory, thereby greatly facilitating loading. Similar conditions do not exist at Boyanup, Busselton or Margaret River. The proposal to construct a loop has not yet developed beyond the suggestion stage, but as soon as estimates are received they will be made known to the hon. member.

(3) Busselton, Margaret River and Manjimup.

T.B. EXAMINATIONS.

As to Basic Wage for Breadwinner Patients.

Mr. NEEDHAM (on notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) Will he take into consideration the fact that many people will not offer themselves for X-ray examination, because if found to be suffering from, or susceptible to, pulmonary tuberculosis, they could not afford to undergo treatment under the rates of compensation recently fixed?

(2) Will he favourably consider joint action by the State and Federal Governments making provision for the payment of a weekly sum, to the breadwinner, of not less than the basic wage, while undergoing treatment for pulmonary tuberculosis, without applying the means test?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) The present payment of a weekly sum is made by the Commonwealth and is experimental. The Commonwealth Minister for Health has stated it will be reconsidered after three months.

WHEAT.

As to Capacity and Cost of Bulk Facilities, Fremantle.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE (on notice) asked the Minister for Works:

(1) What is the maximum carrying capacity per hour of the bulk wheat conveyor tower and loading gantry erected by the Public Works Department at Fremantle?

(2) Would the operation of the plant be limited to a maximum of only 300 tons per hour because of any inability of wheat trimmers to handle more than that quantity per hour in the loading of any one ship?

(3) Were the complete plans of the department in this matter estimated to cost approximately £270,000?

(4) Did any farmers' company offer at any stage to provide an acceptable scheme at less than half of that amount?

(5) If so, what are the major differences in the two sets of proposals?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) 800 tons per hour with existing two belts only; 1,600 tons per hour when fitted with additional two belts.

(2) No.

(3) Estimated cost for establishment of warehouse section, including storage capacity of 5,250 tons, and re-organisation of railway lay-out, was £270,000.

(4) No.

(5) Answered by (4).

FORREST RIVER MISSION.

As to Tabling Report on Health of Natives.

Hon. A. A. M. COVERLEY (on notice) asked the Minister for Native Affairs:

Will he lay on the Table of the House the latest report by Dr. Musso, Travelling Medical Officer for Native Affairs, on the health of natives at Forrest River Mission?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (for the Minister for Native Affairs) replied:

No, not at present. This report is of a confidential nature, and contains certain aspects which are at present under consideration.

MOTOR TRAFFIC.

As to Accidents and Prosecutions.

* Mr. STYANTS (on notice) asked the Minister for Police:

(1) How many accidents involving taxi cars occurred in the metropolitan area for the year ended the 30th June, 1947?

(2) What percentage of the number registered is the above figure?

(3) What is the percentage of privately-owned motor cars involved in accidents in the metropolitan area for the year ended the 30th June, 1947?

(4) How many prosecutions for speeding were instituted against taxi drivers in the same area and period?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (for the Minister for Police) replied:

(1) 482.

(2) 152.25.

(3) 18.47.

(4) 31.

MILK.

As to Treatment Licenses for Current Year.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (on notice) asked the Minister for Agriculture:

(1) When is it expected that the applications for milk treatment licenses for the current year, which are at present under consideration, will be decided?

(2) Is it intended to limit the number of treatment licenses which can be held by any one person or firm?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) No precise date. As soon as possible.

(2) No; provided they conform with the Board's policy

NORTH-WEST.

As to Arrangements for Securing Medical Officers.

Mr. HEGNEY (on notice) asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health:

(1) In what States or countries has the Health Department advertised for medical practitioners for appointment to Port Hedland or Marble Bar?

(2) Will he indicate what arrangements, if any, have been made to obtain the services of a fully qualified medical practitioner for Port Hedland when Dr. Beamish leaves the district?

(3) Is it the intention of the Health Department to appoint a medical officer for Marble Bar if and when one is available?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied:

(1) The Department has advertised in all States of the Commonwealth and in the United Kingdom for medical practitioners for the North-West.

The Agent-General in London is dealing with a number of applicants and should these prove suitable, arrangements will be made to expedite passage to this State, by air if possible.

(2) It is anticipated that Dr. Fischer will be sufficiently recovered from his illness to take over from Dr. Beamish when the latter leaves.

(3) This will be considered later.

JETTIES, SWAN RIVER.

As to Control of Children.

HON. A. H. PANTON (without notice) asked the Minister for Transport:

In view of the congestion at present on the jetties used in transport to and from the Zoo and the danger of a bad accident occurring, will he have an officer placed on the jetties to control the children on and off the boats, whilst on holidays?

The MINISTER replied:

This is the first I have heard of the matter. I will take it up with the authorities with a view to having such an officer made available.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Tenth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. HEGNEY (Pilbara) [4.39]: First of all I desire, in common with members who have preceded me, to offer my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your election to the Speakership, and to the Chairman of Committees and the members of the Government on their appointment to the offices they hold. Without detracting in any way from the occupant of the Premiership I would like to say in all sincerity that as the Labour Government has gone out of office, I would very much like to have seen—and I think everyone will agree with me—the Deputy Premier occupying the position of Premier of this State. I say that for this reason: Some years ago, when I first entered this Chamber—just prior to the outbreak of war—I was strongly impressed by the obvious sincerity of the present Deputy Premier. He was then a back-bencher, but by the force of his ability and application he obtained opportunity of exercising that ability. For some years—though I disagree with him politically on a number of matters—he applied himself assiduously to the tasks of the office of Leader of the Opposition, and only by what might be termed an accident of circumstances was he obliged to accept the office of Deputy Premier. I am sorry that that position has arisen, but believe he will accept it in the circumstances. I say that in all sincerity, without casting any reflection on the present Premier.

During my remarks I will deal only with a limited number of subjects. I propose, first of all, to refer briefly to certain aspects of our constitutional Government. In common with many other members I have, on previous occasions, adopted the policy of submitting for the consideration of the Government a variety of matters affecting my own electorate. On this occasion I intend to leave those more parochial matters to be brought personally to the notice of the appropriate Ministers, or to the Government by other means. I do not believe that the respective Ministers will go through all the numbers of "Hansard," dissecting the items that each member submits for their consideration, and then deal with them from the personal or departmental point of view. I assure the Government that from time to time I will submit to it matters of interest to the people of the Pilbara district, and I believe

that reasonable consideration will be given to any requests that I may make.

A recent announcement from Canberra indicated that the Commonwealth Government may soon take steps to enlarge the numerical size of the Commonwealth Parliament. That announcement is one of serious import to the people of Australia as a whole. It is true that under the Constitution provision is made for the enlargement of the Commonwealth Parliament. Provision is also made that the size of the Senate shall be, numerically, as nearly as possible 50 per cent. of that of the House of Representatives. It may be interesting briefly to touch on matters that led to the establishment of the Commonwealth of Australia. Those of us who have delved into Australian history know that men like Sir Henry Parkes and others were obliged to recognise that, in certain matters of Australia-wide importance, there should be some Commonwealth or Australia-wide council to deliberate on the problems involved, including that of defence. It is only natural that during the course of the years, and while proposals for the implementation of some sort of a Federation were being discussed, the "State Righters," as they are called to-day, raised strong objections. It is interesting to read the verbatim reports of the proceedings of the conventions held some time before the inauguration of Federation, and to note that some of those who were in the forefront of the discussions later held high and responsible positions under the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. Indeed, one or more of them eventually attained to the position of Prime Minister of Australia.

Under the provisions of the Commonwealth Constitution the States transferred certain powers to the Commonwealth. In the earlier years of Federation, when any question came before the High Court for interpretation, it appears that the tendency was for the High Court to be rather conservative in its interpretation of the powers of the Commonwealth. On a number of occasions it awarded the decision to the States. In later years that tendency altered. In the case of uniform taxation, to cite an instance, the judges of the High Court ruled that the Commonwealth had complete power to levy income tax on the people to the extent of 19s. 11d. or 20s. in the £. Some 19 or 20 years ago the Financial Agreement was entered into between the

States and the Commonwealth, after there had been a referendum on the question. That, in conjunction with uniform taxation, has somewhat altered the financial relationship of the States to the Commonwealth.

In a number of matters of Australia-wide importance I think the Commonwealth Government should have complete jurisdiction but, if it is proposed to increase the size of the Commonwealth Parliament, I submit that before that is done, and to deal with a number of other matters affecting the relationship between the States and the Commonwealth, a convention should be held between the Commonwealth Government and representatives of various organisations and interests in the different States, in an endeavour to find some definite basis of agreement that would tend to remove the prejudice and misunderstanding now obtaining between the Commonwealth and its constituent parts. The present Commonwealth Constitution has not been altered as to the basis of representation over the last 46 years.

I believe that a State like Western Australia, which comprises one-third of the Commonwealth, should have stronger representation in that Parliament than it now has. Under the Constitution Western Australia is entitled to five seats in a House of 75. Tasmania is entitled to five seats and South Australia, I believe, seven, while the bulk of the seats—about 48 of the 75—by virtue of the fact that most of the population is concentrated within a 20-mile radius of either Melbourne or Sydney, represent Victoria and New South Wales. Representations might be made to the Commonwealth with a view to having a convention to deal with certain matters such as the basis of representation, an alteration of which is needed so that a State like Western Australia might receive more liberal treatment. Under the State Constitution, the North-West, because of its isolation and paucity of population, is treated on a far more liberal basis than is the metropolitan area. I believe there is room for an amendment of the Commonwealth Constitution to provide some modification in this direction.

Numerous people in all the States claim that there are too many Houses of Parliament and too many legislators. I believe there is room for considerable modification of the Constitution of the Senate. I would not agree to an increase of the membership of the House of Representatives to

120 while increasing the Senate to 60 members. Experience indicates that the functions of the Senate should be revised. The Senate is constituted of six members from each of the six States. This was one of the undertakings that had to be given to the less populous States before they would agree to enter the Federation. It was supposed to be a safeguard for the weaker States. But what has happened over the years? No one will deny that the Senate is just as much a party House as is the House of Representatives. The only redeeming feature is that both the Federal Houses are elected on the adult franchise.

If the people of Western Australia are to continue to have regard for both Houses of the State Parliament, there is room for a big modification of the Legislative Council franchise. Take the Legislative Council of New South Wales, which was set up in 1823, and modified in 1828 and 1842. When sections separated from New South Wales, first of all Tasmania, then South Australia and Victoria, Western Australia in 1831 or 1832, and Queensland in 1859, and when forms of Government were set up by each of those independent colonies, the British Government practically imposed a Council with a very restricted franchise. One cogent reason why New South Wales objected to an election on an adult-franchise basis was that so many people had been transported from England from 1787 onwards. These people were called convicts. In the course of time, they were given their freedom, and as the next generation reached manhood and womanhood, the position changed entirely. In the course of years, Legislative Assemblies were set up in the six States constituted of various numbers, but all elected on the adult franchise basis.

It is remarkable that right through the years there has been a second Chamber engrafted on to the Constitutions of the States with, in many cases, a restricted franchise. Only in one State that had a nominee Chamber—I refer to Queensland—has the Legislative Council been abolished. That occurred some 25 years ago. Another reason that was advanced for having a restricted franchise for a second Chamber was that only people of education should have the right to vote for members of a House designed to protect the rights of individuals and private property. Even today, under the Constitution of Victoria, a barrister, minister of religion and

certain other citizens may exercise a vote for the Legislative Council, while the ordinary worker has no such right unless he can comply with other requirements, such as holding freehold property. In Western Australia, a man must own real estate of a value of £50 or pay rent before he is entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council.

The Honorary Minister: Rent to what amount?

Mr. HEGNEY: About 6s. 9d. or 7s. a week. The fact is important and will bear repetition that thousands of men and women in this State have been denied the franchise for the Upper House, because they did not happen to own property or pay rent to the extent I have mentioned. While persons over the age of 21 may sit as members of the Legislative Assembly—this applies to a few of the new members on the Government side—they are too young to contest seats for the Legislative Council, for which the age limit is 30 years.

Under the Commonwealth Constitution, any person over the age of 21 years may not only exercise a vote for either of the Federal Houses, but may also stand for the Senate or House of Representatives. Here, however, a person must be 30 years of age before being qualified to nominate for a seat in the Legislative Council. We should appreciate that we are living in times when every boy and girl has the right of education. The argument about people without education being denied the vote might have had some force a couple of hundred years ago, but there is little substance in it now. During the debate, reference was made from the Government side to dictatorships, but I suggest that the strongest dictatorship in this State is the Legislative Council. Over the years, we have strenuously endeavoured to remove the Council's right of veto, but in spite of our efforts we have been unsuccessful. The previous Government introduced a Bill to implement the provisions of the British Parliament Act of 1911, which had the effect of abolishing the veto previously exercised by the House of Lords.

Now, if the House of Lords rejects a Bill sent to it by the House of Commons on three occasions within two years, the measure automatically becomes law; but our allegedly democratic Legislative Council did not even pass the second reading of certain Bills. Consequently, we are deprived of the

right of legislating for the people of the State. We endeavoured to introduce a system of compulsory voting for the Legislative Council on the same basis as that obtaining for the Assembly. That was defeated by that august body, another place. We endeavoured to pass a Bill providing for adult franchise, or household franchise, for the other Chamber. That was defeated. It was given short shrift by members of another place. We also submitted a proposal by which the people of the State would be allowed to decide for themselves whether they were in favour of widening the franchise, so as to provide that every person over the age of 21 years should have the right to vote for the Legislative Council. Another place refused to pass that measure. There must be some radical reform of another place if the people are to have any respect for Parliament.

While I am a member of Parliament and while I continue to be a citizen of the Commonwealth, I shall raise my voice on every appropriate occasion in protest against what I consider to be, in these modern days of alleged democracy, an anachronistic Chamber which has more power than has the House of Lords and which can veto, emasculate or defeat any measure sent to it by this Chamber, no matter what the political complexion of the Government may be. Let us consider some relative figures when talking about majority rule. I speak in round figures now. On the Legislative Assembly rolls we have 290,000 or 300,000 names; on the Legislative Council rolls, 46,000 or 50,000. I am open to correction, but think my figures are approximate. No matter what legislation is brought down in this Chamber, a minority dictatorship, as it were, can defeat it in another place.

Yesterday, when the member for Mt. Marshall was waving a copy of "The Worker," he mentioned that the Government was not able to do certain things, or introduce certain reforms, without the approval of another place. That Chamber will certainly now and again pass some legislation as a sop to the mass of the people. That is all it does. It is afraid to reject every measure, as it knows the spotlight would be on it more than otherwise would be the case. It has refused to budge one inch from its position of extreme power over the legislation of the State.

I do not intend to go into full details on the question raised by two members who have spoken on this debate. I refer to the nationalisation of banking. The member for Mt. Marshall made a crude but feeble attempt to link up the Labour Party in this connection with the Communist Party. He tried to indicate that any person who believed there was room for monetary reform was in favour of a dictatorship and allied himself with the Communist Party. That is entirely wrong. When a member has to resort to such arguments it shows his case is weak. I propose, with your indulgence, Sir, to read a few extracts dealing with the nationalisation of banking. These may be the means of altering the outlook of some members on this question, more so than if one were to express his own view. I have here a booklet entitled "The Second Plank." Incidentally, I presume members know that nationalisation of banking was the second plank of the Labour platform, but it might be the third now. The author says—

In the course of time Man improved upon the currency of his ancestors, and today we use coins, notes, cheques, etc., as legal tender. Cast your mind back, however, to the currency of ancient days and picture what would happen in a community where several men cleverly schemed to secure control of the prevailing currency. Suppose the currency to be beads. As more and more beads were acquired and withheld by the schemers and monopolists, the currency would become contracted, its value consequently would go up, and the person wanting legal tender would have to give more goods than usual for it. The schemers would benefit, and so long as they could control the volume of currency in circulation they could make gigantic profits without doing any useful work in the community. What my fictitious currency-monopolists did in ancient days is actually being done by the Associated (private) Banks in Australia today.

Those are not my words.

