

question. Although I regret that the business of this Parliament is to be hung up for a further fortnight, I realise the adjournment is warranted because of the financial position confronting the country. In view of the assurance given by the Premier, I raise no objection to the adjournment.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 5.2 p.m.*

## Legislative Council.

*Tuesday, 26th August, 1930.*

	PAGE
Assent to Bill ... ..	34
Questions, Unemployment ... ..	34
Railway Employees ... ..	34
Committees for the Session ... ..	34
Financial position, Premier's statement ... ..	35
Address in-reply, third day ... ..	35

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

### ASSENT TO BILL.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the Supply Bill (No. 1), £1,730,000.

### QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT.

Hon. E. H. GRAY asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: In view of the acute distress now being suffered by large numbers of unemployed married men and their wives and families, by the failure of the local authorities through lack of funds to provide supplementary relief work in addition to the assistance granted by the State, will the Government give immediate advances to any local authority who will undertake the responsibility of redeeming such advances under the scheme recently placed before the Minister by a combined deputation of representatives of local government bodies?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES replied: At present the Government are not in a position to finance local authorities in the manner suggested. Apart from that fact local authorities cannot borrow until the procedure laid down by the Road Districts and Municipal Acts has been observed. Local authorities have power temporarily to finance by means of overdrafts on their bankers.

### QUESTION—RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Hon. H. J. YELLAND asked the Minister for Country Water Supplies: 1, What is the cost of transferring railway employees to take over ordinary duties—(a) a loco. driver; (b) a guard, from (1) Perth to Merredin; (2) Merredin to Perth? 2, How long is each required to remain at Merredin before being entitled to transfer to the metropolitan area? 3, How long will it take each to learn the road and various duties peculiar to a new district, and what is the cost of this in respect to Merredin? 4, What is the present district allowance for such employees?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES replied: 1 (a) Approximately £8 for a married man and £5 for a single man; (b) approximately £7 for a married man and £3 15s. for a single man. 2, There is no definite period. 3, This depends upon circumstances and the previous experience of the worker. 4, 1s. 6d. per day, 7 days per week.

### COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

**THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES** (Hon. C. F. Baxter—East) [4.35]: I move—

That the following sessional committees be appointed:—

Standing Orders Committee: The President, Hon. C. F. Baxter, Hon. J. Cornell, Hon. A. Lovekin, and Hon. J. Nicholson.

Library Committee: The President, Hon. J. Ewing, and Hon. J. M. Drew.

Printing Committee: The President, Hon. W. H. Kitson, and Hon. A. Lovekin.

Joint House Committee: The President, Hon. J. Cornell, Hon. E. H. Gray, Hon. G. A. Kemp-ton, and Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom.

**HON. A. LOVEKIN** (Metropolitan) [4.36]: This motion includes the appointment of a printing committee. In view of the financial position it seems to me an immense saving could be made on printing the reports that we get. At the present time voluminous departmental reports come to the House already printed, and so there is no opportunity to curtail the expenditure. Yet a lot of these reports are absolutely of no value whatever. I think on this occasion, at any rate, before departmental reports are printed and laid on the Table, they should be produced in manuscript to the Printing Committee. Otherwise the Printing Committee is of no use whatever. Thousands of pounds can be saved in the printing bill by curtailing a number of these reports which are of absolutely no value.

Question put and passed.

#### **FINANCIAL POSITION—PREMIER'S STATEMENT.**

**THE MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES** (Hon. C. F. Baxter East) [4.38]: I wish to make a short explanation. Before we adjourned on the last occasion I said the adjournment would be advisable in order that members might have opportunity to learn more about the financial position. To-day the Premier intends to make a statement in the Legislative Assembly, and I think it would be advisable, and would suit the convenience of members, if this sitting were suspended for an hour to allow members to hear that statement in the other Chamber. They will then get a better idea of the financial position.

*Sitting suspended from 4.40 to 5.30 p.m.*

#### **ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.**

*Third Day.*

Debate resumed from the 12th August.

**HON. V. HAMERSLEY** (East) [5.30]: With other members I join in the expression of condolence at the death of one of the representatives of North-East Province, Mr. J. R. Brown, which has occurred since last session. To you, Mr. President, I extend my congratulations upon the honour con-

ferred upon you. Since last session there has been a general election for the Assembly and a biennial election for this House. This later election has altered somewhat the representation in this House, and while I regret the loss of several old members, I welcome their successors, feeling assured that they will add to the debating strength of the House and co-operate with us in the work of endeavouring to keep the government of the country on sound lines. I wish also to congratulate Mr. Baxter on assuming the leadership of the House. We lose the splendid services of our old friend, Mr. Drew, as Leader, but we recognise that the electors have decided in favour of a change of Government. Mr. Baxter belongs to a party who, I felt, should have received greater consideration when the redistribution of Assembly seats was made. I expressed that view at the time. The country districts did not receive from the Collier Government the consideration to which they were entitled, in that they were not given the amount of Parliamentary representation to which they could fairly lay claim. The redistribution reduced the number of gold-fields seats, but gave extra representation to the large centres of population instead of to the country districts. It is recognised at the present time, perhaps more than ever before, how closely the financial position is linked up with the State's production. Upon primary production we must rely to pull us out of our difficulties. I assumed that, in the formation of the present coalition Government, special consideration would be given to this phase, and that has been done. Much work and responsibility devolve upon the Leader of the House, and I am sure that Mr. Baxter will receive the ready help of every member, and that he will be enabled to carry out his duties with satisfaction to himself and to the country. I regret that the Clerk of Parliaments is absent owing to illness. Mr. Parker has given sterling service to this Chamber over a great many years. Mr. Cornell, too, is absent through illness, and we regret the cause of his absence. It is unfortunate that stringent financial conditions should mark the opening of this Parliament—His Excellency the Governor, in the opening Speech, spoke of the parlous condition of the finances—and that the new Government should find the cupboard empty. It seems to me that throughout the session we shall have to focus attention on the question of effecting

