

sewerage or septic systems in them. Much trouble is experienced in getting sanitary contractors in the country. If the contractors give up the job altogether, the health of the community is likely to suffer severely. The sooner we can obtain water at all these towns, the sooner we can get down to a real health scheme. I implore the Government to attempt to get on with the job and make water available in these areas.

Hon. A. R. Jones: More water and less milk would be better.

Hon. L. A. LOGAN: It would be a good idea.

On motion by the Minister for Agriculture, debate adjourned.

BILL—MAIN ROADS ACT (FUNDS APPROPRIATION).

In Committee.

Resumed from the 11th October, Hon. A. L. Loton in the Chair: the Minister for Transport in charge of the Bill.

Clause 2—Act to be read in conjunction with Main Roads Act (partly considered):

The MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT: The only reason for the adjournment was that Mr. Fraser wanted time to give the Bill more study. There was no hint that he had anything special in mind.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3 to 7, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 9.6 p.m.

Legislative Assembly

Tuesday, 30th October, 1951.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Questions : Railways, (a) as to diesel car operating costs and passengers carried	303
(b) as to new time office, Midland Workshops	304
(c) as to Government iron and steel supplies to private firms	304
Iron and Steel Industry, as to establishment	304
Cement, as to establishment of additional works	304
Harbours, as to rockbreaker "Lobnitz"	304
Gold, as to price discussions and representation of prospectors	305
Migration, as to number of arrivals	305
Cottesloe Jetty, as to reconstruction	305
Sanitary pan depot, as to new site, Victoria Park	305
State Brick Works, as to report by Dr. Huber	306
Royal Visit, as to inclusion of Bunbury in Itinerary	306
Bills : Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment, 3r.	306
Wheat Marketing Act Amendment and Continuance, 3r.	306
Standing Orders suspension, Council's amendment	315
War Service Land Settlement Agreement, recom.	306
Co-opted Medical and Dental Services for the Northern portion of the State, Message, 2r.	307
Rights in Water and Irrigation Act Amendment, Message, 2r., Com., report	308
Lotteries (Control) Act Amendment, Message, 2r.	313
Pig Industry Compensation Act Amendment, returned	316
Native (Citizenship Rights) Act Amendment, Message, 2r.	316
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2r., Com., report	318
Annual Estimates, Com. of Supply, general debate	319
Speakers on financial policy—	
Mr. Ackland	319
Mr. Lawrence	326

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

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS.

(a) *As to Diesel Car Operating Costs and Passengers Carried.*

Mr. PERKINS asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) What are costs per mile (excluding permanent way and general capital and administration costs) of operating diesel rail cars—

- (a) wildflower class;
- (b) governor class?

(2) What are the average numbers of passengers over the latest three months for which figures are available on the diesel rail cars scheduled—

(a) Perth to Merredin, morning and afternoon, respectively, on the rail cars, at—

- (a) Cunderdin;
- (b) Kellerberrin;
- (c) Merredin;

(b) the return trip?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) On a basis of wages, fuel, maintenance and depreciation—

- (a) 50.61 pence;
- (b) 50.85 pence.

(2) (i) (a) Twenty-seven;

- (b) Seventeen;
- (c) Ten.

(ii) (a) Fourteen;

- (b) Eighteen;
- (c) Twenty-three.

(b) *As to New Time Office, Midland Workshops.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Has a contract been accepted for a new time office at Midland Junction Railway Workshops?

(2) What price has been agreed upon, or what is the cost, for building of time office to date?

(3) Was it not possible for employees in the Workshops to erect the time office?

(4) What number of squares is in the building?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Yes.

(2) Contract price is £4,096.

(3) Buildings such as this are not normally erected by the Workshops employees, but by the Civil Engineering Branch. The Department cannot at present undertake all the work authorised and advantage is taken of private contractors when conditions justify such action.

(4) 12.3.

(c) *As to Government Iron and Steel Supplies to Private Firms.*

Mr. BRADY asked the Minister representing the Minister for Railways:

(1) Is it the practice of the Midland (Government) Railway Stores Branch to supply iron and steel requirements to private firms?