Mr. Marshall: Whose are they?

Mr. HEGNEY: As a matter of fact, this pamphlet was written by the Publicity Officer of the Government, Mr. A. Clementson. He continues—

The Den described.

Every expert thief has a den; the big commercial thieves of today conduct banks. There is nothing wonderful or mysterious about a bank; it is merely a trading concern. The people in it are not wizards; they are merely accountants, assessors or clerks. Banks are not run in the public interest by philanthropists; they are run by directors for profits in

the interests of shareholders. A bank is not a public institution, it is a commercial shambles. To establish a bank, a certain number of proprietors agree to contribute a certain amount of ready money, which is called paid-up capital. In the general run of things, the profits soon exceed the total amount of paid-up capital, consequently as soon as the bank is firmly established it is run not upon the shareholders' money, but upon the money extracted from customers in the shape of profits, or deposited by customers. The whole success of the bank depends upon "deposits of customers" because over and above a certain margin the money deposited by one set of customers is loaned out to another set. When you hear of a bank having loaned money to a friend of yours, or having contributed to a Government War Loan, have a good laugh, please, because the money it loans does not belong to its shareholders, it is either "credit" or belongs to the "depositing" customers. The banker is really a go-between or commission agent; he receives money from depositors and gives them 3 per cent.; he then lends their money to borrowers at 7 per cent.;—making a sure profit of 4 per cent. himself. In addition, if the borrower fails to repay the loan on time, the banker forecloses on him and secures his property, usually for about half its value.

The next extract is from an authority on financial matters.

Mr. Leslie: Who is the authority?

Mr. HEGNEY: I am not quoting the member for Mt. Marshall. The following extract is from "Evolution of Banking," by Robert H. Howe. It is preliminary to the chapter which I will read in a moment—

When the people themselves supply the credit they need for all their present collective activities without the intervention of bond syndicates and bankers, they will have learned a most valuable lesson in finance. They can then go on adding one enterprise after another as fast as the growing intelligence of the voters demand . . . With the machinery of credit in the hands of the people, no more interest-bearing bonds need be issued, and the burden of interest would be removed.

Mr. Andrew Clementson goes on to say—

No person can get a correct view of private banking unless they keep always in mind the fundamental fact that banks are run by clever commercial sharks called directors, whose ambition is to obtain profits. Now in the sordid and merciless hunt for profits, banking has been brought to a fine art. The directors on the board are usually captains of industry; each captain has a tacit understanding with his colleagues, each board has a tacit understanding with other boards.

I would like the member for Mt. Marshall particularly to take notice of the next few lines. They are—

For the sake of illustration take the directorate of the "Rookem Bank." One man has big interests in tobacco, another in sugar, another in tin mining, another in shipping and so on. A freemasonry exists between them; each endeavours to help the other. If the sugar director is shipping sugar he does it through his colleague's company and so on. Later on, if he wants an advance for his sugar company for developmental purposes on poor security and at a low rate of interest, he knows the shipper will help him to get it; and so with the other directors, each will sooner or later have an axe to grind, reciprocity is the rule, financial back-scratching the order of the day. Not only do these directors help each other with easy loans at preferential rates, but let a competitor of any one of them apply to the bank for a loan and watch them all come down with a thud. President Woodrow Wilson in 1911 seized them up fairly accurately when he said:—"The great monopoly in this country is the money monopoly. So long as that exists our old variety of freedom and individual energy of development are out of the question. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities, are in the hands of a few men who, even if their actions be honest and intended for the public interest (pip-pip, A.C.) are necessarily concentrated upon the great undertakings in which their own money is involved, and who necessarily by every reason of their own limitations chill and check and destroy genuine economic freedom."

Those are a few extracts from an authoritative pamphlet dealing with the nationalisation of banking, a matter to which the member for Mt. Marshall referred yesterday. I do not propose to detain the House as long as some other members have; but, while I am on the subject, I have a few more extracts the reading of which may have the effect of altering the mind of some persons who have been influenced by what they have seen in "The West Australian." When they have heard these extracts, they may do a little thinking for themselves and judge the position on its merits. I shall now quote from the report of a Select Committee that was appointed in Tasmania some few years ago to inquire into the necessity for monetary reform. First, I shall quote from the report of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce. That is not a Labour organisation. The Southampton Chamber of Commerce among other things had this to say—

The position of an unemployed person is, indeed, strikingly paradoxical. Either he is without work because we are producing sufficient without his services being required, in which case he is poor because there is an

abundance of services and goods available, or he is in want because the available wealth is not sufficient to provide for the satisfaction of his needs, in which case it is difficult to explain why his services are not being utilised to produce more.

It goes on to say—

Currency forms only a small amount of the total money of a country. The bulk of the money is created by commercial banks. By granting loans, allowing money to be drawn on overdraft, and purchasing securities, banks literally create money.

It later states—

Again, the fact that the authority for the creation of money is thus vested in private institutions seems an anomaly, for the "credit" or "belief" upon which the monetary system is based is inherent in the community.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I thought I heard the Speaker say "Hear, hear."

Mr. HEGNEY: Members have all heard of Sir Denison Miller who was at one time Governor of the Commonwealth Bank.

Mr. Needham: He was its first Governor.

Mr. HEGNEY: Yes, and he was one of Australia's greatest sons. His knowledge of finance was phenomenal—as a matter of fact it would compare with that of the member for Mt. Marshall! In the report of the Select Committee which dealt with our monetary system we find this—

According to Press reports of the period, in 1921 a deputation from the Australian unemployed waited upon Sir Denison Miller, Governor of the Commonwealth Bank, owned by the people. A member of the deputation put the following direct question to him:—"In a recent address in London, Sir Denison, you stated that to meet the necessities of the war certain things had been done by you which, before the war, would not have been dreamt of. You advanced Australia over £350,000,000 for war purposes, and you stated that, had the war continued, you would have advanced another £350,000,000. Are you now prepared to advance Australia £350,000,000 for productive purposes?" Sir Denison Miller replied: "Yes, I shall do my best."

Mr. Yates: Did he?

Mr. HEGNEY: I come now to another authority who has been quoted before in this Chamber, and he is Mr. H. D. McLeod. I recommend any members who are interested in our monetary problems to read his book, "McLeod on Banking." What I am about to quote is an extract from that book, and it appears in the report of the Select Committee on monetary reform, as follows:—

With regard to the working of the modern money system, the questions may be asked:

"Where does the money come from? Whose is it, and what is it?"

H. D. McLeod, M.A., a barrister who had been selected previously by a Royal Commission for the Digest of Law to prepare a Digest on the Law of Bills of Exchange, Notes, etc., published a book of over 1,400 pages before 1897—"The Theory of Credit."

This is still quoted as one of the highest authorities on the subject. On page 607 we find the following: "Contrast between the Common Notions about Banking and the Reality." Having now given an exposition of the actual facts and mechanism of banking, it will be as well to contrast the common notions respecting it and the reality.

"I. It is commonly supposed that bankers are dealers in money only; that they borrow money from one set of persons and lend it to another set of persons.

The fact is that a banker's profit consists in dealing in money; they never lend money. The sole function of a banker is to create and issue credit; and to buy money and debts by creating and issuing other debts in exchange for them.

"II. It is commonly supposed that bankers act only as agents or intermediaries between persons who want to lend and those who want to borrow.

Bankers never act as agents between persons who want to lend and those who want to borrow. Bankers buy money from some persons and rights of action from others exclusively with their own credit, or by creating and issuing rights of action against themselves.

"III. It is commonly supposed that a banker's profit consists in the difference between the interest he pays for the money he borrows and the interest he charges for the money he lends.

The fact is that a banker's profit consists exclusively in the profit he can make by creating and issuing credit in excess of the specie he holds in reserve.

"No bank which issues credit only in exchange for money ever did, or by any possibility could, make profit. It only begins to make profit when it creates and issues credit in excess of the credit it creates in exchange for money; when it begins to buy debts payable at a future time, for which it charges a discount; which, according to Mill, as we shall presently see, is robbery!

"And the whole of a banker's profit consists in the quantity of debts he can purchase with his own credit."

The implications there are that the control of credit should be in the hands of the representatives of the people, instead of private individuals getting the benefit. Let us turn to Abraham Lincoln, who was President of the United States of America. I have read "The Life of Abraham Lincoln" and it is

accepted that he was assassinated because he woke up to the machinations of the monetary system of his day. He said—

Government possessing the power to create and issue currency and credit as money, and enjoying the power to withdraw both currency and credit from circulation by taxation and otherwise, need not and should not borrow capital at interest as the means of financing Government work and public enterprise. The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of the consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of government, but is the Government's greatest creative opportunity."

The Bank of England prospectus, published in 1694, contained the following paragraph—

The bank shall have benefit of interest on all moneys which it shall invent out of nothing.

The Rothschilds were, I think, great psychologists, and one of them is supposed to have said this—

The few who can understand the system will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favours, that there will be no opposition from that class, while, on the other hand, that great body of people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantage that capital derives from the system, will bear its burden without complaining, and perhaps without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests.

Mr. Reginald McKenna, Chairman, Midland Bank, London, is reported in the *McMillan Report on Banking* to have said—

1. I am afraid the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks can, and do, create and destroy money.

2. And they who control the credit of the nation direct the policy of Governments, and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people.

3. The Bank of England, and no other power in Heaven above or earth beneath, is the ultimate arbiter of what our supply of money shall be. The regular expansion of money supplies which must be undertaken if trade is to be active and the price level stable, has not been permitted.

The President of the American Bankers' Association, Philip A. Benson, on the 8th June, 1939, said—

There is no more direct way to capture control of a nation than through its credit system.

Lloyd George, when speaking of the peace negotiations, said—

The international bankers swept statesmen, politicians, jurists and journalists all on one side, and issued their orders with the imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees.

The references I am about to make, which will be the last, indicate that the banking combine will not issue credit or overdrafts to all and sundry and, as the member for Mr. Marshall said yesterday, a man who wants to borrow money has no option where to go. Those of us who know the fundamental principles of banking, of lending money and of the accounting system as it affects finance, are aware that the associated banks are a very strong combine. If any organisation is linked internationally it is that composed of the banks. Anyone who likes to read what happened between 1930 and 1933 will learn that the associated banks of Australia were nothing more nor less than appendages of the Bank of England. I am going to quote from the Australian "Manufacturer" of the 27th December, 1924, as follows:—

H. E. Pratten has visited Geelong and said he was told by a manufacturer of blankets in that town that this year his banker had informed him that he could not be granted a bank credit with which to purchase wool for his factory, but if he would import blankets from Britain, the bank would finance him for that purpose.

Mr. Pratten was an authority on finance and was a member of the Commonwealth Parliament for many years. Mr. Arthur Kitson, a British manufacturer, speaking at Caxton Hall, Westminster Hall, England, on the 19th June, 1929, said—

The Bank of England is (only) an international trading company controlled by twenty-five directors, eight represent American, and four represent German interests, while the Governor, Sir Montague Collett Norman, is known to be very cosmopolitan. This super Government of the British Isles is maintained because of the ignorance of the public, assisted by the Press, which is controlled by these foreign financiers.

I have quoted these extracts because those directly interested in finance are prone to misrepresent the position. I said earlier that the Commonwealth Parliament had referred to it, by the States, certain powers, in which is included the power to legislate in regard to banking and insurance. The Commonwealth Government, which is elected on a very democratic franchise, will introduce legislation to control the banking system. Already interested parties are preparing to vilify and castigate that Gov-

ernment for attempting to implement legislation which will be of far-reaching importance.

I invite any member of this House to refer now to the Federal parliamentary debates which took place when the Commonwealth Bank Act of 1911 was being discussed. It will be found that the same stock arguments used then are being used today by many people who do not like to let go the hold they have on the nation. I have the moral courage to stand here and say that the Commonwealth Government can act to the advantage of Australia if it has the right, under its Constitution, to legislate as I have indicated. I issue a friendly invitation to the representatives of the farming community to express their opinion as to what would have happened if a referendum had been held in 1930-31 and the following years when the prices of wheat and wool were not what they are today, so as to ascertain whether the primary producers would then have agreed to a system of nationalised banking. Indeed they would have! Control of the monetary system, currency and credit, with all that that implies, should essentially be reposed in the Commonwealth, just as it is regarded as necessary that the Navy, Army and Air Force should also be controlled federally.

When the 40-hour week was proposed, as well as many other reforms, we saw the same thing happen. "Do not change that," "The time is not ripe," "Leave matters alone for a few years." Right down the centuries these have been the stock lines of argument advanced when those desiring any change whatever have advanced their suggestions. All I can say is—the dogs bark, but the caravan moves on. So it will be with regard to this particular measure of reform, just as it has been with many others. I have no doubt that in a few years' time when the nationalisation of banking has become an accomplished fact, those who now range themselves behind the Associated Banks and the financial interests of the country will assert that the Commonwealth took a very wise step when it introduced, and successfully carried through, legislation to nationalise the banking and monetary system of Australia. For the patient hearing I have been accorded, I wish to thank each and every member of the Chamber.

MR. LEAHY (Hannans) [5.32]: I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my hearty congratulations on your elevation to the high and hon-

ourable position you now hold. Knowing Mr. Speaker as I do, I feel every confidence in his ability to carry out the responsible duties associated with his high office. Although I can express pleasure at his elevation to his present post, my feelings are somewhat tinged with regret when I realise that I at least will be deprived of the pleasure of listening to his very original, always interesting and at times humorous addresses from the floor of the House.

Members: Hear, hear!

MR. LEAHY: To the Chairman of Committees I also offer my hearty congratulations. Knowing how attentively he has carried out his parliamentary duties since he entered this Chamber, I feel sure he will have no difficulty whatever in administering the tasks associated with his position. I followed very closely the various speeches so far delivered during the course of the Address-in-reply debate, and particularly to those made by the new members. I congratulate each and every one of them on their respective efforts. For a moment I desire to pay a little attention to the speech of one hon. member who interested me very much. I refer to the address delivered by the member for Avon. I thought that in his very short, instructive and advisory speech, we had something that had not been previously attempted by any new member since I have been associated with this House. In the first place, he paid a very fine tribute to his predecessor, the opponent he defeated at the last general election. I consider that was indeed a nice gesture.

In the course of his very wise remarks, the hon. member went on to refer to the possibility of little tales being told during an election fight that might not be completely true. I admire him very much for what he said in that respect. He told us that his first election fight had been conducted very cleanly and honourably, and he expressed the hope that, however short or long his membership of the parliamentary institution might be, he would continue to fight cleanly and honourably, irrespective of whether he was successful or otherwise. Then he dealt with what may be described as the elastic possibilities ahead of one elected on a political platform. He inferred that when engaging in a political fight one might be excused at times if one drifted somewhat apart from the exact truth. He almost advised the present Government to play the game! He

went a little further and referred to members of the Opposition as not bad sorts and, in fact, as rather decent fellows.

What impressed me most—I cannot say it in his inimitable manner—was the passage in which he said that in the whirlpool of politics the good sank to the bottom and the dross rose to the surface. I assume he was not speaking individually, but from the governmental point of view. I suggest to the Government that the handsome stripling from Avon, because of his very fascinating personality, his winsome smile, and the fine fatherly advice he gave to the House, might be appointed spiritual adviser to the Administration so that, by virtue of the splendid thoughts he is able to express, he might be successful in wooing Ministers back to the path of righteousness.

Mr. Cornell: If they make it worth while, I might take the job on.