economy in every direction. Several of us from time to time have stressed the need for economy, and events have shown that in doing so we were on solid ground. I have been regarded as an old conservative, as one who did not view radical departures with a kindly eye, but was always inclined to preach caution. I have frequently been called a pessimist, and the same applies to other members here. Our present experiences, however, demonstrate that we were amply justified in urging caution. The Governor's Speech was devoted almost entirely to the question of finance and to indicating the difficult times in store for the State. I well remember that when we entered Federation, this State imposed practically no direct taxation. The whole of the public revenues were raised through the Customs, and it was found that the government of the country could be financed on a revenue tariff. Local government generally was maintained by subsidies provided by the Government out of the revenue received from Customs duties. When Federation was accomplished and we handed over control of our Customs and post office revenues to the Commonwealth, we had to begin imposing land and income taxes in order to raise sufficient funds to carry on the affairs of government. We were a country making slow but steady growth. Soon after Federation the first Labour Government, which was under Mr. Daglish, took office. His idea was that the resources of the State could be best conserved by adopting a mark-time policy. That policy lasted for only a very brief period. The community were not satisfied to mark time, as funds were not being distributed freely enough, and they took the earliest opportunity to displace the mark-time Government with a Government who promised to spend money much more lavishly.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And they have been spending it lavishly ever since.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: That is so. No Government was likely to retain popular favour unless it adopted that course. So we have progressed to the stage of the Collier regime which, so far from being a mark-time Government, might well be described as the spendthrift Government. They not only handled a much greater revenue and a much greater loan authorisation than did previous administrations, but, I believe, exceeded all ordinary bounds of prudence by spending ahead of loan flotations. The result,

as I have remarked, was that when the present Government took office, they found the cupboard bare, and they are going to have a very difficult row to hoe in the immediate future. Unfortunately, they succeeded to that heritage just at a time when the prices of our commodities have receded considerably. The prices of wheat and wool have declined to such an extent that many people will not have the incomes to which they have been accustomed and will not be able to pay so much to the Commissioner of Taxation. I fear that, during the current financial year, the receipts from income tax will be substantially reduced. The Federal Government not only took the whole of our Customs revenue, but also taxed the community on both land and incomes. That was a Labour Government, too. It is interesting to note that when the Federal Government made their onslaught upon landholders, the objective they professed was the bursting up of large estates. The landholders of Australia appealed to the High Court. Sir Samuel Griffith was the presiding judge. He said he had to uphold their claim as the Federal Government were not given power to impose a land tax for any purpose other than defence. As the tax had been put on ostensibly to burst up large estates it was declared *ultra vires*. The following year the Government brought in a measure for compulsory military service. This excuse enabled the Federal Government to impose a land tax to derive revenue for the purpose indicated. It is interesting to note that the Federal Government have now decided to do away with compulsory military service. It would be an opportune time for us again to test the validity of the Federal land tax, as it was tested at the period to which I refer. If the State Government would take up the matter it would be well within their compass, and if the tax were found to be invalid the community would be relieved of a good deal of the heavy burden now resting upon it. A considerable amount of revenue which now goes into the Federal coffers might easily be rendered available to the State Government, with advantage to the people generally.

Hon. A. Lovekin: If you will read the case in No. 5 of the Commonwealth Law Reports you will see that the Federal Government have unlimited powers.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Sir Samuel Griffith was one of those who helped to formulate the Federal scheme. Fortunately

at the time I speak of he was the presiding judge, and he threw out the tax on the ground that the Government were only given power to levy it for defence purposes. Now that defence is scrapped there is no reason why an attempt should not be made to get out of this form of taxation. The Federal Government have undoubtedly made large incursions into the pockets of the taxpayers.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: If the tax were abolished would you advocate an increase in the State land tax?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I could not under present conditions advocate such a thing. If the community were relieved of the Federal land tax it would be of some assistance to the State, and would make more money available to the State Government. People might be encouraged to return to Western Australia and invest their money, but to-day there is very little likelihood of their doing so. The tax has been a means of driving people out of Australia in general and Western Australia in particular. A lot of money which would have been invested in land, and used for the development of the country, has been frightened away owing to the onslaughts by the Federal and State Governments and the imposts by various local governing authorities. In this way the revenue producing activities of the State have been hampered. If the Federal Government could be persuaded to withdraw the tax I am sure the result would be most beneficial.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: You are an optimist.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I have been called a pessimist for many years. I am, however, optimistic enough to work hard in developing the land and to employ a great many people. The results, however, are not sufficient to cause me to advise anyone else to do likewise. Tremendous onslaughts have been made upon the community from time to time, and one has to be honest to one's friends and oneself and express one's views on these matters. During the war a wheat steal took place. Quite recently the Prime Minister tried to repeat the dose. The idea was that the Federal Government should control not only our gold, but handle all the wheat as was done during the war. The experience of the farming community, and those who had anything to do with wheat, led them to distrust any such scheme without the most careful inquiry. The more we looked into

the matter, the more scared we became, particularly those who were growing wheat in Western Australia. As a State we have to rely very largely upon our wheat and wool production, and it was most necessary that we should look carefully into the proposed guarantee of the Federal Government. We found that the guarantee would be hedged around in such a way that if there was any loss on the price of 4s. at sidings, the State Governments would have to bear half of it. We found that if there was a loss of 6d. a bushel, the State would lose 3d. The actual taxation upon the Western Australian community would have been about £1 3s. 6d. a head, to recoup the loss, whilst New South Wales would have been taxed about 4s. a head, and Queensland about 9d. a head. We then realised what a serious onslaught was about to be made on the people of this State, and what a serious increase in the burden of taxation would be placed upon the shoulders of the community. This burden would have fallen particularly upon the growers of wheat and producers generally.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You would not call that an equitable distribution.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It would be altogether an inequitable distribution of the burden. Unfortunately many farmers were ready to embrace the proposal, whatever the consequences, trusting that the Government meant to do them a good turn, or with the idea that it would be expedient for them to get 4s. a bushel irrespective of what might come to them afterwards. I suppose it was a great temptation to those who were eager to get the 4s., whatever the consequences might be.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: It would have been interesting to know where the money would all come from, and when the farmers would have got it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. Probably they would have been obliged to wait a long time. I have some figures relating to the wheat scheme that was under Government control from 1915 onwards. That scheme was a sufficient lesson to many of us to have nothing to do with a compulsory pool. In 1915-16 an advance was made to farmers, but no further division occurred for nearly 12 months. In the following year much the same thing happened. Meanwhile practically all who were trying to finance on wheat were in a hopeless position. Had we accepted this latest Federal