(2) What are the quantities and prices of steel and iron supplied to—

(a) Tomlinson's Ltd;

(b) Hoskin's, Ltd., during the last financial year?

(3) Are stocks of iron and steel for replacement assured to the Government Railway Stores for future needs?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Only in special circumstances such as when work of an urgent nature is being undertaken for supply to the Department.

(2) (a) As our part of the contract for the manufacture of GE wagons, steel valued at £2,100 was supplied. In addition, 189 mild steel plates, 200 feet of nine inch by half inch mild steel flat were loaned and are to be replaced by the firm from stocks expected shortly.

(b) As there are insufficient covered vans to meet traffic requirements, 34 mild steel channels weighing approximately 9 tons and valued at £390 were supplied to enable the company to expedite completion of its contract for VB underframes, urgently required at Midland Junction for the erection of superstructures.

(3) Stocks are fairly satisfactory.

IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY.

As to Establishment.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

Has he received any further information regarding the report from Brasserts in relation to the steel industry?

The MINISTER replied:

The report has been delayed, owing, it is understood, to the illness of the head of the company in New York.

CEMENT.

As to Establishment of Additional Works.

Mr. GUTHRIE asked the Minister for Industrial Development:

(1) Can he inform the House of any further details regarding the cement works which are to be started?

(2) Is he in a position to give any further information as to where and when these works will commence?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) and (2) Investigations and negotiations have been proceeding, but discussions are still in the confidential stage.

HARBOURS.

As to Rockbreaker "Lobnitz."

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

(1) On what work is the rockbreaker "Lobnitz" engaged at present?

(2) When is it expected that the vessel will be used to break up the basalt in the Bunbury Harbour in accordance with information supplied to Parliament some time ago?

(3) What work has been done by the vessel during this year?

The MINISTER replied:

(1) The "Lobnitz" rockbreaker is at present tied up.

(2) The bucket dredger "Parmelia" is engaged stripping the overburden above the basalt floor in Bunbury Harbour. The quantity of basalt rock exposed by the "Parmelia" above the level of minus 32' 0" is much less than originally anticipated and it is not proposed, therefore, to commission the rockbreaker for some months.

(3) The rockbreaker has been laid up since May, 1951, prior to which it was used for the comprehensive testing of the basalt level and the thickness of overburden above it.

GOLD.

As to Price Discussions and Representation of Prospectors.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked the Premier:

Will he favourably consider the advisability of including a representative of prospectors when gold sales are being discussed between the goldmining industry and the Federal Treasurer on the 1st November?

The PREMIER replied:

The discussions referred to are between Commonwealth Treasury officials and the industry representatives who previously visited Canberra and who are well conversant with the whole position.

If, however, the Prospectors' Association likes to supply the Government with its views, I will see that they receive consideration.

MIGRATION.

As to Number of Arrivals.

Mr. HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Immigration:

(1) How many migrants entered this State for each of the years 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1950?

(2) How many migrant children of school age (under 14 years) entered this State in each of these years?

(3) How many migrants entered Australia in each of these years?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

(1) Western Australia—1946, not available; 1947, not available; 1948, 8,667; 1949, 16,205; 1950, 23,023.

(2) The only figures available are for the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1951, and individual age groups are not known. Up to 13 years—3,881.

(3) Australia — 1946, 18,217; 1947, 31,765; 1948, 65,739; 1949, 167,727; 1950, 174,540.

(These figures have been obtained from the Government Statistician and include both British migrants and New Australians).

COTTESLOE JETTY.

As to Reconstruction.

Mr. HUTCHINSON asked the Minister for Works:

As the Government has given considerable assistance towards the repair and rebuilding of river jetties, and in view of the Cottesloe Council's concern regarding the proposed demolition of the Cottesloe jetty, plus public feeling regarding same, will he reconsider the present proposal and take steps to reconstruct a new jetty?

The MINISTER replied:

The Government regrets that it has not the funds available with which to build and maintain jetties exposed to sea action, which are almost entirely used for pleasure purposes.