Mr. LEAHY: I strongly make that recommendation to the Government. While throwing bouquets about, I also have a few remarks to make regarding the eloquent, dramatic oration by the member for Middle Swan. So vividly did that hon. member speak and so delicately did he paint the picture of the suffering of a poor unfortunate family selected out of the whole of those residing in his electorate, that I had only to close my eyes and I was back in the old Theatre Royal in Bourke-street, Melbourne, listening to dear old Bland Holt in one of his melodramas. So vividly and dramatically did he depict the sufferings of those poor people, accompanying his remarks by the finest physical exhibition ever witnessed in the Chamber since I have been a member, that I could detect tears welling into the eyes of those hardened old members occupying the benches opposite. Particularly was that the effect upon the usually sparkling and smiling eyes of the Minister for Transport. Not only was that something unique in a speech from a new member, but he went further and gave us a remarkable display of courage. He even had the temerity to draw the fire of the battle-scarred old veteran of hundreds of fights—political, industrial and otherwise—in the person of the member for Leederville. Even though that hon. member may be hardened in the political arena, he was able to treat our newcomer very kindly. All I can

say is that possibly he is preserving his big guns for some future occasion.

I have still another bouquet to present and this time it is to the Government. I congratulate the present Ministers upon their access to office. In doing so I may say that, in my opinion, they are very fortunately placed in that they have merely to succeed in carrying out the comprehensive legislative programme laid down by their predecessors, the Labour Government, and they will have no occasion to worry. Although the present Ministers have travelled the country extensively and made somewhat lavish promises, I sincerely hope that they will be able to carry out the undertakings they have given. If they are successful in that direction, I shall be the first on this side of the House to congratulate them.

It has been said—possibly with some justice, but to my deep regret—that somewhat doubtful tactics were adopted during the recent general election. Doubtful pamphlets and posters and unreliable speeches bordering on untruthfulness were allegedly used by members sitting today on the Government side of the House, as well as by their supporters. I regret very much happenings of that description because I have always been of the opinion that a certain amount of dignity was associated with Parliament, particularly with the Parliament of this State, as well as with members of Parliament themselves. I deeply regret that that dignity should have been dragged down into the gutter by any party. I care not who the member might be or what party might be concerned; I regret that such tactics should be resorted to. I believe that there is, or should be, a code of honour in parliamentary life that should be preserved.

I would be indeed sorry to know that the kindly, friendly feelings—political and private—that have existed in this Chamber during my membership had been interfered with. During the war we fought unitedly in the interests of the nation, in the interests of the people themselves and in the interests of the Old Country—and we fought successfully. During those troublesome years, which I suppose was the most serious period in the history not only of Australia but of the world, the Labour Government, ably assisted and supported by other Governments stood four square to the enemy and everyone who posed as the enemy or as a supporter of the enemy and said, "You

have gone so far but you shall go no further." Led by the wisdom of the heads of the Labour Government and supported by every citizen in the Commonwealth, today we can at least say we are a free people. We can say we have survived the greatest ordeal in the history of the world. Leading people of other nations are aware from their observations just what did happen during the war, and at the conclusion of the war they paid a high tribute to the Labour Governments of the Commonwealth and of the State of Western Australia.

I join with other members in tendering my regret that the portfolio of Minister for Mines is not held by a member of this Chamber. In saying that I do not in any way reflect upon the character or ability of the present holder of the office. This is the Chamber where legislation is framed and discussed and the very important portfolio of Minister for Mines should be held in this Chamber, and the Minister should be here to hear what is said by members representing Goldfields constituencies. I suppose regrets are in vain and it is not much use talking about it now. I hope, however, the Minister will carry on to the best of his ability for I can assure him he will have a full-time job in attending to affairs associated with mines.

I should like to say a few words with regard to aluminium therapy in the treatment of cases of silicosis. I have spoken on this matter at some length previously but since I did so very little has been done. The Commonwealth Government sent Dr. George from Broken Hill to Canada to confer with people who have for many years been experimenting with this treatment. He returned to Australia but I thought that the whole thing was very coldly received. I do not think the matter received the attention it deserved. Neither do I believe that Dr. George was the right man to send and I do not care who was responsible for sending him. Broken Hill is not up to our standard in dealing with silicosis. We are miles ahead of it. It was wrong to send a man from there; we should have had a man sent from Western Australia. We have people here who have studied the progress of silicosis on the Eastern Goldfields, and we have members of the mobile laboratory which travels the length and breadth of the mining districts. One of those men should have been sent.

The Broken Hill mines have not the problems that we have. The ventilation problems there are not comparable with those found on the Golden Mile. My honest opinion, after getting advice from all parts and receiving personal advice from the McIntyres' in Canada, is that some good must come from the application of the aluminium treatment. The miners on the Golden Mile are beginning to be fed up with the whole business. They say, "We do not know what will be done, for no-one seems to be getting anywhere." Are we going to allow the health of the men to decline and to become worse and worse? Are we going to do nothing?

It is an insult to these men that something has not been done all this time. Many investigations have been made and I am perfectly confident that if the treatment does no good it will certainly do no harm. I am also confident that it will prevent silicosis if used in time. Even after silicosis has taken charge of the victim I believe there is a great possibility of the aluminium treatment arresting the dreaded T.B. I am confident of that as a result of intensive reading and of information received from all sources. I say it is the duty of the Minister for Mines to do his best to have that aluminium treatment installed on the Golden Mile and to try it out there.

I understand that part of the delay is due to the necessity for using a particular kind of aluminium dust. I agree with McIntyres' Research Authorities on that point. It would not be right for every country to use its own particular aluminium dust. I understand this is a point on which there is a hold-up. Not much information can be obtained from Canada concerning it. We have been only lukewarm in our endeavours to secure information from Canada. I hope the Chief Secretary will convey my observations with regard to aluminium therapy to the Minister concerned.

Much has been said about the price of gold. I feel quite lost because I think that everything has been said that could be said. Whatever may be the price of gold the Prime Minister has definitely decided that there will be no gold bonus. He did say there was a possibility of abolishing the Commonwealth gold tax, which amounts to somewhere about £3,400,000. I want to know what the representative of the Chamber of Mines had in mind when he said the

price of gold should be raised. It must be remembered that the people who are managing the big mines in Western Australia are not the mineowners. They are merely managers placed there by the owners to pay the highest dividends possible. For all the millions that have been paid out in dividends from the Golden Mile alone, what have we? The Chamber of Mines and the shareholders themselves have not had the common decency to establish, equip and maintain a miners' hospital. In almost every other part of the world such a thing is invariably done. It appears to me that most of the money paid in dividends has gone to shareholders oversea, and all that we shall have in the finish is a hole in the ground.

I may be excused for expressing myself in this way. After 43 years of mining in this State, under all circumstances and conditions, I seriously doubt whether gold is worth the sacrifice, the suffering and the loss of life it has occasioned. One could travel from Peak Hill to Norseman and would be shocked to find the number of young men up to 23 years of age who have perhaps for two years suffered the most intense agony imaginable. I hope it never falls to the lot of members of this Chamber to witness the suffering of those who have been stricken with silicosis. The average man has not the slightest conception of the suffering associated with that dreaded complaint. I have had friends who have been dying for nine months and during that period they could not lie down or recline, and sleep was out of the question. Is there any industry in the world worth all that physical suffering? Notwithstanding all that mineowners will not even establish a hospital for them. Marvellous progress has, of course, been made in connection with conditions appertaining to mining in this State. That has been brought about through the hard, honest battle put up by inspectors, by the Government and by some mineowners.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: By the unions.

Mr. LEAHY: Compared with 12 or 14 years ago there has been a marked improvement, but there is plenty of room for more to be done. We have achieved a good deal but silicosis still goes on. I appeal to every member of the House to ask himself whether it is really any use carrying on with the system of examination that we have today. A man may want employment on a mine. He then goes through the laboratory and

may work on a mine for a few years. Every two years he must go up for examination. At the end of four years it may be found that he shows signs of suffering from early silicosis. We then simply say, "We will issue a warning to you, old chap, to leave the mine in the interests of your health." The man may have a wife and three or four children to keep and he may be employed on the Golden Mile or some other part of the Fields. He has been driven into the mining industry and what can he do but carry on?

The whole system is wrong. There is only one thing to do and the time has long gone by when it should have been done in the interests of such men. Immediately a miner is found as a result of the laboratory examination, be it mobile or the head laboratory, to be suffering in any way from silicosis in the early stages, he should be taken from the industry in his own interests and in the interests of his family and of the country, and placed in some healthy occupation. The extent of the disability from which he is found to be suffering should then be assessed and he should receive compensation accordingly. I appeal to the Minister for Mines through his representative here to see whether he cannot alter this system. It has prevailed far too long. I can see no end to it. Why, darn it all, we are leaving men at work till they die!

A man waits until he gets an advanced silicosis ticket—and that is a ticket for the graveyard—and then he can work if he wishes. That is not right and it should not be allowed to continue. If it is permitted to go on in a country such as ours it is time the goldmining industry went to the wall. Quite a number of people are interested in prospecting and prospectors are recovering a fair amount of gold. I believe it would be in the interests of the industry generally if the rate to legitimate prospectors was increased. I do not mean the Hannan-street prospectors or people who walk around the pepper trees, but men with extensive experience of prospecting who are under the guidance of some officer of the Mines Department. If we were to increase the amount paid to men like that we would be doing something in the interests of the industry.

The question of the operation of the State Batteries is a very contentious one and prospectors complain very bitterly about their treatment. I think the principal bone of contention is the delay in payment for sands.

I am sure that could be overcome. I do not see why the department should hang on to the gold in the sands belonging to the prospectors. I believe the men should be paid promptly. A lot has been said, too, about the possibility of establishing treatment plants for sulphide ore. I do not know that I am too keen about that. I believe the department should be perfectly satisfied that sufficient sulphide ore will be obtainable for treatment before installing a plant. We hear a lot of small people talking about the treatment of sulphide ore, but before anything is done it is necessary to insure that there will be some permanency and that material will be available for the plant to treat.

I think I have mentioned before—but it will not do any harm to repeat it for the information of the Minister representing the Minister for Mines—that when a prospecting party locates gold and develops it to a certain extent, and possibly it is fairly low grade, a plant such as a portable compressor, with a pneumatic drill and a winch should be supplied to it. I believe that will be the practice of the Mines Department in the future if it is possible. Today a mobile boring plant is in operation and it can be transferred at a moment's notice wherever desired. That plant will bore to over 100 ft., and provides a very quick way of proving ground. The Mines Department has purchased five of these plants, which have been distributed throughout the State at a rental of £1 a week. That is reasonable enough for anyone, and those drills cannot be manufactured fast enough. People are enquiring for them all over the place.

I wish to thank the Minister sincerely for promising that the Government will proceed as soon as possible with improvements to the abattoirs at Kalgoorlie. I am very pleased indeed to know that the Government intends to undertake that work now the material is available. I am not going to give the Government all the kudos, however, because we have been working on this for a very long time. It has been a hardy annual with me but unfortunately I have not been able to "get places" because material was not procurable; but now I believe it is available and electric current has been carried to the plant and the badly needed improvements should be undertaken as quickly as possible. The people of the Eastern Goldfields are very tolerant. They do not howl just for the sake of

howling, but they have been howling to me about the abattoirs as long as I can remember. They do not complain publicly and are prepared to accept reasonable excuses. Now that materials are obtainable, the Goldfields people should be given the benefit of an up-to-date system of keeping meat. I think that the Honorary Minister, Mr. Wood, visited the abattoirs recently and said he was astounded at their condition. I hope that the Government will proceed with improvements as soon as possible.

People in the Eastern Goldfields and the Goldfields generally—and in fact people in all outback centres—are very proud of their children and are at all times anxious to see an improvement in the educational facilities provided for them. There are many schools in my constituency, but I do not think any of them is up to standard. At North Kalgoorlie classes have been held in hatrooms, on cement floors—and during winter, too—in parish halls and elsewhere. From there right down to South Boulder conditions have deteriorated far too much. I know there has been a difficulty in obtaining materials, but according to the Government supervisor, they can be made available and labour which was very scarce on the Eastern Goldfields can now be secured. There is a little outback centre called Lakewood. It is a very important little village, being the administrative headquarters of the Goldfields Firewood Supply Co. which has kept the goldfields mines going for a great many years. The children there can be educated only to the 6th standard.

Every parent likes to see his child receiving higher education. To obtain this children have to travel away from Lakewood. Before they can claim a travelling allowance or a board allowance, children seeking a higher education away from their home centres have to travel a distance of five miles. Three or four months ago I received a letter from a man at Lakewood who wanted to send his little girl to St. Joseph's Convent at Boulder and he asked me whether the child would be entitled to a board allowance. I rang up the department and had many conversations but never seemed to get anywhere; so I wrote and after four months this is the gem I received in reply from a department of which I am very proud. The letter is dated the 8th August, 1947, is addressed to me and reads:—

With reference to your memo on the subject of the refusal of the department to grant the

boarding allowance to Patricia Sexton of Lakewood, I have to inform you that the distance from Mr. Sexton's home to the St. Joseph's Convent, Boulder, has been measured by the district inspector. As it is slightly less than 4.9 miles, she is not entitled to the allowance.

I wonder what he measured the distance with. I wonder whether he got a qualified surveyor to put his tape over it. Action of that sort is an insult. I suppose the distance was measured with some old Government bus, but I never saw two speedometers that agreed. This reply that I received is an insult to people who are doing a very valuable work. The road board has spent a lot of money trying to keep them contented and this is the sort of reply I receive from the department after a lapse of four months. The letter is here for anybody to see.

I am sorry the Minister is not in his place but I spoke to him about it. I ask whether these people who are battling in the outback are receiving a fair go. Had the man said, "I will send the child to the Goldfields High School or the convent in Kalgoorlie, or the School of Mines, the 176 yards that prevented this child from receiving an allowance would have vanished. But it is possible to reach this particular convent by various routes. I presume this inspector must have secured the help of a surveyor from a mine and asked him to put a tape over the distance; otherwise it is too exact to be believed. I am rather peeved about this—and I am pretty hard to peeve as a rule. But I repeat, this is an insult to the people I represent.

There is another thing I regret, and that is that the workers are not represented on the Royal Commission which is inquiring into workers' compensation. I do not know why that is. I cannot for the life of me believe that any Minister or Government would fail to say to the workers, "We would like one of your representatives on this Commission which is enquiring into a matter about which you are vitally concerned." It would have been only courtesy to extend that invitation.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. LEAHY: I will not long delay the House.

Mr. Reynolds: We like to hear you!

Mr. LEAHY: I feel that I must refer to a couple of matters that have come to my notice. One concerns the Minister for Water Supply. I am referring to a very indus-

trious and hard-working section of the people on the Goldfields, the market gardeners. Goldfields members know very well the struggle these people have had in that dry area. The soil is excellent, but it requires water. I do not think I need fear contradiction when I say that when these people went on the land they worked—men, women and children—almost day and night to produce the very fine vegetables that are so badly needed by the hospitals and the people on the Goldfields. Some time ago—I think it was about three years ago—the market gardeners approached me as to the possibility of having a larger main installed to supply them with sufficient water to enable them to grow more vegetables. I did all I could at the time but, as members know, during that period it was impossible to get waterpipes and, even had they been obtainable, there was no labour available to instal them. I approached the then Minister, and he did his best, with the result that we got a few pipes. I cannot now recall the number, or the amount of ground they would cover, but they were not sufficient.

I again approached the Minister and asked whether, in the interests of the people of the Eastern Goldfields, the job could be completed. The department advised me that it would not be good policy to commence the installation of the main unless it could be completed. I am led to believe that pipes can now be made available and, even though they may be secondhand, they will be better than nothing. The urgent need for this pipeline is created by the fact that the old line is so corroded that it will not supply sufficient water to serve the areas already under crop. I might mention that the gardeners wish to extend those areas and I am hopeful that the Minister will now go into this matter and do all he can for the people concerned.

The Minister for Works: Was your application made to this Government or its predecessor?

Mr. LEAHY: I thought I had explained that it was made three years ago. I know the material was not then available, nor was there the labour to do the work. I appeal to the Minister to do whatever is possible in this matter. These market gardeners are fine people and are doing an excellent job. It is well known how much fresh vegetables mean to the people in Kalgoorlie and other Goldfields districts.