scheme, the Government might have made an advance of 6d. or 1s. a bushel, and the growers might have had to wait another 12 months before getting any more. That is what happened during the years 1915, 1916, 1917, and so on. No undertaking was given that the guarantee would be made good within a certain time, or even within the first 12 months. It was just as well we were able to keep out of the wheat steal, as I term it, and retain control of our own wheat marketing. The revenue of the State has suffered seriously because there has been a falling off in our trade, particularly in the timber industry. In effect our timber trade has practically disappeared. It is unfortunate that our gold production has not gone ahead as much as we hoped it would. We had looked forward to a gold bonus, but I fear had it been granted it would not have been a great success. At any rate, the granting of the bonus would have shown that the Federal Government had some consideration for this portion of Australia. I look upon the cotton-growing bonus as a dreadful proposition. Cotton is undoubtedly a black labour industry, whereas gold is a white labour industry. I do not for a moment think that cotton growing is a suitable proposition for Australia. Cotton has at all times been a competitor of wool, and has always steadied the price of wool. It may be said that wool and cotton have maintained a balance with one another. To find the Australian Government subsidising the production of cotton, extracting revenue from the wool grower to encourage the cotton industry, which is and always has been in direct competition with the wool industry, savours to me of foolishness. Why should Australia wish to produce cotton when it is at such a low price? Moreover, the low price of cotton has materially helped to reduce the price of wool. Again, the Australian is not the type of man to give his attention to cotton growing even under the best conditions. In my opinion, cotton growing is not an industry upon which Australia should embark at all. When an Australian Government which subsidises cotton growing refuses a bonus to gold production, Western Australia may reasonably complain that it is being left out in the cold by the Federal authorities. It is most unfortunate that we should have to pay tribute to the Federation when the staple products upon which Western Australia relies receive so

little consideration from the Commonwealth. In years gone by this Parliament has passed legislation which has considerably interfered with the industries of the State. I was looked upon as a Conservative when I opposed certain measures relating to industrial arbitration and workers' compensation. To-day we are faced with serious unemployment. In my opinion, the whole of that unemployment is attributable to the legislation I have mentioned, and in order to overcome the difficulty we must retrace the road we have long been travelling. A man who finds himself off the track turns back and seeks the right road.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You will have to retrace your steps to 1901.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: In respect of industrial arbitration we shall be compelled to retrace our steps. A stage has been reached when there is a great deal of unemployment owing to people being unwilling to venture their capital because, once having embarked it, they lose control of it. The man who invests his money in production has a court sitting to tell him what he must pay, irrespective of whether the rate means the ruin of the industry or not. To the existence of that court I attribute the ruin of the timber industry and the ruin of the gold mining industry. Unless the legislation to which I have referred is amended, we cannot reasonably expect people to bring capital here for investment. As a result of that legislation we are practically telling people to lend their money to the Government instead of risking it in industry. People used to lend this State money at 4 per cent. Then the rate rose to 5 per cent. To-day it is 6 per cent. free of State income tax. Goodness knows what Western Australia will have to pay if it has to go on borrowing. At present there are far greater inducements to lend money to the Government and let the State be responsible for it than to take the risk of investing it oneself. I intended to quote some figures relative to wool prices, but they will keep. Let me say now that the price of wool has receded till it is no longer payable. The price of sheep, too, has gone down considerably; and our pastoralists are undoubtedly experiencing most difficult times. I may point out that in spite of the heavy reduction in the price of wheat, the price of bread has not altered. Those who are concerned in shearing do not

like the latest award of the Arbitration Court and are inclined to strike. Apparently they are not disposed to realise that the wool industry can no longer pay the rates formerly imposed by the court. Such people wish to continue in a fool's paradise. Without delaying the House by quoting a quantity of figures, let me express my sincere hope that during the next few months all sides of this Chamber and of another place will get together to discover a way out of the difficulties confronting the State. We should retrace the path we have travelled in years gone by, with a view to getting back on the right road. Our endeavour should be to revert to those broad lines on which this country is so capable of producing wealth. In that case Western Australia will have a wonderful opportunity to progress. We have wool and wheat, gold and timber, meat and fruit; and we shall be able to produce unlimited quantities of butter. I agree with Mr. Rose that the South-West is rapidly increasing its output of butter. Again, we are exporting eggs, and there is a strong impetus to the production of bacon. We have everything we need for successful production if we can only get the people to embark on these industries. However, owing to the measures I mentioned a few moments ago, there is a disinclination to invest capital in those directions. Until we get back on the right track, we shall not be able to relieve Western Australia of the difficulties now oppressing it.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Will you not suggest some economies?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Economy is the principal point I desire to stress. I have been preaching economy for a long time. To my regret, I do not find in the Governor's Speech the principal economy that I have to advocate. I refer to a reduction in the salaries of members of Parliament.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is that the principal economy?

Hon. J. Nicholson: Now you are striking home.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: We must start at the head, and the economy must go right through the body politic. I am a producer of wool and of wheat, and my income has been considerably reduced.

Hon. H. Stewart: Has it not been wiped out altogether?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It will be all gone when I have paid my taxes. How can it possibly be thought that there is sufficient

to pay the old rates to members of Parliament and to all the workers of the State, at the same time keeping all the people employed, under existing conditions? I employ a good number of men, and am doing my utmost to keep them employed; but there is not sufficient to go round at the old rates. We have to prepare to-day for the crops we shall be putting in 12 months hence and reaping 18 months later, and the whole thing is a gamble. We do not know what the season or the price will be. We are sure, however, that the price of wool will not rise. Cotton has secured a tight hold on the market. How are wool growers to carry on with judges telling them what wages are to be paid irrespective of whether the industry can afford them or not? It is beyond my comprehension. In some respects we must revert to the stage at which we were in earlier years. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