SANITARY PAN DEPOT.

As to New Site, Victoria Park.

Mr. GRIFFITH (without notice) asked the Minister for Health:

(1) Is she aware that the Perth City Council proposes to remove the sanitary pan depot and stable from where it is now situated in Rathay-st., Victoria Park, to a new site in Kent-st., Victoria Park?

(2) Does she know that the proposed new site is 110 yards from the nearest house, 250 yards from the Kent-st., High School and 240 yards from the Methodist Children's Home?

(3) Does she consider that this new site would jeopardise the health of the people and school children in the district?

(4) If so, will she take action to ensure that the Perth City Council obtains another site the choice of which would not jeopardise public health?

The MINISTER replied:

The hon. member intimated that he would ask these questions and I have been able to obtain the desired information.

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes.

(3) I am informed that it is the intention of the Perth City Council to use the new site for the following purposes only:—

(a) The stabling of horses. As the distance between the horses and any habitation is well outside the limit prescribed under the Health Act, there can be no objection.

(b) Pans which will be stored there will already have been cleaned, washed and tarred and will, therefore, be harmless from a health point of view.

(c) The carts and the pans will be stored under cover in a shed.

- (d) The site will be screened by trees and should not be objectionable from an aesthetic point of view.

It is considered that the presence of the depot in this situation will not constitute any danger to health.

(4) See (3) No workshop would be put up on the site and therefore there will be no noise. Staff amenities will be provided. An alternative proposal to use the sanitary site on the other side of the Collier Pine Plantation as the site for this depot has been considered by the City Council. All local authorities have extreme difficulty, because of labour shortages in fulfilling their obligations to maintain a sanitary pan service. The proposed depot will be situated at a strategic point so that empty pans may be collected for use without the carts having to make a long journey to and from the sanitary site, thus increasing greatly the time occupied in any pan round, and increasing the difficulties in supplying a service.

STATE BRICKWORKS.

As to Report by Dr. Huber.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN (without notice) asked the Minister for Housing:

Will he table the report by Dr. Huber on the erection of new works for the State Brickworks?

The MINISTER replied:

As I have no knowledge of any such report, I ask that notice of the question be given.

ROYAL VISIT.

As to Inclusion of Bunbury in Itinerary.

Mr. GUTHRIE (without notice) asked the Premier:

Will the Premier consider recommending that Princess Elizabeth and the Duke of Edinburgh visit Bunbury if Busselton is included in their itinerary?

The PREMIER replied:

The programme for the Royal Visit has been drawn up by a committee which met in Sydney recently after the return of General Berryman from London. Many requests are being received for visits to be paid by the Princess and Duke to various towns. Time does not permit of those visits being made, and the reason for the visit to Busselton is that there is an aerodrome at that place at which a landing can be made.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1. Coal Mines Regulation Act Amendment.
2. Wheat Marketing Act Amendment and Continuance.

Transmitted to the Council.

BILL—WAR SERVICE LAND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

Recommittal.

On motion by the Minister for Education, Bill recommitted for the further consideration of Clause 6.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair: the Minister for Education (for the Minister for Lands) in charge of the Bill.

Clause 6—Granting of tenures:

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The amendments I shall propose have arisen out of a discussion in the Committee stage. When I made a few remarks in support of the Minister for Lands on this clause, I was under the impression that the objection taken by the member for Melville had reference to the principle of permitting amendments of one Act to be incorporated in another Act, and was not aware until subsequently that he had raised the question whether there could be any doubt as to the validity of regulations made under such a clause. Accordingly I agreed that the point should be submitted to the Crown Law officers, and there some difference of opinion seems to exist. A careful perusal of the clause will show that the Land Act is first referred to and then reference is made to regulations having force and effect under that Act. I appreciate the point raised by the hon. member and I believe any doubt that might have existed can be clarified as I suggest. I move an amendment—