I must now mention the speedy train from Kalgoorlie to Perth, which takes 17 hours, and sometimes 27 hours, to complete the journey. I wish the Minister concerned would make inquiries as to whether it is possible to run a Saturday night train from Kalgoorlie to Perth, and to have the express leave Kalgoorlie a little later so that people might have tea before boarding it. They would then need only breakfast on the train and would have all night, which is the ideal time for travelling in this State, in either winter or summer, in which to make the journey. It would cut out a lot of expense and would perhaps reduce the running time of the train. The train covers 380 miles in 17 hours, during which it pulls up at so many sidings as to make one wonder what is happening. The reason for some of those stoppages is a mystery to me, but they do occur. Perhaps many of them could be cut out, which would provide a better service and reduce the running time.

During the Christmas period, the poor unfortunate miner and his family—some members might say that he is not poor—may desire to go to the coast for a holiday. I admit that he earns good money, but he is entitled to earn and spend it, as his life is so limited, and during the period of good health that he enjoys he should have everything he can get. In summer the people have to queue up to book, no matter whether they are in good health or not—both young and old—and possibly when they arrive at the booking office it is only to find that the train is booked out. That is an old custom, but it should be cut out as it does not measure up to modern times. It may have been all right 160 years ago, but it should not apply now.

I humbly suggest to the Minister for Railways that an office be opened in the centre of Kalgoorlie, and another in the centre of Boulder, so that people in their leisure moments—they do not have much leisure there—can walk up to book and, if disappointed, return the following day and perhaps obtain a booking. I suggest to the Minister that during the coming period of hot weather, when miners and their families wish to travel to Perth for recreation, officers and accommodation be made available for the purpose I have mentioned. I hope the Minister will investigate the position.

HON. A. R. G. HAWKE (Northam)
[7.40]: Mr. Speaker, the credit or blame for

the speech I am about to make will rest almost entirely with the member for Mt. Marshall. Had he not made the brisk speech that he delivered last night, I think it highly probable that I would not have spoken at all in this debate. His speech had many remarkable and not a few strange features in it. He could well be described as one capable of talking for hours without stopping even once to think, but I do not propose to describe him in that way.

The Minister for Lands: Although you have said it.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I was considerably surprised that he should have attempted a justification of at least one of the wilfully and completely untrue election advertisements that was authorised last March over his name.

Mr. Leslie: I thought I had nailed that untruth of yours last night.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: That advertisement stated, not in effect but absolutely, that there were no materials, no houses, no education, no transport, no hospitals, no enterprise and no ideas in this State or in the Labour Government that was in office in Western Australia at that time. The untrue nature of each of those declarations is so obvious and actually so stupid as to make it unnecessary to argue the point about them. I think several members on the Government side of the House interpreted incorrectly the motives that moved members of the previous Government, during the debate on the Supply Bill, to condemn strongly the more extreme part of the propaganda used by the Liberal and C.D.L. Parties during the last election campaign. Our condemnation did not arise in any degree from a feeling of disappointment or resentment at having been defeated at the election.

As a matter of fact I did not, in my speech on the Supply Bill, say, or even suggest, that propaganda of that kind during the election campaign had influenced even one vote; and no-one, of course, can measure or attempt to measure with any degree of accuracy just what influence that type of election propaganda might have on any elector. It might have influenced some against the Government of the day, but nobody can say with certainty. Our purpose was to try to establish a belief in the minds of Parliamentary members and those people outside associated with Parliamentary organisations that elec-

tion propaganda should be kept on a reasonably high plane.

Mr. Leslie: Like the constant reiteration of the Mitchell-Latham Government being responsible for the depression.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It is pleasing to hear the member for Mt. Marshall getting excited so early. Any member who thinks deeply about the matter should realise that, if this is persisted in, there can be only one result in the future. It is not to the credit of the member for Mt. Marshall that he was the only one on the Government side that sought to justify an advertisement of the type I am now discussing.

Mr. Leslie: Facts prove that it was right.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think that the Attorney General, for instance, realised that this type of propaganda is undesirable and unfair, and should not be used by any Party here or elsewhere.

Mr. Leslie: I do not think he said that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I did not say that he said it. I said I thought he realised it. The only reply the Attorney General was able to make—and I think we all agree he would be capable of making a better reply than would the member for Mt. Marshall—was to produce an election advertisement published during the last Commonwealth election campaign by the Australian Labour Party. He was not able to produce any leaflet or advertisement issued by the Labour Party in this State during the recent State election campaign. The action of the Attorney General, in producing the Commonwealth election pamphlet, proved absolutely the feature of the whole thing with which we were concerned during the debate on the Supply Bill and with which I am concerned at this moment.

I most earnestly hope that we in Western Australia will never see political standards established on a level as low as that which operates in at least some of the Eastern States. I believe it has been the proud claim of political leaders and of Parties in this State in the years gone by that our standards in Parliament and outside were considerably above the general standards operating in the politics of Eastern Australia. Political standards in the Eastern States have fallen from time to time because one Party or the other at an election produced electioneering propaganda of a most unfair and discreditable type. We can all feel very superior in matters of this sort;

we can all flatter ourselves that, even if the other fellow does kick us in the stomach, so to speak, or hit us from behind, we will still adhere faithfully to the Marquis of Queensberry rules. I suggest to any member who is inclined to think in a superior way along those lines that it often happens in human relationships that, when one man is struck unfairly or savagely, a very strong tendency develops within him to use the same type of warfare against his attacker. In essence, I think that is an explanation of why political standards in Eastern Australia are not as good as they were in this State prior to the recent State election.

If the Parties opposed to the Labour Party in this State feel that, in connection with State elections in future, it should be a case of boots-and-all in, a case of say anything and do anything, no matter whether it is true, no matter how discreditable it may be, no matter how much it might mislead the public deliberately as to the position, it will be most unfortunate, because I feel that the reaction would be that all Parties would probably adopt the same methods. The inevitable result of such a development would be to drag down the political standards of this State to what they are probably in New South Wales. So I hope very earnestly that every member who has misinterpreted the reason for the protest we made on the Supply Bill will realise that it was made in an endeavour to ensure that, in future elections in this State, the best possible effort will be exerted by all leaders and by those in control of and associated with Party propaganda to ensure that we keep within reasonable limits of political warfare. I trust that this suggestion will receive the careful consideration of everybody who was concerned in the recent election and everybody who might be concerned in future elections in this State.

Those who have studied political organising work over the years will know without my telling them that the boots-and-all-in method of electioneering always favours the Opposition. That is easily understandable, too, because no matter how good a Government might be, no matter how capable it might be, and no matter how much beneficial work it might have achieved for may sections of the community, there are always people who will be dissatisfied. And they need not necessarily be dissatisfied with justification

because, with the passing of the years, many people and some groups of people have come to expect from Governments ever so much more than they are justly entitled to receive. So I say it is much easier for an Opposition to reap profit politically from indulging in methods of the sort I have been describing and methods of the sort represented by the advertisement I have mentioned tonight and some of those referred to during the debate on the Supply Bill.

Whilst saying a few words about some of the statements by the member for Mt. Marshall, I wish to add something about things said by some other members. If it provides any relief to the new members, I propose to say nothing at all about anything any of them said. I would say, however, to the member for Irwin-Moore, and not in any fatherly or superior way, either, that he should strive for accuracy and reliability to the limit possible. I am not suggesting that any one of us, no matter how much he may strive for complete accuracy, will ever achieve it. There is always the possibility of mistake, the possibility of miscalculation, the possibility that we have not seen the complete picture or become aware of all the facts. When I was previously a private member, I was inclined to jump to conclusions with only half the facts in my possession, and I say, in the hope that all members will take notice of it in their dealings with Ministers, that very often only Ministers are in possession of the complete facts and that it is not always possible for them to make all the facts known.

The member for Irwin-Moore made more than one mis-statement; two of them I propose to refer to briefly. One was that the failure of the Labour Government to do its job properly and effectively was proven beyond any shadow of doubt by the action of the ex-Premier in taking a deputation to the new Premier on North-West matters soon after the election. The hon. member led us to believe that the member for Gascoyne and members of the deputation made a number of requests to the new Government to do certain things in the North-West, and the suggestion was that the member for Gascoyne and his Government, if they had not been asleep or in a state of unconsciousness during the years

they were in office, could have done those things themselves. If the facts were as stated, the claim of the member for Irwin-Moore would have been well based. The truth is that the deputation requested the new Government to carry on with the work commenced by the Labour Government, and with the policy it had developed for the North-West.

The other statement, which was not one bit accurate and not one scrap fair and with which I am sure no Minister would agree, was to the effect that the Labour Opposition had never ceased trying to embarrass the new Government from the very hour it took office. I am sure that the Opposition has not done this in any degree. We have naturally criticised on occasions, which is not only the privilege but is also the bounden duty of the Opposition to the people of the State. If Ministers would take us into their confidence—I am not asking them to do so—

Mr. Leslie: I have heard this stuff before.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You will hear it again.

Mr. Leslie: When the position is reversed.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If Ministers would take us into their confidence, they would probably tell us that most of their embarrassment up to date has been due to their own supporters—I am not suggesting their supporters in this House.

The Minister for Works: It might be correct to say that it does not come from either side.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the Minister for Works is prepared to support my view that the Government has not been embarrassed to an extent worth talking about, up to date, that is a complete answer to the charge made against the Opposition some days ago by the member for Irwin-Moore. I am prepared to accept the assurance of the Minister for Works absolutely and with considerable pleasure.

The Minister for Works: You will not go too far!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I will go no further, but will leave that subject entirely alone from now on. The member for Albany romanced in his usual delightful fashion in the course of the speech which

he made in this debate. I think he feels that some of us on this side of the House have him set for some reason or other.

Mr. Hill: Oh, no!

Hon. A. H. Panton: We love him.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He thinks we do not like him, whereas the truth is that we like him very much. We greatly admire his persistency, even though at times it did become a nuisance to us, as Ministers. I am sure it has already become a nuisance at times to some of the new Ministers.

The Minister for Works: Are you going to be the spokesman for the Government this time?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The member for Albany sought to create the impression in this House, and, through the newspapers, to the public—especially the public in his own electorate—that when I was Minister for Works and struggling with proposals for the greater development of the Albany Harbour, which the Duchess of Gloucester has, through the member for Albany, told us should be developed—

Mr. May: He sat side by side with her.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He thought I was confused and muddled and did not know what the actual proposals and plans were. For instance, he said I had explained to the people of Albany that the proposal consisted of four stages; whereas, in fact, in his opinion it was divided into only three stages. The reply to that was provided by the Minister for Works today in his answer to a question which I put on the notice paper. The answer was that the first of the three stages is divided into two sections, Section A and Section B.

Mr. Hill: Why did not the measurements you mentioned correspond with the measurements on the plans?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The second point which the hon. member raised was that I had said to the people, when explaining these plans, that 4,990 feet of berthage accommodation was provided for, whereas he considered that the berthage was much less. The answer given by the Minister today proves that my figure was not far from accurate.

The Minister for Works: It proved that both were wrong.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I was wrong by 5 feet and the member for Albany by 1,555.

Mr. Hill: I will reply to you later.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The member for Albany cannot do it in this debate; not with the Speaker we have in charge of the House at present. Another point was that, despite the fact that it had been promised that the engineers of the department would visit Albany to discuss the proposals with the local organisations, the promise has not been kept. It was my privilege a few days ago to inspect the file, which was made available to me by the Minister. Anyone who cares to study it will see that clear-cut arrangements were made early this year for the Director of Works (Mr. Dumas) and the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers (Mr. J. S. Young) to visit Albany, I think on the 21st February.

Mr. Hill: March.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: They were to have had a conference with representatives of the Albany Municipality, the Albany Road Board, the Albany Chamber of Commerce and the Albany Branch of the A.L.P. The Minister, in reply to one of my questions today, informed the House that the visit had not been made. I am not aware of the reason why.

Mr. Hill: You were Minister at the time.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I was. I have already said that I have examined the file, which proves that clear-cut arrangements were made by me for the two departmental engineers I mentioned to visit Albany on the 21st March of this year. I have no idea whatever why they did not go. If the member for Albany will study the file, he will find letters and even telegrams dealing with the matter. Hotel accommodation was booked. Some reason must have arisen why those highly-placed engineers did not visit Albany on the date in question. The hon. member says I was Minister at the time. I was and was not. An election was held on the 15th March and by the 21st March it had been made very clear that a change of Government had been decided on.

The Minister for Works: You were still carrying on your departmental duties at that time, were you not?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I was indeed. I think the present Minister for Works will know that no Minister, no matter how active he may be, can follow up every detail of every matter dealt with in his department.

The Minister for Education: I hope you will admit that in the future.

The Minister for Works: We have scored something from your speech.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The member for Albany complained that the plans prepared by the department for the extension of the harbour did not originally provide for some road that might be regarded as being necessary for better transport. That road was to have been constructed between the town and the wharves. I suggest that that is not the kind of thing which is regarded as being important when original plans are being prepared for an undertaking such as this. Such things come later and are then decided. However, his main complaint was that I had sent some information to the Albany branch of the A.L.P. to the effect that a road of the nature required would undoubtedly be provided when the time came for it to be used. His complaint was that the letter had not been sent to the Municipal Council or to the member for Albany. As the matter had been brought under my notice by the Albany Branch of the A.L.P., obviously the letter in reply had to be sent to that organisation.

The member for Victoria Park is a very amiable fellow, a very friendly chap, who has developed in the City Council and in other places. In his speech he took considerable exception to the fact that I had, during my remarks on the Supply Bill, condemned some election propaganda issued by the then Opposition during the last election campaign. He was righteously indignant that the member for Northam should have dared to condemn any propaganda when, in fact, the same member for Northam, as Minister for Works, during the last election campaign had sent a personal letter to the electors in Victoria Park on the subject of the new Causeway. Everything contained in that circular letter was true and accurate beyond any successful question. In effect it claimed that the member for Victoria Park had in no way, at any time, ever approached me personally or in writing to stress the need for the building of a new Causeway over the Swan River.

If the hon. member is able to stretch his imagination so much as to compare that circular letter of mine with some of the advertisements that have been referred to in this House during the past few weeks, all I can say is that I admire very deeply the elastic nature of his imagination. He did tell us during the progress of this debate that he had referred to the need for the new Causeway in speeches which he made from time to time in this House. Here, again, I might presume to offer some advice to the new members on both sides of the House. If new members content themselves with only making speeches in this House on advocacy of the things which they think ought to be done in their districts, they will finish at the end of this Parliament without having had anything at all done in their districts.

Mr. Yates: I agree.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The most effective way of getting things done in members' districts—

Mr. Read: Is to arouse public opinion.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You would have a job.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The only effective way is to rouse the appropriate departmental officers and get into conversation with the appropriate Ministers as often as it is possible to do so.

Mr. Rodoreda: The member for Albany is an example of that.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know some members—and some ex-members—who used to advocate the needs of their districts in Parliament frequently and at great length; but they did not give nearly enough time, or make nearly enough effort, to advocate their districts' needs to the Minister and the appropriate departmental officers. So the fact that the member for Victoria Park in some of his infrequent speeches in this Chamber referred to the need for building a new Causeway did not in the slightest degree influence the Government or those concerned in the decision to proceed with that undertaking.

I wish to discuss briefly—I hope it will be briefly—the criticism levelled against the Labour Governments from 1933 to 1947. A few speakers on the Government side of the House—and only a few—claimed that those Labour Governments during that period had done very little, had achieved very little,

and for the most part had been incompetent, even lazy, and consequently, and rightly, suffered defeat at the hands of the people in March last. I think the defeat has been magnified. The state of the Parties in the House at the present time proves beyond even the argumentative or talkative powers of the member for Mt. Marshall that the decision of the people was not very decisive.

Mr. Leslie: It was decisive enough, though.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: It was not overwhelming.

The Minister for Works: Was that claimed by anyone?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The position today is that there are 23 Labour members, and the Government Parties have 24 members on the floor of the House, —

The Minister for Education: We have 25.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: — with one who would be a supporter on occasions except for the fact that he is in the impartial position of Speaker of the House.

The Minister for Education: That does not leave 23.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He did not say it did. He said, 24.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have always had a great admiration for the Acting Premier, and I still have, but I am beginning to suspect that his hearing is fading slightly.