**HON. J. J. HOLMES** (North) [6.13]: First of all, Mr. President, may I be permitted to congratulate you on the honour which has been conferred upon you by His Majesty the King, an honour which you fully merit and which we all appreciate. Our appreciation of it springs more especially from a consciousness that your association with this Chamber had something to do with the bestowal of the honour. Some of us regard this Council as the bulwark of the Constitution. I hold that if ever an Australian Chamber was called upon to realise its duty, it is this Chamber. On that aspect I shall have more to say at a later stage. I desire to make a reference to the death of the Hon. J. R. Brown. I got to know the late Mr. Brown very well indeed. My acquaintance with him did a great deal to convince me that the more one associates with our fellow men, the more one becomes convinced that there is good in all of us. I grew to like and to respect Mr. Brown. It is a matter of regret to me that in the recent elections some members of the Council fell by the wayside. However, that is only what is to be expected by anyone who attempts to serve the public. I welcome the new members, and I venture to say that if they live up to the standard of those who have gone out, they will become useful members.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Before tea I was about to refer to the absence of Mr. Bernard Parker, the Clerk of Parliaments. We all very much regret his sad illness, and I am sure I am expressing the sentiments of every member of the Chamber when I say we hope he will soon be back here amongst us fully restored in health. He has been a very useful man here, of great assistance to us all, and I am sure we miss him very much. Also I desire to congratulate the Leader of the House upon his elevation to office. I think he realises, as we all do, that his is a very difficult position to fill, and I feel sure I can promise him all the assistance we shall be able to give him. In my opening remarks I referred to this Chamber as being the bulwark of the Constitution. I do not think I am egotistical in saying this is the best conducted Chamber in Australia, whether Federal or State, and I think the most thoughtful Chamber, a Chamber which gives earnest consideration to everything that comes before it. It may be that some of us have been not as fully seized of our responsibility as we should have been. It is a responsible position to be one of thirty who have the last say in all legislation affecting the welfare of the country. Some of us in the past may not have been as thoughtful as we might have been, but matters are now so serious that it behoves every one of us to do the best he can to put Australia back on the map. I have always held that this Chamber represents the people who pay, and I think it cannot be repeated too often. When I was a kiddy I was taught that the man who pays the piper should call the tune. We here represent the people who pay the bulk of the taxes, and if we have not called the tune sufficiently loudly in the past, it is now up to us to make our voices heard and our influence felt. I do not know that Parliament to-day stands as high in the regard of the community as it should do. When we look back 10 or 15 years and see what the successive Parliaments of the country have done and how we have handled the finest heritage on God's earth, I do not think we can afford to throw bouquets at ourselves. Still, we know it is never too late to mend. Whilst I may have a few hard words to say before sitting down, I recall that as a child I was taught also that to spare the rod was to spoil the child. Incidentally I myself was hammered almost every day in the week, and so I think I may say I have not been spoiled. If ever there

was a time in the history of Australia when the people of the country looked to the several Parliaments for financial salvation, it is the present juncture. Much as I appreciate what some members of the present Government have done in the past, I cannot find in His Excellency's opening Speech very much promise of relief for the people of the country. There are in it too many platitudes and not very much of what is going to be done. On the second page we find this—

Notwithstanding the general depression prevailing, the internal condition of the State is satisfactory. National income is derived chiefly from primary production, and it is satisfactory to note that the wheat output grows steadily year by year.

Not a word as to how matters will be adjusted to the end that that primary product may be sold on the world's market at a profit. That aspect of the question I will deal with before I sit down. Then we have this—

Western Australian apples retain pride of place among Australian fruit in the Home and foreign markets. The dairying industry is flourishing.

Incidentally at this stage I may mention that Sir Otto Niemeyer has not thought it worth while to refer to any industry in Australia other than wheat and wool. Before I sit down I will endeavour to show you why. Here is another excerpt from His Excellency's Speech—

The work of the session will be devoted largely to finance, and to legislation affecting finance. It is regarded as of the utmost importance to increase the national income by production.

And so it goes on. When first I entered Parliament, the Governor's opening speech invariably forecasted legislation to be introduced that session; and unless something exceptional happened, nothing else was introduced. That was the set programme for the session. If this Speech before me represents the set programme for the present session, it seems to me a poor look-out. Here is the programme of legislation:—

A stipendiary magistrates Bill; an amendment of the Local Court Act; an amendment of the Main Roads Act; a consolidation and amendment of the Supreme Court Act; an amendment of the Agricultural Bank Act; an amendment of the Traffic Act.

That does not get us anywhere near to all that is necessary.

Hon. J. Nicholson: In a paragraph a little higher up it is stated that the work of the session will be devoted largely to finance.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If you compare that programme, as the outline of what Parliament is called together to consider, with Sir Otto Niemeyer's address as to what we have to do, you will see that there is at all events one man now in Australia prepared to put up the facts and tell us that we have to face them. So it is up to somebody else to set out a programme that will give expression to Sir Otto's recommendations if we are to get back to where we ought to be. Surely we have in Australia sufficient members of Parliament to conduct the business satisfactorily. I find from a return I asked for that there are 661 members of Parliament controlling the destinies of Australia. Their salaries alone, to say nothing of other expenses, amount to £355,865. To my mind it looks as if there had been too many cooks, and so the broth was spoiled. These figures represent salaries only, and you, Sir, know there are entailed many other expenses that add considerably to these figures. I am sure the Mother country has served us well; too well in fact. Australia did great service in the war, and we have been trading on it ever since. We have borrowed money and spent it, and even borrowed money to pay interest and expenses. It could lead only to one end. The Mother country has wakened up to the fact that she has to apply the rod to save the child. My candid opinion is that the harder she applies it, the sooner shall we get back to where we ought to be. I am not alarmed about the position. Seven years ago I told the House that when we reached the stage where we would have to get back to living on what we earned instead of on what we borrowed, then we should be on sound ground. That is the stage we have reached to-day. For years I have been expecting it, and I am happy and contented about the conditions to-day, bad as they are, because I know we now have to get back to where we once were. Frequently have I told the House that we were coming to a dead-end. An individual who borrowed money to pay interest and expenses could end in only one place, namely, the Bankruptcy Court. The difference between an individual and the combination of individuals which is the nation or state, is this, that if the nation or state or commonwealth borrows money to pay interest and expenses it cannot repudiate, it cannot seek the protection of