That after the word "regulations" in line 10 of Subclause (1) (c) the words "under that Act" be inserted.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I had two objections originally. Firstly, I did not like, and still do not like, trying to do by regulation something that certain Acts set out shall not be done, but what I took strongest objection to was the attempt to provide for regulations in one Act giving power to over-ride the provisions of some other Act. I thought that a most undesirable practice, and I doubted whether it could be validly done. The more I thought about it, the more I thought it could not be done; although I believe certain persons in the Crown Law Department still say it can. With all due respect to those persons, my view is that it is not possible to take power under one Act to make regulations to over-ride some other Act. I base my contention on this reasoning: Obviously, in certain circumstances, it is possible to have a regulation ultra vires the Act under which it is made, because it over-rides the Act or goes beyond the powers or scope of the Act.

If it is possible to have a regulation ultra vires of the Act under which it is made, then I say most definitely that such a regulation would be ultra vires if it over-ride some other Act. That is why I took

the stand I did and told the Government I thought it was doing something it should not do. I told the Premier he should have another look at the Bill, and I suggested that progress be reported so that it could be examined and put right. The Minister declined to do that, but he subsequently held up the third reading. I agree to what the Minister now proposes to do because of the special circumstances or nature of the Act.

There is an Act for war service land settlement which deals with a specific thing, and if we amend the Land Act to make it sufficiently wide in scope to permit something to be done which is not now sufficiently well known to be clear, but nevertheless has to be provided for under a contingency, and if it has to be done by an amendment of the Land Act, then it might not be wholly desirable. So I have agreed, in consultation with the Minister, that the amendment is a big improvement on the previous position, inasmuch as it purports to give power to make regulations under the Land Act. We are stating in this Act that if it is necessary to take certain power which is now outside the scope of the Land Act, we can get that power by making a regulation under the Land Act for the purpose; and so that we will not have the situation of a regulation under the Land Act over-riding the Land Act, we are to amend the Land Act by this Bill by saying that the Land Act has been amended accordingly.

This method of legislating has not a great deal to commend it. If we are going to amend Acts, we should amend the Acts themselves without putting provisions into other Acts. But I do agree, with regard to land settlement—and there is a precedent for what is being done now—which deals with one specific type of settlement, that anyone interested in that subject would naturally read that Act first and would find the provision contained in it that the Land Act was being amended to enable something specific to be done in connection with land settlement. Because of that need, I am prepared to waive the objection I had before, although I still do not like the principle of amending one Act by altering another. It should not be followed extensively. I think it only adds to the confusion of the Act and, incidentally, to the fees of the lawyers, because it gives them more scope for different interpretations, and there is plenty of scope now. Now that we have the Bill dealing with something specific, and we have got over the objection I had previously, that we were going to try to over-ride some other Act by regulations under this Act, I am prepared to agree to what is being done.

Mr. Marshall: It would be ultra vires. The Government could not do it.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: I think what the Government now proposes to do is all right.

Mr. Marshall: I have my doubts.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: We propose to say now that we are going to amend the Land Act in this way. We are competent to amend that Act, which is quite a different matter from giving the Minister power to make regulations under this Act, and then to go away from Parliament and over-ride the provisions of the Land Act by those regulations. That is a different proposition from the one before us, because here the House is in a position to consider whether or not it is desirable that the Land Act be amended in this way.

If the House says it does not desire that the Land Act be amended in this manner, then the Land Act will not be amended, and the Minister cannot make regulations to over-ride it. So Parliament will determine that. But under the Government's original proposal we were to give the Minister power to make regulations, so that he could make a regulation which would over-ride the Land Act. My view then—and it is the same now—was that to alter some Act of Parliament by a regulation made under another Act would be ultra vires the Act and would have no force or effect. I am glad the Government has had the matter further considered and now proposes to take a different course.

Amendment put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to paragraph (c) of Subclause (1):—
“and that Act is deemed to be amended accordingly.”

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported with further amendments.

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

Message.