The Minister for Works: His point is that 25 less one is not 23.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It is worth something to have a mate like you in the House!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I think the sooner the Treasurer returns to Western Australia the better it will be for the Government because, firstly, the Acting Premier and, secondly, the Minister for Works seem to be getting horribly mixed up as to what was said and as to how different calculations should be worked out; so much so that they commenced a moment ago to have an argument amongst themselves. Therefore, as I have said, the decision of the people was certainly not emphatic. It was effective inasmuch as it left the previous Government with insufficient supporters to enable it to continue as the Government of the State. I want, as quickly as possible, to trace the periods during which Labour

Governments operated in Western Australia from 1933 to 1947. I think every member will agree that conditions in this State in 1933 were tough.

Mr. Leslie: Following the Mitchell-Latham Government, of course.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: If the member for Mt. Marshall cares to say that—and I know he has to say something every minute or two—he is quite entitled to make the remark. I am not concerned at this stage with trying to allocate any blame or endeavouring to divine the causes which brought these conditions into existence.

Mr. Leslie: They served you in good stead for 14 years.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: We all know that the trade depression which commenced about 1929 or early 1930 was world-wide and was brought into existence mainly by causes entirely outside the control of any State Government in Australia, or that of even the Commonwealth Government. However, this is not the occasion to go into a discussion of that tragic matter, although if, later in the session, there is a debate—and I hope there will be—on the Commonwealth Government's present proposals to nationalise the banking system of this country, we will be provided with an appropriate opportunity to discuss these matters in detail. I say again that no member could possibly deny that conditions in this State in 1933 were extremely tough. They were tough for almost every section of the community, and especially so for the unemployed and those employed part-time, and for farmers, businessmen generally and, perhaps, for other groups as well. The task put upon the shoulders of the State Government to grapple with these difficulties and problems was most acute.

I think any unbiassed observer, who knew the conditions of those years and the progress made from 1933 onwards, could not but admit that the Labour Government of the time did a fairly good job under extremely difficult conditions. As a matter of fact, I would go so far as to say that the man in Australia who played the biggest part in laying the foundations for Australia's recovery from the depression was the then Premier of Western Australia, Philip Collier—I might explain that in more detail on some other occasion—because of his constant advocacy at Premiers' Conferences

and Loan Council meetings that there should be brought about in Australia a reversal of the financial policy which had been followed within the Commonwealth during the previous three, four or five years. His pleading won through finally, and we saw the reversal of monetary policy, as I am sure Mr. Speaker would support if he were able to be on the floor of this House and take some part in this debate. When the policy of monetary reflation as against the depression policy of monetary deflation commenced to operate within the Commonwealth, conditions generally, for every section of the community, began to improve.

As the volume of purchasing power within the community was greatly expanded by putting more public works into operation, by paying more wages, by gradually revivifying industries which the depression had compelled to close down completely, or in large part, there began that movement towards recovery that was so vitally necessary in Australia at the time. I know there were other factors. Some such were operating oversea which, in their world-wide sweep, assisted Australia. Especially was that so in the matter of gradually increasing the prices for primary products which we exported in large volume to other countries. So, from 1933 to 1939 the Labour Governments of this State grappled conscientiously, solidly and without stint, so far as the personal strivings of individual Ministers were concerned, to raise the standard of living of the people of this State; to lift them as far as possible out of the misery which had been forced upon them by that trade depression.

And I do ask, in all fairness, that every member of this House will take his mind back to that period. I ask especially that Government members, inclined to take up the cry about "fourteen years of Labour rule in this State, with nothing accomplished," will cast their minds back to those years, as I am sure there is no member in this House, no matter how young he may be, who does not remember—I hope it is not necessary for him to make any effort to remember—the dreadful conditions under which groups of people in this State lived during that time. By 1939 conditions in Western Australia were fairly good, having improved vastly in comparison with what obtained in the worst years of the depression. I do not suggest that all the credit

for that achievement belonged to the State Governments of the period or to the Commonwealth Government, because we know that this and the other States of Australia are affected to a considerable extent by world policy—the policies carried out in other countries of the world.

In 1939 the war came and the Labour Government of this State rightly or wrongly—I do not think there is any doubt that what it did was done rightly—pledged the total resources of the State to the Commonwealth Government for the prosecution of the war to the fullest degree possible. Everybody at that time was 100 per cent. in support of that attitude and policy. Every man and woman in this State and in Australia—except perhaps a fifth columnist here or there, if there were any in this State—was 100 per cent. behind that policy. As the war progressed, and particularly after Japan came into the war, the people of this State were, if possible, even more strongly in favour of the policy of the State Government in giving up the manpower and production resources of Western Australia to the war effort. That policy was continued during the whole period of the war which, I think, finally concluded in August or September, 1945.

It is extremely easy for selfish people in a community to be wholly in favour of a war effort while the war is on, and while perhaps their own existence is threatened, and then to become vocal, immediately the war is over, for this, that and everything else to be done. I feel that with the passing of the years in Australia there has been an all too great tendency on the part of many people to expect too many things and too much from Governments. On that account it is a great pity that the people of this State, a few months ago, were led to believe that the effects of the war on the economy of the State had not been serious in their post-war application and had by then, at all events, almost completely disappeared. It was unfortunate, because it led too many people to believe that they were entitled to expect the Government of this State—no matter what might be its Party complexion—to provide with little or no delay all the things that they needed, and perhaps even most of the things that they wanted. That was unfortunate, not because of any political results that it brought about at the election, but because

of the influence that it had on the minds of so many of our people.

I have no patience with the man or woman who seeks to discount or depreciate the terribly dislocating and destructive effects of war on any country that has been involved in it—more especially in a modern war. I put it to members that no nation, in these modern times, can be involved in a world war for five or six years without suffering destructive effects and dislocation that will affect it detrimentally for many years after the last shot has been fired.

Mr. Leslie: It is remarkable that none of our Commonwealth high planners visualised this period. Read their reports!

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: When I am not in the most serious frame of mind I do not object to being interrupted by the member for Mt. Marshall, but at this stage I prefer not to take notice of him, and I do not say that offensively.

Mr. Leslie: I did not intend to be offensive, but it is an important aspect.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The time has arrived in Australia when all members, irrespective of Party, should try to impress upon the people the seriousness of the effects that the last war had on our country. Any man who thinks or says that once a war is over it is ended and everything should return to normality almost overnight, is a shallow-minded thinker, if he thinks at all. The destructive and dislocating effects of war will be with us for at least another three years and, in several respects that I could mention, for 15, 20, 50 or even 100 years. I think that public men, especially, should seize every opportunity of educating the people to realise the tragic nature of war, what it does, and how it penalises men, women and children, not only during the war but for many years after it has ended.

If we discount the destructive and dislocating effects of war during the war or even only in the postwar period, we do not hold up war to the public in the dreadful colours in which it should be held up. We have heard all sorts of ideas and theories for the prevention of future wars, but, in my opinion, there is only one real possibility of preventing wars, and that is to do it through the processes of human thinking, to

do it by education, from perhaps the cradle to the grave. I am sure that if war could be shown to the people of all countries of the world in its stark nakedness during the time it is raging—many people, of course, have experienced that—and in addition its destructive and dislocating effects after the war is over and even many years after, if this sort of thing could be taught in the schools, taught from political platforms, taught over the radio and preached from the pulpits, we would be making a really valuable step towards the goal of trying to prevent war in future.

Whether the stage will ever be reached in human affairs when the people in every country will be educated to the futility of war is something about which nobody can be certain. I know that we might be able to educate the people of one country to the right level, but that would not do unless we could educate the people of every country to the same level, and this is a tremendous problem that faces public men all over the world. It is probably the greatest problem with which mankind has been faced or ever will be faced.

Any member who seriously considers the housing problem in this State will know that it will take a considerable time before that problem is completely solved. I feel sure that the Ministers of the new Government can put nothing more into the effort in that regard than Ministers of the previous Government did. In saying that, I may be paying Ministers of the present Government a very great compliment. The limiting factor in regard to the building of houses, as in regard to the building of schools, hospitals and public buildings generally, is physical. Many people, soon after the war ended, developed the foolish idea that physical limitations in Australia could be overcome by bringing to this country hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of men from other countries of the world. I must admit that I never had the slightest degree of faith in that theory. The world wages war on the most destructive basis for six years. Almost every country worth mentioning is in the war. Large numbers of men enter into the fighting services of every country and large numbers of civilians in the countries where war strikes are either killed or disabled. How millions of men could be killed off for six years and, at the end of the killing orgy, hundreds of thousands or millions of men could be obtained from war countries and

brought to Australia was beyond my comprehension when the idea was put forward and has been ever since.

Countries that were engaged in the war and actually struck by the war, such as the countries of Europe, including Great Britain, need every man they can lay their hands on for their own reconstruction. So I repeat that the limiting factor in this State is a physical one. It is the same in every other State and in almost every other country, and will be, in my opinion, for at least five years to come. Therefore I feel that any one who misleads the people into believing that existing problems can be overcome quickly either does not know what he is talking about or is misleading them in a manner that is wicked and discreditable.

I believe that members of this Government will grapple conscientiously with every problem that it is the responsibility of Governments to grapple with. I believe that every Minister will give of the best that is within him, and, if the Honorary Minister were taking an interest in what I am saying, I would also add that every woman in the Ministry would give of the best that is in her in trying to grapple successfully with the problems confronting us.

If this Government is able to achieve considerably more success than the previous Government did in the most difficult fields of endeavour, then it will deserve to be congratulated. Time, of course, is on its side, and I think every Minister will probably agree with that. However, the fact that time is on its side is no guarantee that the passing of time will make those problems easier. The strain and anxiety of war did strange things to the minds of a great many men and women even in Australia, which was not struck by the war. Tens of thousands of men and women in this country during the years of war lived under great strain, stress and anxiety, and this was one of the dislocating and destructive effects that the war had upon our people. And it did not finish when the war ended. The minds of many of those men and women are still suffering the effects of stress and strain.

We know that, for about two years after the close of the war, there were, in Eastern Australia, many industrial troubles. Some of them no doubt were instigated by the friends of the member for Mt. Marshall, the Communists; but many of them I suggest might have been caused by the fact that

workers had during the war period given much more, mentally and physically, than they were capable of giving. As a result, when the war ended they were impatient, easily upset, easily disturbed. Consequently, we did see, unfortunately, an outburst of industrial unrest in eastern Australia for all too long a period after the war ended. I cannot say how long that post-war mental anxiety in the minds of men and women might continue to exist.

Mr. Leslie: I wish you would get the economists to realise that and to prepare their plans accordingly.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: No-one can tell how long it might exist. No-one can foretell when it might cause industrial unrest or other trouble. As I said earlier, time is on the side of the Government; it would be on the side of any Government in office now. There is no guarantee, however, that the passing of time alone will make the solving of these problems easier. I hope it does, because I do not wish the Ministers of the present Government to undergo the stress and strain, the worry, the burden of work and the responsibility which Ministers of Labour Governments had to undergo during the 14 years immediately prior to the 1st April of this year. The member for Wagin looks a bit worried, but I am not going to refer to what he said, as I think new members are entitled to every consideration.

Mr. Yates: Do not worry! We can take it!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I know. I have not the slightest doubt on that point. As a matter of fact, if it is any satisfaction to the member for Canning, I can say to him that I greatly admired his speech.

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

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I admired the spirit behind the speech as much as the speech itself.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do not make him blush.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He did not, as some members on the Government side did, express entire satisfaction with the work of the Government. He did say some of the Ministers had been wandering about his electorate. He dealt with the urgent needs of his electorate and with the undertakings

which he and his Party had given to the electors in March last. He said with some determination—I am sure he was earnest about it—that the new Government would have to deliver the goods, or something to that effect. I consider he is quite justified in taking that stand. I do not think it was a threat and I am sure that Ministers understood the spirit which moved the hon. member to say that he felt absolutely bound to live up, as far as he could, to the undertakings he gave to his electors during the election campaign.

The only other member about whom I was inclined to say something is the member for Geraldton. He made a speech the other day in this Chamber, and, as far as I know, no-one has seen him since. In my opinion, he is not a new member and therefore is not entitled to come under the assurance which I gave earlier.

Hon. A. H. Panton: He is an old offender.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: He is an old member, a very wily one, a most unreliable one, a desperate kind of individual politically.

Hon. A. H. Panton: You woke up the Honorary Minister!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I understand the majority opinion in another place is that their gain in losing the member for Geraldton has been the Assembly's loss. In his speech the member for Geraldton condemned the action of the Government, with which I was associated some 10 or 11 years ago, in appointing Alwyn Schroeder at that time as Special Magistrate of the Children's Court. When the member for Geraldton was questioned by way of interjection about this matter, it was clear that in his opinion the person who should have been appointed was the then Secretary of the Child Welfare Department, Mr. Meecham. Knowing the member for Geraldton very well, I can imagine what happened when the Government decided to appoint Mr. Schroeder. No doubt, as soon as possible the member for Geraldton got into touch with Mr. Meecham, sympathising with him, telling him that he was the ideal man to be Special Magistrate of the Children's Court, that he should have been appointed, and that the Government had done a terrible thing, a brutal thing, in overlooking

the Secretary of the Child Welfare Department by appointing Mr. Schroeder.

I do not desire to say anything in this House about Mr. Meecham. It would not be fair to him; it would be most undesirable in every way, but I do say that that is the method of the member for Geraldton in matters of this description. He told the House about a deputation which waited upon me some years ago and advocated the re-establishment of a psychological clinic in this State to deal with children—or some of them, at any rate—brought before the Children's Court. I gave that matter much consideration and did a lot of research in connection with it—a lot of reading. The Government discussed the matter in due course and we decided that the deputation's request could not be granted. This psychological business is a weird business. In certain respects it has developed into a racket in some places, especially when the psychologist is one in theory only. It is remarkable how many of these groups develop a jargon of their own. I am sure the member for Mt. Marshall will agree with me on this point, if on nothing else, that during the time both of us have been members of this House the same remark could be applied to economists and to many planners.

Mr. Leslie: By jingo, they have a jargon!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: When members of Parliament, or even Ministers, or the man in the street—if the man in the street ever has occasion to do so—go to these persons, they metaphorically blind him with science. They throw this jargon at one in great heaps, and when one is able to get in a word edgewise, they quickly again set this jargon going and sooner or later one has to give up in absolute despair, feeling that these persons are theorists almost entirely.

Mr. Leslie: And dangerous to the community.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: With not much commonsense and with little or no practical ability.

Mr. Leslie: Jingoism! Those are my sentiments exactly.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I had an idea that if I kept talking long enough I would convert the hon. member on some point or other! I suggest to the present Govern-

ment that if it is considering the matter of re-establishing the psychological clinic it should be very careful, extremely careful, regarding the personnel which it chooses to staff that clinic. Otherwise it might easily lead itself into a tragedy which would be bad enough in all conscience but might, at the same time, lead many of the children of this State into a much greater tragedy. I suppose my opinion might be regarded as being prejudiced; but I would say that the present magistrate of the Children's Court, Mr. Schroeder, is a practical psychologist of very great value. I am not sure what psychology is, though I think I have heard you, Sir, discussing the matter in this House at different times. I do not know what it is.

Mr. Leslie: Does anybody?

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I doubt it.

The Honorary Minister: They know everything and understand nothing.

Hon. A. H. Panton: She has awakened at last!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am not sure whether the Honorary Minister is conscious—

The Honorary Minister: I am conscious!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: —or in a dream.

Hon. A. H. Panton: I hope she is not in a nightmare!

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I did not hear what she said, so I cannot refer to it.

The Honorary Minister: I said they know everything and understand nothing.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I understand the Honorary Minister is not very keen about these psychologists either! My view about dealing with human beings—and this applies to grown-ups as well as children—is that commonsense is the best basis upon which to judge.