the Bankruptcy Court, and the result is it bankrupts the industries in the country by taxation. I said that here seven years ago. Was I right or was I wrong? Notwithstanding repeated warnings, the country and the legislature have been prepared to go on borrowing and spending, trusting to something turning up. Something has now turned up, for the Mother Country has stepped in and said, "I will save these people from themselves." Time after time have I told the House that if we persisted in the old policy the day could not be far distant when we should not have enough money to pay the salaries of the public servants. Seemingly we have nearly reached that point now, at all events in respect of the Railways, for I understand there is barely enough money to pay the wages of the railway men, and the Premier has told the department it is of no use their going to the Treasury, that they will have to live on what they earn. I apprehend that a good many other Government departments will have to live on what they earn if we are to get out of our difficulties. In these remarks more or less I have to deal with Australia as a whole, because when we entered into the Financial Agreement we gave up our control of the purse strings. The ex-Chief Secretary knows that. When we gave up control of the purse strings we gave up control of the government of the country, for government is finance and finance is government. The Financial Agreement was described by the then Chief Secretary as the end of all our troubles, because under it we would always have money to burn, since we would have to pay only half the sinking fund and the payment of our debts would be postponed. If it brought us money to burn, we must have got through it pretty quickly, for we have nothing much to-day. As I have shown, His Excellency's speech declares that the work of the session will be devoted largely to finance. I want to take members back to 1923, when we had a purely financial session. The Collier Government were then in power. The speech with which His Excellency opened that session contained this paragraph—

My advisers, believing that finance and development are the matters of vital importance to the State, will ask Parliament to devote the greater portion of the session to their consideration.



If we give these matters the consideration they deserve and the Government give them the consideration they deserve, we can accomplish something, but in the seven years that have passed I say that we have not accomplished much. We shall never accomplish anything so long as we can borrow and spend. Thank God we have passed that stage now. The Speech refers to primary production. Strange to say, as I have already pointed out, Sir Otto Niemeyer refers in his statement to wool and wheat only. I am safe in saying, so far as wheat is concerned, that that commodity can be produced and sold at a profit at present prices but for the tariff that is murdering every man engaged in the industry. We have in this State the cheapest and the best land and also the best climatic conditions. The land is good and the rainfall is good. Rain is the first essential to growth and it is only a question of producing economically to place wheat on the world's markets in competition with any other community. But how can we do that when we have a tariff wall, the building of which was started 20 years ago and which has been added to every year since. Twenty years ago I bought a reaper and binder—I need not mention the name of the makers—for £43; I bought a similar article a couple of years ago for £97, less £3 for cash—more than double what I gave for the first machine. We can see what is going on behind the tariff barrier, and so we learn what is pushed on to the primary producer. He is the man who is being called upon to save the country. Why did Sir Otto Niemeyer pick out wheat and wool? Principally because they have not been bonused; they have been standing on their own bottom, and they have to. Take butter, about which no mention has been made. I am not going to decry what has been done to develop the butter industry in this State, but we cannot deny that it has been produced at an enormous cost. I find from the figures that have been supplied to me by the Minister this afternoon that on group settlement and on the Peel Estate there has been spent £8,135,128. We have written off to the 31st July, £2,177,690. We have dealt with only 1,046 group holdings and we have yet 676 group holdings to receive attention. So I estimate on the basis of what has been done we shall have to write off on group settlement no less a sum than 3½ millions. The taxpayers have been called upon to pay

£600 a day in interest. The group settlers have been relieved of this.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: We shall have to pay the principal, too.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and if we do not pay it the interest will go on for ever. The price of butter at the factory is 1s. 7½d. per lb.; the public here pay 1s. 10d. for it, and the same butter is sent to London, freight and all charges paid, and is sold there for 1s. 1½d., or 6d. per lb. less than the factory in Western Australia receives. The pool pays the butter producer 4d. a lb. Is it any wonder that Sir Otto Niemeyer did not mention the butter industry? Butter is produced on the best land in Australia, and yet the conditions that are imposed are such that it is necessary to charge the public of Australia 6d. per lb. more than the London price in order that the surplus may find its way on to the world's markets.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Government control.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I do not care whose is the control; it is bad for the community.

Hon. E. Rose: It is a voluntary pool.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: If the controllers of that pool have any conscience at all, they must say that this shall end. Now turn to the dried fruit industry. Pick up the morning newspaper and we find that 20,000 tons of dried fruits are in London waiting for someone to come along to buy at a price that will pay the grower in this country. The grower here will produce the fruit as cheaply as it can be grown anywhere, but he is handicapped by the Arbitration Court, the Workers' Compensation Act and the tariff. We have stood behind the tariff for 20 years, and it is getting worse every day. Sir Otto Niemeyer never mentioned one manufactured article that can be sold in the world's market. Who is it that has been bled in this country? The wheatgrower and the woolgrower. Now they are called upon to save the rest of the community. I have already said that we have no right to maintain an arbitration court that cannot enforce its judgments and awards.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: That court has been brought into ridicule and is undermining the courts of justice. Talk about unemployment in a country like this! The only reason for it is that we have made the employment of labour unprofitable.

As soon as you do that the natural sequence is unemployment. Will the Minister tell me that 2,000 men at Blackboy Camp, knocking down blackboys and breaking up stones in a time like this at a cost of probably £100,000 a year are going to help us out of our difficulties? This £2,000 a week, which the primary producer has to pay, will not do anything in the direction of assisting us out of our troubles. Those men should be preparing land along existing railways for the cultivation of wheat. We were told by the Mitchell Government when they were in power that there were 19,000,000 acres alienated along the existing railway routes of this country and that only 9,000,000 acres had been dealt with. We passed a Closer Settlement Act in order that those lands should be dealt with and so that the railways should get the traffic. When that Closer Settlement Bill was first introduced, it went out, but in the first session of the Labour Party's regime it was passed. Sir Hal Colebatch asked this House by what right did these people become possessed of the land. He quoted to us what appears in front of the London Stock Exchange—I cannot repeat it in Latin, but in English it is "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." That is the kind of thing we had put up to us six or seven years ago. The land is still lying idle. It should be turned to use and in that way help the railways to pay. We had six years of Labour Government and now we have a National Government again, and not one word has been said to us about those 10,000,000 acres. There are 2,000 men at Blackboy Camp playing football and cricket and being given a little work to pay for tobacco. Will that kind of thing get us out of our difficulties? Sir Otto Niemeyer refers only to the production of wheat and wool. I am sorry for Mr. Rose that butter does not come into the chapter so far as Sir Otto Niemeyer is concerned. If we are to put wheat on the world's market we must produce it cheaply. But we will never have cheap railway freights while the railway employees work only 44 hours and while we have to pay the price we do for Collie coal.