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

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. Dame Florence Cardell-Oliver—Subiaco) [5.0] in moving the second reading said: This is a very short Bill. I am very glad to see the member for Leederville in his seat because, having held the position which I now hold, he understands what I am driving at—I say that without casting any reflection upon other members. I am sorry that the member for Kimberley is not here because he, too, would understand the position, as would the member for Eyre. From time to time emergencies arise in the northern portion of this State requiring additional medical assistance which is not locally available. On past occasions the Commonwealth Government has co-oper-

ated by permitting medical officers from the Northern Territory to fly into our State to render urgently needed aid. The Commonwealth is prepared to continue to assist us in such a way.

However, as the law relating to the practice of medicine in this State stands, these practitioners are acting illegally in that they are not registered with the Medical Board. In an emergency we must not pause to consider whether a medical practitioner holds a registration certificate or otherwise. Nevertheless, in accepting the services of these officers we should ensure that they are not exposed to legal proceedings because they have rendered us aid in good faith. The Commonwealth feels that we should rectify the position by exempting these practitioners from the normal former requirements relating to registration.

A similar situation exists in regard to dentistry. The Commonwealth maintains a travelling dental clinic in the Northern Territory. In the course of a tour it is sometimes necessary for this clinic to use roads which bring it across the border into Western Australia. The dental officers are quite prepared to render treatment to residents of Western Australia who live along the route. They, however, are legally debarred from so doing by the requirement in the Dentists Act which provides that they should first be registered with the Dental Board.

A few weeks ago, when I was in Wyndham, I was approached by a number of residents, who asked me to have this Bill passed through Parliament as quickly as possible because a dental van was due to cross the border. The residents told me that this travelling dentist did wonderful work, and that the equipment in the van was estimated to be worth about £20,000. Because of the work these dentists are doing, the residents in those areas are very eager to have their services made available.

This Bill seeks to legalise the emergency services which may in the future be provided by Commonwealth medical practitioners and the casual dental treatment provided by the Commonwealth travelling dental clinic. Clause 2 of the Bill defines dentistry and medicine. It also limits the application of the exemption to be granted under this Bill to that portion of the State north of the 22nd parallel. This is that portion of the State north of a line drawn east from the North-West Cape. I looked this up on the map and it is quite apparent that the 22nd parallel should be the limit. It will, therefore, not interfere with the rights of private practitioners, nor will it affect any portion of the State where the services of private practitioners are readily available.

Another clause of the Bill empowers the Minister to co-opt the services of medical and dental practitioners in the employ

of the Commonwealth Government for service in the northern area—as may be agreed with the Commonwealth Minister for Health. Clause 4 grants a practitioner, whose services have been co-opted, the legal right of practice and exemption from registration as at present required by the Medical Act. Clause 5 requires that the names of co-opted practitioners shall be published and confers legal recognition upon certificates issued by such practitioners.

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: What is the number of that clause?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I do not think I am supposed to give the numbers of clauses, am I? I was hoping that the Speaker was not listening to me numbering the clauses.

Hon. A. H. Panton: The hon. member is trying to lead you astray.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I think it makes the Bill much easier for members to understand. It is possible that in an emergency a recently appointed officer of the Commonwealth may be called upon to render aid before the formality of publishing his name has been observed. It is, therefore, provided that the Minister may certify that such practitioner shall be deemed to have been co-opted. A further clause empowers the Governor to make regulations in order to facilitate the operation of the Act.

This Bill is necessary in order to meet the peculiar circumstances which pertain in the northern portion of our State, due to its remoteness and the fact that in the Northern Territory we have available the professional services of medical and dental practitioners who are willing to render assistance in an emergency, and frequently are more readily available than similar persons in the lower portion of this State. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. A. H. Panton, debate adjourned.

BILL—RIGHTS IN WATER AND IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Message.

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

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

MR. HOAR (Warren) [5.7]: This Bill seeks to amend the Rights in Water and Irrigation Act and, firstly, I wish to thank the Minister for his clear exposition of what is intended in the Bill. A number of Bills come before Parliament, as most

members realise, and frequently the Minister does not take the trouble to make a careful explanation of the Bill he is introducing.

Hon. A. H. Panton: It must have been clear water that he had in his mind.