The Honorary Minister: I agree.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: Commonsense is the best foundation upon which to work. For my part I would much sooner take the opinion of the average man in the street—

The Honorary Minister: Or woman.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: — and perhaps even more the opinion of the average woman in the street, about the treatment that should be applied to children who might need some attention, some correction, than I would take

the opinion of 100 of many of those people who parade as psychologists. I feel sure there are in the present Government enough members with sufficient commonsense not to be rushed into this business of appointing people who parade as psychologists, no matter how much pressure the member for Geraldton might put upon the Government.

I hope that when the Government is choosing the person who is to replace Mr. Schroeder as special magistrate of the Children's Court, it will give much thought to the matter. I am sure it will. I hope it will not appoint a lawyer unless he is appointed for qualities other than his legal knowledge and training. If the person appointed in due course is chosen because of his knowledge of the law, and his legal training, I am afraid of the results that will accrue. I have no objection to a legal man provided he has great qualities of commonsense and human understanding. If such a lawyer is available in this State, he is entitled to consideration in regard to the appointment equal to that which should be given to every man and woman in this community whose training, knowledge, commonsense and human understanding would entitle him or her to consideration for appointment.

MR. RODOREDA (Roebourne) [9.1]: I had hoped this debate would terminate without my having to make a contribution to it. I was certain the member for Pilbara would touch upon North-West topics, but he got on to more controversial matter. It would be something of a record if this debate were allowed to take place without the North-West being mentioned at all! I also hoped that I would not have to take part in the debate particularly as I had to follow the previous speaker. The contrast is too noticeable at such close range. There is a phrase used a lot lately in the Press, which speaks about "talks on the Ministerial level." I have some idea of what that means now, and I could not hope to deliver any sort of speech on the Ministerial level or even on the ex-Ministerial level. But some reference has to be made to the problems with which the North-West is struggling.

Before I get on to that topic, I regret having to mention the remarks made by the member for Irwin-Moore in connection with the deputation to which reference was made by the member for Northam. I had no knowledge that that member would touch

on the subject and I regret having to do so, because I listened with very keen attention to the splendid effort of the member for Irwin-Moore. I am afraid, however, that he was unwarranted in the conclusion to which he jumped when he heard about that deputation. He said something of this nature. I took it down, and if these are not his exact words, what I shall read conveys the sense of what he said. This is it:

If we want proof of what has not happened in the past it can be found in the facts surrounding a deputation taken by the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier shortly after he took office. That amounts to an admission of the failure of the previous Government to do what was required.

The member for Northam dealt very briefly with that. I desire to elaborate a little. I can assure the member for Irwin-Moore that no new request of any description was made to the Premier in relation to matters affecting the North-West. The deputation was not introduced to the Premier of our own volition. The Leader of the Opposition was requested by the North-West Advancement Association to take a deputation of North-West members to the Premier to find out what the Government's attitude would be in regard to matters that had already been initiated or were in train at the time the Premier and the present Government took office. We received the usual reply that most deputations get, that we would be advised later as to the Government's policy. We were told that the Government had not then had time to find its feet properly and we would have to possess our souls in patience.

One result, however, has already accrued from that deputation. We impressed upon the Premier the necessity of obtaining a copy of the report of a very high taxation official who was sent to the North-West to make an investigation into the hardships there and to see whether a remission of taxation would have the effect of inducing people to go there. This officer was appointed owing to representations made by the ex Labour Premier, during his term of office, to the Prime Minister. It took a considerable amount of time and argument to bring about this investigation. Eventually, Mr. Dundas, a taxation officer, made the survey required—and he has made similar surveys in other parts of Australia—and his report is of vital concern to the North-West and to the Government of the State.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It is not unfair to say that the Premier was not aware of the report, and did not even know who Mr. Dundas was.

Mr. RODOREDA: That is so. The present Premier had no knowledge of the position. This deputation pointed out the extreme importance of obtaining a copy of that report which had been in the Prime Minister's hands for a few weeks—we do not know just how long. I was pleased to see in "The West Australian" of a few days ago that the Prime Minister had grudgingly agreed to make a copy of it available to the Government of this State on condition that the details were not mentioned or discussed in Parliament. The Prime Minister said it was a very gloomy report. We had an idea that it would be something of that nature, because we had all met Mr. Dundas and discussed the position with him. I can ascribe a reason why the Prime Minister does not want it discussed in this House. I would say it is because Mr. Dundas has probably recommended a considerable deduction from income, for taxation purposes, of everyone resident in that country. We gathered that was the position from informal discussions we had with Mr. Dundas.

The Government of this State has now at least something definite to go on in that regard, and I would urge it to keep the pressure on the Commonwealth Government to implement the report of its own taxation official in connection with remission of taxation in the North-West. This is a vital matter. I am satisfied that in no other way will we get people to go into that part of the State to help in its development. I might be accused of parish pump tactics, and I plead guilty. The North-West is an enormous parish; it is probably more than half the area of this State, and even to attempt to solve its problems will require all the ingenuity of this Parliament. If we fall down on our job, we will not hold the North-West very long. It is vital to this State and to Australia in the matter of defence, and this Government should do everything possible to assist in its development. The object of the North-West Advancement League, and of everyone in the North, is to secure an exemption from taxation of at least £500. After knowing the North for 25 or 30 years and seeing every other method tried, in an endeavour to get people there and industries established, I am certain that if this pro-

position fails then no-one will have anything more to suggest.

The great problems facing that part of our State just now are lack of labour and lack of transport—principally sea transport. Members representing southern constituencies know how difficult it is for them to get labour, and they can readily imagine how much more difficult the position is in the North country where there are not the amenities that men have a right to expect nowadays. If this inducement of taxation remission were held out and men knew that by going there for 18 months or two years they would, with the wages prevailing—which would be practically free of taxation—at least be able to come with plenty of money to a more equable climate for a holiday, then I have no doubt they would go there. We have in this State men who like the life in the North, and if it were financially possible for them to remain there they would glory in it. But it is financially impossible under present conditions for a married man to go there and leave his wife and family in the town; and he could not take them North because there is nowhere for them to live. The same thing applies to the companies that might be willing to invest capital there.

This freedom from taxation would be an inducement for men to give their capital a chance in the industries of that part of the State, such as the fishing industry, the pearl-fishing industry, the turtle industry and the shark-fishing industry, to name a few. Also, the mining possibilities there have scarcely been scratched. If this Government will only keep going in the way that the Labour Government did, in regard to the North-West, and try to implement the plans and blue prints already in existence to induce population there, it will be doing no small thing for the people of this State and Australia as a whole. I do not want to go into details in regard to other matters at this stage as I will have a better opportunity when the Estimates are before the House.

I know the Acting Premier is desirous of speaking tonight in reply to the debate, so I will take up no more of the time of the House other than to say that I have no intention of intruding into the controversial matter of electoral propaganda, or anything of that nature. The Government has been in office for too short a period for me to expect anything from it yet. But it has made very glowing promises to the electors, and

if it falls down on those promises, and I hope it will not but I am afraid it inevitably will, I will not be so forbearing this time 12 months hence.

THE ACTING PREMIER (Hon. A. F. Watts—Katanning) [9.15]: Mr. Speaker, I was always under the impression that the Labour Party objected to monopolies, but I have listened, since the debate commenced, to a great number of homilies—I can give them no other name than that—which have been directed towards establishing the desirability of a monopoly of Labour Government in Western Australia, and therefore I can only suggest either that the Labour Party's objection to monopolies which has been voiced in my presence in this House on a score or more occasions, is not sincere, or alternatively, that when the loss of the monopoly is a loss to one's own pocket the injury inflicted is so serve as to cause one to lose sight of one's principles. Beyond that there seems to have been little in this debate, so far as members on the Opposition side are concerned, with one or two notable exceptions, about which I will say something before I sit down.

We have heard a great deal about promises. One would imagine, on this aspect, that the political parties opposed to Labour in this State had another monopoly, to wit a monopoly of making promises at election time. May I also suggest that that is a completely erroneous statement or belief, the error of which can be clearly substantiated by the events of the last 10 or 15 years. I say, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that the morale—if that is the correct word—of the people of this State has been maintained during a great part of that period by promises made by the Government of the day, which obviously was not a Government with which I was associated. For years we have had promises of all sorts of things. We have been told and made almost to believe that things which it was quite obvious could not be accomplished for a decade were of the order of tomorrow morning.

I have heard a former Minister for Works, not the one sitting opposite to me tonight, addressing a road board conference, about six years ago, and informing it of the wonderful schemes that the Government was going to produce. That sort of thing was done until there arose in this

State, unquestionably, a belief that immediately the war ended there would be a transformation. The absence of that transformation, I believe, was one of the principal reasons why the electors of this State chose to end the desirable monopoly—desirable in the eyes of members opposite, the then Labour Government of Western Australia. It was not because the people were misled by the present Government to such a great extent, but because they had been misled by its political opponents to a grievous extent over a period of not less than 10 years.

I have here some notes taken from a report of a speech made by Mr. Willcock, the then member for Geraldton, while conducting the Labour Party's campaign in 1943. That speech was, broadly speaking, a series of promises, none of which have been successfully brought into effect up to the present time. I am not suggesting that all of them could, by any means, have been carried into effect, but I do suggest that if promise-making is a serious offence, serious enough to have been the subject of something like 15 homilies in the last 10 or 12 sitting days, it is an offence that has been committed by leading persons in the Labour Party as well as leading persons in the Parties with which I am associated, if the statements made have any basis of fact at all. I say, also, that had I been aware of the extent of the retrogression that had taken place in certain departments during Labour's continued term of office, the statements that I made on some aspects during the election campaign, caustic though they have been said to have been, would have been considerably more caustic than they were.

I decline to associate this criticism with any particular Government of the Labour Party in this State in the last 14 years. I decline in any way to deal in personalities. I would have been quite prepared to have made no reference to these matters during the debate. I would have been prepared to have devoted such energies and abilities as are mine to the task of improving the situation in various directions, without making any reference—other than where absolutely necessary upon a factual basis—to the things that I have in mind, but, unfortunately, any such good resolution as that has had, to some extent at least, to be re-considered owing to the

statements and propagandisation, if I may use that word, that have been put forward during the 14 or 15 years to which I have referred.

I will turn for a moment or two to the question of the State railways. It must be a well-known fact that, in a State such as Western Australia, where vast quantities of goods of low freight value and heavy tonnage have to be carried over extremely long distances, the State's economy, prosperity, development and production to a very substantial degree rest upon an efficient railway system. Goods of these types over long distances, goods such as wheat, superphosphate and the like, especially bearing in mind the difficulties of our road system, it was quite obvious would have to be carried for a long time, if not indefinitely, upon a railway system. If that railway system at any time became unable successfully to carry them then it became as sure as the sun in the sky that either production and industry must be hampered or haulage at very great expense would have to be incurred by the individuals making that production and conducting that industry. So it should have been the obvious duty of every Government in power to ensure, irrespective of what other problems faced it, that the railway system and its capacity for haulage was maintained at a reasonable level.

Since 1924—and 23 years have elapsed since that time—we have had various Governments of the State Labour Party. With regard to the railway system, they cannot claim that their activities have been prevented by the Legislative Council. Whatever they may claim, truthfully or untruthfully, regarding any other aspect, they cannot make that claim against the Legislative Council in regard to the railway system. They have had the power of administration; they have not been hampered in any serious degree over legislation because they produced none until last year, when it was too late, even if the legislation were otherwise desirable.

The situation has been that the railway system has gone steadily backwards. In 1929-30 Western Australia grew something over 50 million bushels of wheat, the largest crop ever harvested in this State. We handled the quantities of superphosphate requisite for the growing of that crop, and did the railways fall down on their job of

transporting it? I think members will find that they did a pretty fair job. Since that time we have had 14 continuous years of an administration which has been indulging in so much criticism because of the criticism directed against it.

This year and last year, too, had there been a 50 million bushel crop, there would have been no more chance of handling it than of flying to the moon. Fifty per cent. of the locomotives will not work; a great number of those that will work are almost at the stage of obsolescence; the rolling-stock is insufficient and ineffective, and yet we are told that eighteen months ago or nine months ago or some other number of months ago, steps were taken to order locomotives, to provide rollingstock, to do this, that and the other. But that was at the very least five years too late, and whatever may be said of my colleague, the Minister for Railways, he as the member for Pingelly from the other side of the House consistently and persistently drew attention to the fact over a period of at least the last seven or eight years that this state of affairs was coming.

And what did the Labour Government do? It effected no improvement at that time, and that was the time when improvements should have been made, the time when they were wanted, the time when it was obvious that the future was fraught with danger and difficulty unless the improvements were made. Today it is virtually impossible to face, within a reasonable time, the carriage of goods that have to be used and have to be produced and are being produced because of the effete, inefficient condition of His Majesty's Government Railways in Western Australia.

For this I and those associated with me refuse to accept the slightest responsibility, except that we shall do our utmost to make use of what we have in the best interests of those whose goods are to be transported and to hasten as soon as possible to provide sufficient facilities to handle the goods somehow or other, faced as we are now, as the member for Northam truthfully said, with the problem of slow delivery and delay in many other directions.

So I say that, if on no account other than this, the criticism which was directed against the Labour Party during the last election campaign was justified. In a State of 960,000 square miles, with nearly 5,000 miles of rail-

way open for traffic, with millions of acres of land under crop, as I have said, the railways, in my opinion, represent the fundamental for the prosperity of industry in this country. Whatever else was let go, if something had to be let go, the railway system should have received a very high priority; and it did not.

Once again, may I reiterate that I do not like a debate of this kind, but I felt, after due consideration of what has been said, that a reply of some sort to some part at any rate of the statements made was essential. I have before me a document issued by the Labour Party during the last election campaign, authorised by T. G. Davies, Labour Campaign Director, Trades Hall, Perth, one paragraph of which that I shall read reminds me very clearly of the observations of the member for Northam regarding someone else on the Supply Bill a fortnight ago when he said, "Lies! All lies!" This is what the paragraph says—

Labour's agricultural policy. The most recent advance in investigation has been the establishment of a pasture research station on a property purchased at Kojonup. This was established by the State Government and the Commonwealth in conjunction with the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research.

That document came into my hands last February. At that time there was no research station established at Kojonup, nor is there one established there yet. That was lies, all lies, as the member for Northam observed a fortnight ago. A station, it is true, is in the course of purchase and will be opened at Kojonup, I hope, in the near future. When I ventured to look into this matter, I found there was competition between three districts on the west of the Great Southern. I am given to understand that the responsible officers have now selected Kojonup and that a property there is in course of completion for a research station. But at the time that statement was obviously put into the circular to tickle the ears of the groundlings in the district of the member for Wagin, because I happen to know that the Labour Party's organiser at the time had great hopes, on the departure of Mr. Stubbs, of collecting that seat.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: He was an optimist.

The ACTING PREMIER: He was, but I happen to know. The Labour candidate, as it transpired, came in rather a poor third out of four candidates; and only for

the grace of God he would have been last—an extraordinary position for a Labour candidate in Western Australia to be in, I frankly admit.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: A Country Party member lost his deposit.

The ACTING PREMIER: None of our candidates lost his deposit. All our candidates did extremely well, but the member for Wagin did best.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Your candidate for Mt. Hawthorn lost his deposit.

The ACTING PREMIER: There is nothing to worry about in that. Many decent men have lost their deposits, but are not to be reflected on for that reason. It is quite possible for the member for Northam or myself to suffer the same fate and therefore I propose to make no reflections on candidates who lose their deposits. It is ill-advised to do so.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: It depends where you stand.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That applies to anybody who runs third or last.