Hon. H. Stewart: And construction.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There will be no more construction for some years. I told the House, at the time the Bills for the construction of new railways were introduced, that those railways would not be built. So

we need not talk about construction; we must confine ourselves to making the railways that we now have pay their way. The Labour Government told us that the railways were going to be made to pay, and we have heard that also from the present Government. Many jokes have been put on this country, but I do not think it is in the mood to stand any more.

Hon. H. Stewart: What is the coal bill?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I have it on reliable authority that we pay 2s. a ton more for Collie coal than the New South Wales railways pay for Newcastle coal, and we know that 100 lbs. of Newcastle coal are equal to 155 lbs. of ours. So that apart from the additional price of 2s. a ton that we have to pay we are also compelled to use coal, the calorific value of which is so much less than that of Newcastle.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Which do you prefer, Newcastle or Collie?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Whichever pays the better.

Hon. V. Hamersley: If there was a strike in New South Wales and we had to depend on coal from that State, we would not be able to run our railways.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There will be so little work to do shortly that there will be no question of strikes.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How many men would you throw out of work if you did not use Collie coal?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Two years ago a Bill was introduced to amend the Coal Mines Regulation Act in which it was proposed to make compulsory by Act of Parliament a 35-hours week and a 5-days' week for the miners at Collie. Why should the coal miners work 35 hours a week and bleed our railways while the poor wretch on the land who has to provide the freight is obliged to live on the smell of an oilrag? Thirty-five hours a week was what they tried to push through Parliament! The owners said they were in favour of it. My answer was, "If you are in favour of it, go and work those hours, but this Chamber will not help you." If we gave the 35 hours to the coal miners, what should we give to those engaged in the mining industry whose work is much more dangerous? It was the thin end of the wedge.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It is the first I have heard of it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member has to go away from home sometimes to hear news. While we find provision being made for the men in the South-West, there is none for the men in the great North, where they have had to be paid off because the price of wool demanded that course. Those men are stranded there. The fact is they cannot get away. Money can be provided elsewhere, but when we ask for money to be spent in the North, it is a different question altogether. The Government leave the North alone, yet they can spend £2,000 in connection with the Blackboy camp, in order to keep men away from the city. That is not an equitable distribution. That is not the way to lift the North out of its present state of adversity. The few people there should be encouraged to stop in the North and not be allowed to drift down to Blackboy to be spoonfed by the Government. When the group settlements were in difficulties, the Government immediately began to write off liabilities in order that the settlers might get their blocks back to payable propositions. Did anyone suggest reducing the rental of pastoral leases held in the North? Will anyone suggest writing off anything on account of the losses the pastoralists have sustained? Nothing of the kind! When it was proposed that the Federal Government should take over the northern portion of the State, a friend of mine at the Melbourne University wrote to me regarding the question. I replied to him saying that when we found a man strong enough to provide harbour facilities, roads and other requirements for the development of the North, and then to pass an Act providing that any politician found in the North would be arrested, something would be accomplished. If the people were given that assistance and then left alone to work out their own destiny, they would achieve that end. I will give the House one instance. One of the oldest towns in the North is Roebourne, which was served by a jetty at Point Sampson. About five years ago the jetty was blown down. Then it was decided to construct a new jetty. The ex-Minister for Works, Mr. McCallum, got the project in hand. The iron work was being made at the State Implement Works and the piles were being cut in the bush. As soon as the present Government came into power that was all stopped. They found there was no

money for the North, and so this project has been hung up. This and other such incidents are side lines indicating what the North is up against. They show that the man who makes the most noise is the one likely to get something done. I have been pretty quiet in the past, but if I make more noise in the future, possibly something may be accomplished for the North.

Hon. H. Stewart: Do you think the Point Sampson jetty is justified?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Of course it is.

Hon. H. Stewart: Justified at present?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member is one of those men who go North in a steamer, look at the country from a distance, and come back knowing all about it.

Hon. H. Stewart: Is it not better to do that, than not to go at all.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Coming back to the financial position, hon. members must realise that the State is up against a deficit of £6,000,000 which was never got rid of and in respect of which we are still paying interest. I have worked that out as costing us, at the rate of 6 per cent., about £1,000 per day for interest alone. Then there is another £600 interest per day on account of the group settlements, with more to follow. I find to my surprise that the interest bill that Australia—Commonwealth and States—has to meet, at the 30th June, according to the Federal Budget, totals £55,365,449. According to the figures quoted by the Premier this afternoon, the total will be about £5,000,000 more. It seems to me that an interest bill of £5,000,000 is, apparently, neither here nor there. If I remember the statement by Sir James Mitchell aright, he said that the annual interest bill for money raised in Australia was about £30,000,000, but according to the figures I have before me up to the 30th June, we have travelled fast since then. Probably we have had to pay a lot of interest that was not paid in the past. However, according to the Budget figures, Australia has to pay an interest bill of £27,769,748 per annum in respect of Australian borrowing and on top of that there is an annual payment of £25,184,802 in respect of London borrowings. Having exhausted Australia and London resources, we have gone to New York and owe the Americans interest amounting to £2,410,899, giving a total of £55,365,449 per annum.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But the Premier quoted other borrowers such as municipalities.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am sticking to the facts.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Are you quoting figures relating to the loan moneys raised by public bodies in Australia as well?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: No, I have quoted from the Commonwealth Budget.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The figures were announced this afternoon.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I think the figures Sir James Mitchell quoted this afternoon included loans raised by all public bodies in Australia, hence the additional £5,000,000 interest.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do the figures include short dated Treasury Bills?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I cannot answer that question. I do not know exactly what is included in the figures, but I presume they include everything. How has this huge sum been created? It has been by borrowing money to pay interest and borrowing more money to pay expenses. We insist that every child born in Australia, whether it sees the light of day first in a mansion or in a cottage, shall bring to the mother a bonus of £5. The other day the Sydney "Bulletin" referred, I think, to the wife of the Governor of Victoria, who had collected the £5 baby bonus! We have to calculate public finances on a per capita basis. We have 4,000,000 people in Australia and it means that with an interest bill of £54,000,000 every individual child that is born in Australia is loaded at birth with an indebtedness of £9 per annum for interest, the same amount that is carried by its father, mother and every member of the family.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Interrupted.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I cannot proceed with my speech if the hon. member will persist in interrupting me.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: I was only going to say—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the hon. member to allow Mr. Holmes to proceed with his speech without interruption.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I thank you, Mr. President. We insist on every mother receiving this baby bonus of £5. As I have said, that means that every time the bonus is paid out, a child has been born around whose neck hangs the tag indicating in-