The ACTING PREMIER: Quite apart from the trenchant observations made last evening by my friend the member for Mt. Marshall with respect to the low-wage device of Parties, particularly the one to which I belong, the Labour Party has indulged in mis-statements of a great many kinds over a period of years, deliberately aimed at pulling the wool—I quote the observation of some member opposite—over the eyes of the persons entitled to vote at election time. It is a well-known fact that I, and those associated with me last year, debated at considerable length the Bill which was introduced by the then Minister for Agriculture for the purpose of implementing the Commonwealth's so-called wheat stabilisation proposal. I think the last man who would doubt our sincerity in that argument, in view of all that transpired in the debate, is the member for North-East Fremantle himself. The fact that we sharply disagreed on the matter in many respects, is no justification for his impugning our sincerity. The fact that we believed it was a damnable bad scheme, and he believed it was a reasonably good one, does not make it necessary for "The Westralian Worker" to come out with the following, as it did—

The Opposition parties are great advocates of stabilisation of primary products until somebody proposes a plan of stabilisation, and then they are not so keen about it.

Even the member for North-East Fremantle will agree that we were keen enough about a plan of stabilisation, but the question was the details of the plan. We tried to hammer them out—as I believe we should be doing tonight instead of talking as we have been—by legislation which would effect a successful compromise. It was a good debate from the point of view of debating, but our reward is to be directly accused of blatant insincerity in the propaganda in the official organ of the Labour Party. I strongly resented it at the time I saw it, but I did not come to this House and bleat and cry because I had been accused of insincerity in the official organ of the Labour Party. A public man must expect that sort of thing, fair or unfair, and I venture to say nothing about it in the hope that propagandists will learn to become a little fairer in future. This debate might help us to achieve that result. I will go a little further. Eight days before the election this same interesting official organ came out with the following:—

The sincerity of anti-Labour is most open to question when it talks of high standard of wages and living for the workers. Every anti-Labour subscribes to a policy which demands low wages and low standards of living for the workers.

I do not subscribe and never have subscribed to any such policy and I throw that outrageous lie back in the teeth of Mr. Davies. I have said in this House—and am not ashamed to repeat it now—that in my opinion the individual workers of Western Australia are the cream of the workers in this Commonwealth.

Members: Hear, hear!—

The ACTING PREMIER: And as such are entitled to the best consideration we can give them.

Mr. Fox: How long will it take you to give the workers the 40-hour week?

The ACTING PREMIER: I will talk about the 40-hour week later. More than three weeks before this appeared in print, I had stated in my policy speech that we would endeavour to lower the cost of living and thus increase the purchasing power of wages by that means. I believe, although it may be extremely difficult of achievement in view of our national economy and present methods, that that is the real secret of conferring prosperity on the worker. Leave his wages where they are and reduce the cost of living, and not have, as we have

had for the last 45 years, this endless chasing of the tail by the dog. It has produced, according to the last statistics I saw, an increase in wages of 117 per cent. since a given date and point, and increased the cost of living by 120 per cent. Therefore, over that long period of years we have lost 3 per cent. in the chase. That method is not going to achieve prosperity for the workers of Western Australia, or for workers anywhere else.

So far as I am concerned, once again I throw that lie in this document in the teeth of the man who wrote it. As far as I am concerned, the individual worker can earn all he likes in exchange for a fair day's work, and no-one here will deny he is entitled to give that. Therefore, it is no wonder I did not get enthusiastic about the comments that were passed on my political beliefs, when I recall that never at any time during the whole of my 12 years of public life have I made any suggestion in this House or elsewhere that I would, by any action of mine, deprive the worker of anything that he had lawfully obtained. I venture to say—if venturing on this occasion is required—that the vote I received in my district at the recent election is a substantial indication of that fact. There is no member of this Government, to my certain knowledge, who would subscribe to the views with which we are charged by Mr. Davies.

Now I will turn to something which pleases me little more than that sort of thing, and that is some observations that were made during the course of a speech by the member for Geraldton a few nights ago. He had been charged with voting against a measure which was aimed at enabling amenities to be supplied to the coalminers and it had come out in the course of the debate that he alleged that the Legislative Council had passed a measure at the second and third readings without a division and with only one very slight amendment in Committee, which had nothing to do with the essence of the Bill. In this connection the member for Kalgoorlie said—

The member for Geraldton asked why the Labour Government had not improved conditions there.

That is, at Collie. The member for Kalgoorlie continued—

The hon. member knows as well as I do why they have not been improved to a great extent. The reasons are that the attempt made by the Labour Government and this House to improve the conditions have been stood aside by another place, a House elected on a most undemocratic franchise, a property franchise, the roll for which consists of only one-third of the people, while only about one-third of those eligible to vote do so. The member for Geraldton graced another place with his presence for a great number of years as one of the members for the Central Province. As a test of the sincerity of the member for Geraldton, in his solicitude for the coalminers, I decided to ascertain how he cast his vote on two measures that had been sent to another place from this Chamber during recent years.

Then he referred to the Coal Mine Workers (Pensions) Bill, that was not introduced last year at all. He went on to say—

The other measure dealt with coal production. It was brought forward last session and the member for Geraldton cast a silent vote against it. He did not speak to the measure, but voted against the second reading. Even if he did not approve of the clauses dealing with coal production, the Bill contained many other clauses providing for additional amenities for the miners, and the hon. member did not think it even worth while to vote for the second reading. He considered that it was not worth while to discuss those clauses which had for their objective the betterment of the conditions of the miners. The Bill did not reach the Committee stage.

That is lies—all lies, because the two Bills introduced last session were the Bill for coal production and distribution and the Coal Mines Regulation Bill! The Bill for the production and distribution of coal was not passed and did not contain one single solitary clause having any reference whatever to amenities, working conditions, safety conditions or the like. The Bill which contains something like 60 or 70 lines of provisions in regard to working conditions, safety conditions, amenities, wash-houses, bathrooms and so forth—things which are being put into operation by regulation under that Act—was the Coal Mines Regulation Bill. That Bill was passed at the second and third readings in the Legislative Council without a division and only one small amendment in Committee; and therefore the member for Kalgoorlie was either singularly ill-informed—which I do not believe—or was trying to make the people of this House and this country believe that the Coal Mines Production and Distribution Bill which was defeated contained the amenity clauses and

was voted against by the member for Geraldton. I am of the opinion that the member for Kalgoorlie knew perfectly well that it was nothing of the kind and was simply out to misrepresent the member for Geraldton and the Party with which he is associated.

So there, if we want misrepresentation, we have plenty of it and of the worst kind; because it is made by a man personally in a deliberative Assembly; by a man in full possession of his faculties who should have the knowledge required to enable him to know better. That is the position in regard to that matter. If we want some more rash statements we can turn to the reported speech of the Leader of the Opposition—then the Premier of Western Australia—a speech made on the 25th February, 1947, and reported in "The West Australian" of the following day. We find in that speech this statement—

Respecting health and hospitals, the Premier pointed out that hospitals throughout the State had suffered severely because of the impossibility of proceeding with expansion and improvements during the war. A comprehensive programme to cost £2,000,000 had been approved, which would bring up to date every hospital in the State, including the provision of hot water and sewerage systems where adequate water supplies existed. Seven new hospitals were to be built and 34 others enlarged. Before I go any further, allow me to say that that is no less elaborate but rather more elaborate a promise in regard to hospitalisation than any member or the leader of either of the Parties forming this Government ever made. The present Opposition set out 41 hospitals in its policy speech. We did venture the suggestion that £2,000,000 would have to be spent on hospitals but we did not mention 41. The Leader of the Opposition went further than that. Here is what the report states—

Substantial enlargements were to be made to the King Edward Memorial Hospital, the Fremantle Hospital, the Children's Hospital and Wooroloo Sanatorium.

And here is what I think the Frenchmen used to call the *pièce de resistance*.

The new Royal Perth Hospital was expected to open next month.

That was in March. I have been to the Royal Perth Hospital—I went a little time after the present Government took office—and I say without the slightest hesitation that it was absolutely impossible for the Royal Perth Hospital to be finished in

March 1947 as the Leader of the Opposition stated in February, 1947.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: This is a case where the ex-Premier was misled by official information supplied by the Under Secretary at the time.

The ACTING PREMIER: Well, well, well, well! Any excuse is better than none.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That is not an excuse; it is a reason.

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The ACTING PREMIER: I am confining myself to things which are clearly on record and the Royal Perth Hospital is on record today and I find it extremely difficult to believe, in view of what has been said to me in recent days by the Principal Architect, that any Under Secretary in February of this year could have said the hospital would be finished next month.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: You would believe it if I could show you the paper it is on.

The ACTING PREMIER: Then if it were so—but I do not believe it—I would say he was a most unreliable Under Secretary. The following day the statement was taken up by Dr. Hislop in the Press; and though I have made careful inquiry and search, I could not find that the Leader of the Opposition made any response when Dr. Hislop observed, stating that he had some acquaintance with the matter as liaison officer between the committee and the B.M.A., that it was impossible for the hospital to be opened in March. I saw no response from the Leader of the Opposition or any evidence of his having checked up on this matter to rectify his error or explain the source of his information.

I want now to turn for a few minutes to the question of the 40-hour week about which so much has been said in this Chamber this evening. I do not want to have any misunderstandings about this. The situation is that we sent instructions to Mr. Williams, counsel employed by the South Australian Government in the first place, and latterly called on to represent both Governments, and what I am about to read is a report of the statement he made to the court in consequence of those instructions—

I have been instructed to make a short statement on behalf of the State of Western Australia, if the Court pleases.

In the first place, the W.A. Government desires me to put quite clearly to the Court that it is not to be taken as adopting as its own either any part of the evidence I have called for the State of S.A. or any of the submissions which I have made on its behalf. I am also to inform the Court that the case for the two States should not be regarded as identical. The W.A. Government wishes to declare its own attitude independently of the S.A. Government.

That attitude is as follows: The W.A. Government accepts the Court's determination that the 40-hour week is approved in principle as to the time for its introduction, the W.A. Government leaves this to the decision of the Court. It does not seek to advise the Court on this question since it feels that the Court, with all the evidence that has been placed before it, is in the best position to arrive at a determination that will be in the best interests of the nation.

At the same time, inasmuch as the W.A. Government is gravely concerned about what, in its view, is the necessity of increasing production to meet the needs of workers for housing, and the requirement of primary producers and of manufacturers in respect of plant and materials, it requests the Court to give earnest consideration to the question of whether the introduction of the 40-hour week at the present time would be in the interests of the Australian people and their living standards, and in particular of the people of a State such as Western Australia, which is awaiting the development of great areas and latent resources.

Further, since the Western Australian Government feels some anxiety lest the introduction of a 40-hour week at the present juncture might adversely affect the State's living standards and economic and budgetary position, it invites the attention of the Court to the evidence of Mr. Lancaster, as brought up to date by the exhibit which I recently tendered, relating to the likely impact of a 40-hour week on the State's production, budgetary position and general economy.

That, if the Court pleases, completes the statement I have been instructed to make on behalf of the W.A. Government.

We were forthwith accused of bitterly opposing the 40-hour week proposal. In the face of this statement, that was a lie!

Hon. A. H. Panton: It was not encouraging to the granting of a 40 hour week.

The ACTING PREMIER: It is a lie. If that is the right word, and I learned it from the member from Northam. Some three questions were raised, firstly, that in connection with the working conditions of the people; secondly, the budgetary position; and thirdly, the economic position of the people of Western Australia. Let us hear

what certain Labour Premiers had to say, according to the minutes of a conference held in Melbourne, on this subject last year. It is on record that Mr. Cain of Victoria observed—

I consider that if the 40-hour week is granted by the Court, freights and fares must be increased in the three big States, whatever may happen in the smaller States.

If it is going to have that effect in the large and thickly-populated States, I can see no reason why it should not have the same effect in the smaller States—Western Australia, Tasmania and South Australia. But according to the member for Kalgoorlie, the other evening, any suggestion to increase freights and fares would be disastrous to the Goldfields people. He preached for a quarter of an hour in that way.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The member for Nedlands did the same thing last year.

The ACTING PREMIER: Maybe, but I am referring to the member for Kalgoorlie who wants, apparently, the immediate introduction of the 40-hour week without ascertaining what may be its effect on the industry that he is so fond of, and rightly so. He says that any suggestion to raise freights and fares will be disastrous to this community.

Mr. Leslie: Then he says he must have the 40-hour week.

The ACTING PREMIER: Exactly, and resents apparently—in fairness to him I do not think he said so, but it is the general tenor of what his associates have said—any suggestion that there should be a complete and proper inquiry, which is all this Government has asked for, into the economic and budgetary reactions of the State. The Minister for Labour, has said plainly in the public Press that if the court, after considering all these aspects of the matter, comes to the conclusion that such an order is justified, then the Western Australian Government will loyally abide by it. Yet the public is told that we bitterly opposed the 40-hour week, and a great deal more rot to the same effect. Mr. Cain goes on to say—

We must not say to the Court that the States have plenty of money. If we do, there will be repercussions.

I quite agree; there will be. The statement is not true. Of course it is not true. We have not plenty of money. We have to make sure that what we have got and what we

can get is spent to the best interests of the development of the State, and in the increase of production and the betterment of conditions generally. That is all we seek to do. Then we go a little further and find that Mr. Martin, of New South Wales, had this to say—

The position of the States should be passive, but not negative. The States should rely on the cross-examination of witnesses, and not lead evidence.

It seems to me that the difference between the States being passive and not negative is the difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. If he does not mean by that, that he wants the question fully investigated because of the budgetary and economic difficulties he sees ahead, and the need for arrangements with the Commonwealth Government for the acquisition of more money to carry on, then I am greatly mistaken. There is precious little difference, to my way of thinking, between the two points of view. They certainly do not justify the propaganda and hostility that has been displayed towards a decision of this Government to alter, in some slight degree, the responsibility of its legal adviser before the Federal Arbitration Court.

The Minister for Lands: The Premier of Queensland made a similar statement.

The ACTING PREMIER: Yes. I could have quoted from him, but I did not want to be here all night. I think I am doing my duty by dealing with the matter in broad outline at the moment. The member for Forrest, whom I wish to compliment on a very good speech, on the occasion of his first appearance in this House and notwithstanding the atmosphere with which he was surrounded, asked whether the Government proposed to push on with the South-West power scheme. Because I felt it was desirable to answer that question, I made some inquiries, and I am informed that there will be no unnecessary delay in that direction. At this juncture I would like to say that I understand that up to 1933, or thereabouts, it had been the custom for at least one Minister to make some attempt to reply to the observations of members on any matters raised during the course of the Address-in-reply debate. During the whole of my 12 years or more in this House, however, that practice has fallen into disuse. I do not know whether Ministers of the Labour Government were too lazy or too disinclined to

seek information to give to members, but in all those 12 years no-one ever made a reply from the Government benches to remarks or suggestions which came from the side of the House on which I sat.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They had nothing to reply to.

The ACTING PREMIER: They had more to reply to than I have on this occasion, because there have been few constructive observations from that side of the House. That is why I have taken the opportunity of picking out two or three items from the speech of the member for Forrest and that of the member for East Perth, in particular, because, without disrespect to one or two other members on that side of the House, these two made the most constructive contributions to the debate from that side.

The member for Kanowna, who incidentally was Minister for Railways for four or five years, and who therefore must accept his full share of the argument with which I opened my remarks this evening, wants to know if the Government is prepared to do anything about a regular service to Esperance. I take it he is referring to a ship, and that involves certain other parts of the State along the south coast where shipping used to run in the days of the "Ferret," before the "Eucla." My information on the subject is that every effort will be made, as soon as the additional ship or ships can be obtained for the North-West, to return the "Kybra" to that area as the commencement, at all events, of somewhat better things. The member for Kanowna also made reference to the Public Works Standing Committee, to which he objected strongly on the ground that it would be too cumbersome. That is, in short, what he said about it, but that has not been the experience of other people. He said—

I entirely disagree with the proposal. We shall not have statesmen in Western Australia if that legislation is passed. The consideration of works exceeding that sum would be relegated to the Standing Committee, the members of which would probably know very little about them and very little about finance, and such a procedure would undoubtedly restrict the development of the State.

If that does not make it cumbersome, I do not know what was in the hon. member's mind. He should make a study of what has taken place in South Australia under a system such as this, and he would be well

advised to read the speech made by the member for Perth regarding a similar Public Works Standing Committee in the Federal arena. He will find that that hon. member alleged—

(1) that it had not restricted any worthwhile public works and,

(2) that it had, in the carrying out of those same worthwhile public works, saved the Commonwealth some millions of pounds.

He will find in South Australia, in particular with relation to the Whyalla water supply scheme, that exactly the same considerations apply. The work was proceeded with and was completed even below the estimate made by the committee, but the figure that the committee gave was given after the closest investigation, and indicated to the people of that State that the scheme was worth while and should be proceeded with. The Commonwealth Government, in the matter of our own comprehensive water supply scheme—the activities in regard to which last session were, as I then said, premature, because there had been no financial arrangements made and it was known that there was to be an investigation by the Commonwealth—appointed a committee that has done a remarkably good job, and has put forward something that will do immeasurable good to Western Australia in overcoming difficulties that were inherent in the first proposal, and yet has not neglected to provide for the requirements of those who really have such requirements. I say, quite frankly, that the Government proposes to submit to Parliament a Bill on those lines, and is not in the least afraid that any matters referred to that committee will prevent members of the Government becoming statesmen, which is the hon. member's first objection, or alternatively, will restrict the State's development. On the contrary, the Government believes that it is likely to ensure the State's development on sound lines.

May I say that there has been an utterance from several members complaining that they are allowed to take but little part in deliberations of such a nature. I refer to the neighbour of the member for Kanowna. I say that such a committee will give some members of this House opportunity of obtaining a better knowledge of what is in hand and of the State's problems, and proposed developments. The member for Kanowna, in the course of his some-

what lengthy dissertation—which thereby gets double attention from me—said, in reference to petrol and oil—

It does seem to me very unfair that the people who live furthest from the centre where these things are produced should have to pay 1s. per gallon more for them.

I wholeheartedly agree with him, but might I suggest—in all sweet reasonableness—that if he has an idea that will solve this problem and provide the necessary equalisation, he should tell the House why he did not have a shot at putting it into operation during the six or seven years for which he was a member of the Government of the State. That is one aspect; the other is that if he knows of a way in which to do it and will be good enough to expound it to the House, without more delay than is necessary under the Standing Orders, he will find me a happy, and I trust a useful ally. I say frankly that I have looked at this problem, as a private member of the House, quite a lot, and will co-operate with him at any time if he can find a workable scheme for doing what he wants. I will not be backward in offering thanks to him for any worthwhile suggestion in that direction, but I am very much afraid that, as apparently was the case during his six years or more of office, he will not be able to find a solution quickly enough to comply with my urgent request.

The hon. member also said that the clubs on the Goldfields—referring to the Goldfields racecourses—"are greatly concerned over the legislation, passed by this House, whereby the fraction is reduced to 6d. instead of 1s., as it has affected them generally. They now suggest that the Government should bring in a system similar to that in South Australia, and I hope the Chief Secretary will bring down legislation to that end." What is he talking about? He was one of the sponsors, if not the inventor, of the legislation that was passed last session to do the very thing about which he now complains. It was the policy of his Government. It was one of his Party or Government Bills. He pushed it down the throats of members, whether they liked it or not, and now he has what I might almost call the impertinence to come here and say that the Government should alter it.

The Minister for Lands: He is talking to his electors, now.

The ACTING PREMIER: The mental activities of a member who can, after an interval of a few months, in these circumstances make that suggestion, completely passes my comprehension.

Hon. E. Nulsen: I will take that up later.

The ACTING PREMIER: The then Government brought the Bill down.

The Chief Secretary: I objected to it.

The ACTING PREMIER: It is well known that the Chief Secretary objected to it.

The Minister for Lands: The member for Kanowna is quiet now.

The ACTING PREMIER: Now let me turn to some remarks by my friend, the member for Canning. He said in the course of his remarks—

I think the Government should support every move to see that the coal industry in this State is explored to the fullest extent.

I give him my assurance that I agree with him, and action is being taken at the present time that I hope will result in much more being known about the Collie coalfields and their potentialities than is in our possession at present. He also referred to the necessity of increasing police protection. I understand that the Police Force is at least 60 constables short and, of course, such officers have to be put through a school before they can attend to their duties in a proper and efficient manner. The Government has therefore in the last few weeks authorised an increase in the establishment by 30 constables and, as soon as the present school is successfully concluded, I understand it is the intention of the Minister for Police to recommend that the full requirements suggested to him should be met. In these circumstances, the hon. member will have every opportunity, no doubt, to see that his wishes are given effect to.

He also referred to the question of bus shelters in St. George's Terrace. Here again I am in agreement as to the desirability of action in the matter, but there seems to be, and in fact there is, a diversity of control involved. The pavements concerned in this question are obviously under the control of the Perth City Council, the members of which are not over agreeable to hasty action being taken towards implementing some of the ideas of the member for Canning. One cannot help sympathising with that attitude to a certain extent. Certain negotiations

have been proceeding and it is to be hoped that means will be found of arriving at a compromise regarding the conflicting opinions on the subject at no far distant date. It is very necessary that something shall be done and it is certainly a great pity that the problem was not tackled in its embryo stages years ago. That was the time, in my view, to have made a really earnest attempt to solve this particular problem.

I had some controversy with the member for Mt. Magnet during the course of the debate concerning the alleged dismissal—I think the word used was "sacked"—of one Mr. F. C. Fox who had been invited to carry out experiments with regard to the gasification of Collie coal, together with one or two other allied matters. The hon. member was told that his allegation that Mr. Fox had been sacked was absolute rubbish, but he persisted in his statement and I therefore must now take time to explain to him—his understanding of the matter, I think, was wrong but bona fide wrong—just what the situation is. Mr. Fox was not sacked. The work on which he was engaged, testing a gas plant to his own design, and for which he received £814 retainer and fees for the year 1946-47 was, for all practical purposes, completed on the 11th July, 1947.

At a meeting of the Coal Panel held on the 7th July last, at which Mr. Fox was present, it was agreed that the work should be closed down until the fuel technologist investigated what had been carried out under Mr. Fox's supervision, and the panel decided to wait on advice from this officer as to whether any further extension was justified. Mr. Fox expressed his complete agreement with this decision. I have here a copy of the minutes of the 16th meeting of the Coal Panel which was held on the 7th July, 1947. Mr. Fox was a member of the panel and at that meeting a report prepared by him was presented to that body. The report covered the following points:

1. Total gasification.
2. Production of smokeless fuels.
3. Carbonising and coking.
4. Briquetting.

The minutes contained the following:—

After members had had an opportunity of perusing the report, the Chairman drew their attention to the fact that extra money had had to be provided to cover these operations. He thought that perhaps the time had now come when this work should be closed down at least until the Fuel Technologist had had

the opportunity to investigate the work which has been carried out and to determine whether anything on the same lines would be justified.

Mr. Fox said he would be perfectly content if the panel determined to close the works down.

Mr. Triat: Did you check what I said about "The Blackwood Times" report?

The ACTING PREMIER: I have.

Mr. Triat: How did it get there?

The ACTING PREMIER: I do not know where it came from. I told the hon. member by interjection that it was my intention to interview Mr. Fox about the matter. I had that interview with him, and I put to him two questions. The first was whether these minutes represented a fair record of what took place at the meeting of the Coal Panel, and he said they did. Secondly, I asked him whether I was justified, in his opinion, in setting out the whole matter in the House, to which he said he had no objection. I will go further and say that the discussion I had with Mr. Fox yesterday was most interesting and I am very hopeful that he will achieve some results somewhere in Western Australia that will be quite worth while. That will have been done as the result of his investigations which were sponsored by the previous Government and which the present Government is prepared to back up so long as it can see some sound reason—as Ministers believe will be found—indicating that the use of gas from Collie coal will be available in a desirable way in Western Australia.

Mr. Triat: Hear, hear!

The ACTING PREMIER: I think that explanation will satisfy the member for Mr. Magnet and others interested in this matter. It is obviously one of those things into which we cannot rush, but the position at present is roughly as I have stated it.

I would like to make some reference to the remarks of other members and the first one I shall mention is the member for East Perth. He observed that it was necessary to do something with regard to the parking of motor vehicles in the city block. I entirely agree with him. So keenly do I agree with him that a week ago, as Minister for Local Government, I had with me the whole of the twelve members of the Traffic Advisory Committee. We discussed at considerable length the question of that committee carrying out an exhaustive in-

vestigation as to what can be done to solve this problem in a reasonable manner. We have, as I think the member for East Perth said, to see that the right to unload had to be made available for ordinary business and commercial places and the like, and the fixed parking areas that appear to have grown up during the last few years cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. At the same time, we have to bear in mind that there are people in poor health and some who are crippled or infirm, all of whom cannot be expected when they bring their vehicles from the suburbs to the city to walk considerable distances from where their cars are parked, to get to their destinations or go about their business.

We have, on the other hand, the fact that the motorist is paying a fairly heavy tax into the revenue of the State or local authority and another very heavy tax on the petrol he uses. And it is hardly reasonable for him to be excluded from getting somewhere near to his destination and being allowed to leave his vehicle for the time he has to take, which may be a long time, to transact his business. These aspects were discussed very carefully with the Traffic Advisory Committee by me and the Minister for Transport, and I have no doubt from the tenor of the discussion that those gentlemen will be able to produce a report that will effect a substantial improvement in the position which, as I say, ought to have been effected a long time ago. But the cobwebs were right over that; there is no question about it; and they have not been brushed off yet, although some steps have been taken to try to remove them.

Hon. A. H. Panton: Do not you think that the taxis near Cathedral-Avenue are fairly dangerous?

The ACTING PREMIER: I think the hon. member will find that regulations will be promulgated shortly to prevent that part being used as a parking place. It is a bad point. But that is only a little bit of a very big cherry.

I was greatly struck by the observations of the member for East Perth concerning the 40-hour week and the difficulties which the doubting Thomases—with them I am sure I was included for the reasons I gave just now—saw in the possibility of a reduction of production at a time when we could not stand up to it successfully. He suggested

that when production reached 102 or 105, taking datum point as a 100, being the present level, we could then safely and quickly reduce the hours of work proportionately until finally we could hope to get down to what was desired. If such a scheme were practicable, I am sure it would be given very favourable consideration by the arbitration authorities, with whom it is no part of this Government's policy to interfere. That is the fundamental of our attitude to this matter.

I suggest to the member for East Perth that he should take steps to elaborate a scheme based on such a proposal as he put forward and let it be submitted to the proper authority, because it might, with thought and attention and criticism by others, very easily reach a proposition that would be generally acceptable. Anybody whose mind is the incubator of bright ideas, such as the member for East Perth appeared to be last evening, is entitled to and I think did, receive an extremely respectful hearing.

I should like to make some references to an observation by the member for Kalgoorlie, which amounted to a statement that the State Labour Government in the last 14 years had been in office for only about six months, because he argued that 1933-36 were depression years, which was news to me, 1936-39 were partial or 'post-depression years, or something of the sort that cut them out, the next six years were years of war and the next 18 months were months of demobilisation, so that out of the 14 years the only chance the Labour Government had had to do anything was a period of six months, in which, unfortunately, the general election occurred. In fact, the Labour Government had not been in office at all during that 14 years. Unless I am much mistaken, a careful perusal of the hon. member's speech in "Hansard" by any logical mind will lead to no other conclusion.

If I may digress for a few moments without offending too severely against the Standing Orders, that statement has some analogy to the case of an American negro cotton picker, who approached his boss at the beginning of the new year and asked for the previous year's wages. For a moment the boss did not know what to say, but after a little thought, he replied, "Look here, Sambo, for eight hours a day you slept. As last year was a leap year with 366 days,

you were therefore asleep for 122 days." "Yes," said Sambo. "Then," continued the boss, "you had eight hours recreation and tucker time, which amounted to another 122 days." Sambo replied, "Yes, that is right." "That leaves you only 122 days." Again Sambo agreed. The boss continued, "Well, you did not work on Sundays. That takes off 52 days and leaves only 70 days. We do not work on Saturdays, and that takes off another 52 days and leaves only 18 days. Then you went with me on a fishing trip when you were not picking cotton, which amounted to 14 days, so that leaves only four days. Further, you were ill for a week, and so you owe me three days' wages." That is analagous to the statement of the member for Kalgoorlie. That is what it amounts to and nothing else. The hon. member tried to prove that his Party was not in office at all.

Mr. Styants: I did not say anything about being in office. I said "in power."

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. member's Party was in power and in office, too, because everybody knows that administrative authority without legislation is extremely powerful.

Mr. Styants: I said that while we had been in office for 14 years, we had not been in power.

The ACTING PREMIER: Everyone knows that practically all the legislation of any value introduced during that time was ultimately passed by both Houses.

Mr. Styants: That is your way of putting it with your legal training.

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. member's former Premier (Hon. J. C. Willcock) said so in 1942. The hon. member should read his remarks on the Commonwealth Powers Bill. You people who want power were prepared to sell out the whole ship. We wanted to keep some power for you, but you wanted to give it all away. Well I remember the debate on that Bill and how we tried to thin down the giving away to a reasonable degree, but every amendment was wiped out by a solid block vote of your Party. So you do not want to talk to me about obtaining more power.

Mr. Styants: That is only a distortion of what I said.

The ACTING PREMIER: It is a fact; you had all the administrative power for

14 years and in some aspects you did not use it successfully. You were very rarely rebuffed by another place in respect of any major legislation. The other night you told the House that it was the Coal Production Bill that contained the clauses about coal-miners' amenities, social conditions and the like. It contained nothing of the sort. The Bill that contained provisions for those amenities and conditions was passed by another place on both readings without any division. The hon. member need not try to tell me what occurred; I have read the whole of the reports of the debates.

Mr. Styants: So have I read them.

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. member knows perfectly well that the Bill dealing with amenities and social conditions of the miners was not the Coal Production Bill.

Mr. Styants: I dealt with the pensions Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I cannot allow this conversation to continue.

The ACTING PREMIER: Well, I am the speaker, so I think the member for Kalgoorlie is quite out of order. He knew perfectly well that he was misleading the House and the country in order to score off the member for Geraldton.

Mr. Styants: All right, I shall have an opportunity to score off you.

The ACTING PREMIER: The hon. member should read in "Hansard" what he said and what I have said. If he looks at the record, he will see that he is not the one who is telling the truth. I am getting tired of this sort of thing.

Mr. Styants: You are not the only George Washington in the House.

The ACTING PREMIER: Other members have had their say and now I am entitled to have mine. You talk of liberty, but you do not like liberty for the other fellow. You know that perfectly well.

The Minister for Lands: They do squeal.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: I think we will have to call the Minister for Lands the Minister for dirt soon.

The ACTING PREMIER: I am not concerned about the Minister for Lands, but I am concerned about the general question. The hour is getting late and I do not propose to detain the House much longer, save

to say this: That so far as this Government was concerned, before its members came into office, the things which they undertook to do were, in the light of the information which they possessed, able to be done within the three years of the life of Parliament. It has been suggested by some members opposite that they were supposed to be done in any period from five minutes to five months; but in the opening stanza of the policy speech which I delivered as the then Leader of the Opposition I said, "I have pleasure in giving you tonight the policy of this Party for the next three years," and if at the end of three years we have not succeeded in implementing the greater part of it, then we will take the consequences."

Point of Order.

Hon. F. J. S. Wise: On a point of order, I take it the Deputy Premier will table the file from which he quoted.

Mr. Speaker: The point is covered by "May," not by the Standing Orders.

The Acting Premier: I have no objection.

Debate Resumed.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

BILLS (11)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Child Welfare.
- 2, Road Districts Act Amendment.
- 3, Rural Relief Fund Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Education.

- 4, Crown Suits.
- 5, Constitution Acts Amendment (No. 1).
- 6, Constitution Acts Amendment (Re-election of Ministers).
- 7, Fatal Accidents.
- 8, Public Trustee Act Amendment.
- 9, Public Service Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Chief Secretary (for the Attorney General).

- 10, Industries Assistance Act Amendment (Continuance).

Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

- 11, Closer Settlement Act Amendment.

Introduced by Hon. F. J. S. Wise.

House adjourned at 10.46 p.m.