debtedness to the extent of £9 per annum. The mothers are commencing to find out the position now that the sales tax has been imposed. If they desire to buy a little frock for their child, they have to pay 1s. extra because of the sales tax. In such circumstances the Federal authorities will not be long in getting back their £5; it is a question of how long the public will stand it. We have heard a lot about Federation, secession and so forth. I am not a secessionist.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I was an anti-Federalist and I fought the Federal proposal seven days a week. I could not see that we would ever be anything but a junior partner in the Commonwealth. I have had experience as a junior partner and I know he gets all the work and any kicks that are coming, whereas the senior partner collects the cheque and all the kudos. That has been our experience in Australia. The way out of our difficulties is not to be found through secession. We went into Federation knowing full well there was one way only out of it. I will not be a party to breaking a contract. The only way out of Federation is to secure the concurrence of a majority of the people in a majority of the States. There is the alternative of seizing the Customs and so on. What would that mean? We have the police and the Commonwealth have the Army and the Navy. They would merely stop the running of the Trans-Australian railway and police the entrance to Fremantle harbour with their warships, and it would not even be necessary to fire a shot. There could be but one end to it. Australians have lived in an excessive fashion and Sir Otto Niemeyer has told the Australian Governments that Australia will never succeed except as a whole. One of these days someone will wake up and see that justice is done to this part of the Commonwealth. To my mind, the most serious problem confronting us in Western Australia is that the Eastern States use the West as a dumping ground for their mass production. If an hon. member were to go into a shop and price an article that cost £4 10s. to be made in Western Australia, he would find a similar article made in Adelaide at a cost of £4. He would probably find that the people there have to pay £5 10s. for the article as against £4 10s.

here. That is what the Eastern manufacturers do because they know that our manufacturers cannot produce the article at less than £4 10s. The same thing applies to other lines. Jam has been sold here at 4s. a case less than in other States nearer the point of manufacture in order to stifle our production. We have the finest fruit in the world here, but if we were to start a jam factory, that is what we would be up against. These are the difficulties that have to be dealt with. It is useless talking about walking out of the Commonwealth, and of using force. That will not do any good. Then we have various bonuses paid to bolster up industries, and the Government ask the wheat growers to pay for them. That is another matter that must be dealt with. Next we come to the railways, which represent a nightmare to most people in these times. We have been told that the difficulties confronting our railways arise out of the granting of the 44-hour week and long service leave to the employees. What puzzles me, and I hope to get an explanation of it, is that so far as I know the 44-hour week and long service leave were granted to the men behind the back of the Arbitration Court. If Governments do not respect the Arbitration Court and its awards, how can we expect the rank and file to do so? I believe those concessions were gained behind the back of the Arbitration Court.

Hon. G. Fraser: That is not so. The Arbitration Court first granted the 44-hour week.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I am addressing my remarks to the Minister. If these concessions were granted by an administrative act of the Government, why cannot the present Government, as an administrative act, put the railways back where they were before those concessions were granted, without going to the Arbitration Court about it at all? Even members of the court had something to say regarding the court being asked to deal with this question.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think the concession was made as part of an agreement.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Some few years ago a brilliant idea was conceived and the Commonwealth Government were to provide £2,000,000 a year for ten years, the State to give £1,500,000 per year, for the purpose of building roads throughout the State. But the irony is we did not get

roads built to transport the products of the country. The roads have been built more or less parallel with the railways, and the railways on which the bulk of our borrowed money has been invested have been robbed of their traffic. Now someone has wakened and asked why we cannot alter it. Such a thing should never have been allowed or tolerated. The road expenditure was intended for the development of the country, to build roads by which the primary products could be transported to the railways, and the State Government, with the consent of the Commonwealth, have built the roads parallel with the railways, depriving them of their traffic.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: For the benefit of joy-riding motorists.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: There must be economy: there is no help for it. The position has been acknowledged in the Governor's Speech and it cannot be dodged much longer. It has to be faced. As I said at the outset of my remarks, Parliament is the highest tribunal in the land. It is the body which should be looked up to and respected by the people. If we wish to deserve the respect of the community, the first thing we should do in the way of economy is to reduce our own salaries. I shall not be a party to reducing the salaries or wages of other members of the community until members of Parliament first set the example.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have to begin with Parliament, and until we set the example, I shall not support any movement for a reduction of other people's salaries. Huge sums of money could be saved by a reduction of over-staffed departments, and the best scheme I can evolve is one for sending out the surplus men to clear and get ready for production the areas of land within nine or 10 miles of existing railways that should have been producing years ago. It is time someone told the people the truth. I have mentioned before where another big economy could be effected. At the waterworks office we have a huge body of clerks engaged in preparing details of water consumption and assessments for the city of Perth. At the City Council offices is another body of clerks making similar assessments for the municipality. The municipality makes an assessment having

all the data necessary for that purpose, and the waterworks clerks copy the municipality's figures. Having done that, an assessment notice is served on occupiers and owners for the water rate. If an owner appeals to the municipality against his assessment and wins the appeal, his rate is reduced. He then has a right to tell the Water Supply Department of the reduction, and the waterworks clerk has to go down the the civic offices to verify the reduction, after which a credit note must be issued from the Water Supply Department. It is an unnecessary duplication of work. We went to no end of trouble to amalgamate the Federal and State Taxation Departments in order to economise, but when I suggest amalgamating these two local departments, whose work dovetails one with the other, the effect of which would mean the saving of probably thousands of pounds a year, I am told that it cannot be done. I am at a loss to understand why it cannot be done, and why it has not been done long ago. If the Minister is seeking avenues where economy might be undertaken—and he will find he has to do it—I hope he will get on to the track of this one. We have to abolish State trading concerns. We have carried them long enough.

Hon. E. H. Gray: The implement works as well?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We shall probably hear something about them later on. Let me remind the hon. member that some years ago we wrote £120,000 off the capital account of the State Implement Works and are still paying interest on it. This concern has been doing Government work in the shape of repairing steamers and other things and charging whatever prices it thought fit. It was all taken out of loan money and paid into revenue. There has been quite a happy family carrying on in this way for a long time, and I think even Mr. Gray will admit that it cannot continue much longer. In August, 1926, the Auditor General told us that £700,000 of trust money had been taken by the Government and used for State trading concerns. Some people might ask, "Why did not the Auditor General act?" It is not for the Auditor General to act; that is the duty of Parliament. The Auditor General reports to Parliament—and he did report to Parliament—and if Parliament

chooses to disregard his criticism, that is not his business. He has done his duty by reporting to Parliament. I should like members to take a serious view of the existing position. It is bad enough for those members of the community who can see daylight, but there are hundreds of deserving people who, through no fault of their own, find themselves hungry and in want. Something must be done to provide work for them, and it must be profitable work. Let me repeat some words I used in 1926—

I would urge that it is the duty of every member carefully to analyse the State finances. Anyone who looks into the question must realise that we are approaching near to the evil day.

That was four years ago. The evil day is here. It is heart-breaking to see people suffering through no fault of their own, people who have been misguided by tales of the so-called benefits of the 44-hour week and other concessions that were to be the salvation of the country. Those things have been the ruination of the country, and they cannot be allowed to continue any longer. The Mother Country has been told so many tales, that I am not in the least surprised to find her sending somebody out here to look into things. Seven years ago there was a proposal to build a railway from Pemberton to Denmark, a tremendous undertaking in view of the difficulties of the country to be traversed. The then Leader of the House, Mr. Colebatch, told the country that the railway had to be built. The intention was to build the railway a mile at a time and clear the land a mile at a time. The State Government had agreed to take 75,000 people from the Mother Country, and were being urged to take more. I was instrumental in getting the Bill held up. I told the Government they could have a section of the line built at either end, but I would not consent to the country being committed to the huge expenditure that the whole project would involve. If the whole length of railway proposed had been authorised, there would have been no chance of getting a railway constructed in any other part of the State. We have a port at Bunbury connected with Pemberton. We have a port at Albany connected with Denmark. Extend settlement out and out and the ports would serve either end, and when money enough was available the intervening section could be linked up. That was the effect of my objection when the Bill was held up. We had a special session of

Parliament to deal with it. The Engineer-in-Chief was consulted, and he said the length of line proposed was insufficient because he had to terminate the railway at a station, and it was possible to provide stations only at certain points. We compromised by agreeing to the construction of a section of the line that would fit in with the Engineer-in-Chief's requirements. Has the railway ever been built?

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Yes, from Denmark to Nornalup.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: But not from Pemberton to Nornalup. A gentleman of my acquaintance who knows the country, says that to build the line would be a public scandal. Yet 75,000 people were to be brought out from the Old Country and placed in what they were told would be a paradise. We were to provide this, that and the other thing for them and we have not done it. I am not at all surprised that someone is now asking why. We know how anxious the Mother Country is to assist this portion of the Empire. Sir Otto Niemeyer told us that one part of Australia cannot succeed unless the whole of Australia succeeds, and the statesmen of the Empire know that the Empire cannot prosper unless every portion of it does so. Sir Otto has come to Australia to advise us of ways to overcome our difficulties. The redeeming feature of his statement is that we must balance our ledgers without any assistance from the Old Country. According to this morning's paper, Sir Otto goes further and says that we have to balance not only this year but every year. It is idle to attempt to sidetrack the issue. It is useless to appeal to the Arbitration Court and spar for time in that way. The position must be faced. The time is not far distant when, if it is not faced, we shall be left without funds with which to carry on, and should that stage be reached, calamity will be inevitable. There will be no need for that if someone will arise with courage enough to say what must be done and what will not be permitted. In the course of reading the other day, I came across a quotation by Abraham Lincoln, which ran, "With malice towards none, with charity for all, let us bind up the nation's wounds." If ever there was a time when the Parliament of the country was called to bind up the nation's wounds, it is the present. In my opening remarks I said I intended to say some hard things. I have applied the rod in order not to spoil the child, to the end that the people

of the State may appreciate the difficulties confronting them. The position must be faced. Apart from straight talking, any thing I can do to help the country of my birth out of its difficulties will be cheerfully done.

On motion by Hon. G. A. Kempton, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.28 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Tuesday, 26th August, 1930.*

	PAG.
Swearing in of member ... ..	4
Questions: North Perth school ... ..	4
Local products, preference, 1, Blackboy canteen, 2, Departmental contracts ... ..	4
Perth Causeway ... ..	4
Unemployment: 1, Sustenance; 2, Opossum trapping; 3, Country work ... ..	4
Forests Department ... ..	5
Kangaroo skin royalties ... ..	5
Committees for the Session ... ..	5
Sitting days and hours ... ..	5
Government business, precedence ... ..	5
Leave of absence ... ..	5
Ministerial statement, financial position ... ..	5
Assent to Bill ... ..	5
Address-in-reply, second day ... ..	5

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

### SWEARING IN OF MEMBER.

Mr. Lamond (Pilbara) took and subscribed the oath, and signed the roll.

### QUESTION—NORTH PERTH SCHOOL.

Mr. PANTON asked the Minister for Education: 1, Is it intended to carry out the promised additions to the North Perth school? 2, If so, when will the work be commenced?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Yes. 2, As soon as funds can be made available.