Mr. HOAR: In this particular case, there can be no such complaint about the manner of the introduction. The importance of the Act itself is well known to all members, and I do not suppose the agricultural districts of this State could have developed to the extent they have unless some Government, about the year 1914, had taken the trouble to bring before Parliament the necessity for providing water in these particular areas. I doubt whether this State will develop to the extent we desire, or carry the population that we hope it will carry in the years to come, unless this or any succeeding Government is prepared to continue the expenditure of large sums of money for irrigation purposes.

Apart from what might be termed a few more or less minor amendments contained in the Bill, the main purpose of it is to obtain additional revenue from the farmers of the irrigation areas so that a greater amount of the capital outlay may be met by those farmers instead of the Government, as applies at the moment. With the exception of one or two main amendments, I think most members will agree with the measure as a whole.

Section 11 of the principal Act, in effect, gives power to the Crown to enter a property for the purpose of preventing any interference with the water course. But that section of the Act limits the activity to clearing and deepening the channel, whereas the Bill seeks to include the additional work, if necessary, of straightening and otherwise altering the channel. So far as I am concerned, I can see nothing very much to object to in that. Section 11 deals principally with matters that are, in effect, illegal and an offence against the Act. So I do not feel disposed to prevent any officer of the Crown from carrying out his responsibilities in respect of the Act, by refusing him these additional powers. If the Minister will have a look at the section in question he will agree with me that it deals principally with the matters I have raised.

There are two other minor amendments in regard to Section 25. The Minister proposes to delete Subsections (3) and (4). I have no objection to that because those subsections deal solely with the power to draw up regulations, the publication of regulations and the laying of regulations on the Table of the House within a prescribed time. All these matters are dealt with fully in the Regulations Act which every member has before him. The proposed amendment to Section 42, the two proposed new sections, and also the amend-

ment in respect of Section 59, could be better taken together for the purposes of debate because they are, collectively, the main purpose of the Bill. Those particular provisions deal with the proposal to change completely the present method of supplying and charging for water. They are, therefore, the backbone of the Bill.

In introducing the measure the Minister stated that the Government had invested a large sum of money—I think it was roughly about £2,300,000—in the irrigation works of the South-West and he did not seem satisfied with the return the Government was getting from the farmers in the irrigation areas of the South-West. He said there was a need for a greater return of money in respect to outlay of capital involved. I think that inspired the Minister to bring this Bill before Parliament. When he mentioned that particular fact I would have been more pleased if he could have given the House some information, or a rough estimate, of the amount of revenue being obtained each year from the irrigation areas so that we might be able to judge better the value of this particular Bill and the necessity for an amendment to the Act.

Hon. A. H. Panton: They are all in the Premier's electorate, so the Government would not be getting any.

The Premier: None of them is now.

Mr. HOAR: Furthermore, the Minister stated that the department itself is doing everything possible to encourage the settlers to produce more from each acre that they hold. In that regard I would like to know, as the Minister has omitted to tell us, what the department has been doing over the years to encourage farmers to produce more. Is it his, or the department's intention to change the system of agriculture in certain areas that are not, in his opinion, returning sufficient money to the Government by, if not insisting, then advising strongly certain farmers to go into different forms of agriculture? Is that the intention of the Minister? If not, what has the department been doing over the years to encourage farmers to grow more of whatever they are growing, and produce more on their particular acreage which is being irrigated today? I have heard from him the question of the cost of establishing a system of irrigation throughout the South-West.

But when the Minister speaks of the cost in a money sense, it does not impress me very much because I look upon irrigation projects in just the same way as I do railways and other large Government undertakings which become, and are in fact, vital to the opening up and development of any new country. Consequently any Government of any particular colour must be prepared and willing to invest large sums of money in respect of all those and other matters too, without any

immediate thought of a great amount of return. Even though it is a day of good prices, I am wondering whether the Minister is not to some extent premature in attempting to draw from the farmers of these areas more than they are paying under the present system of water distribution.

The proposal in the Bill is to change over from a system of watering on a broad acre basis at the rate of 9s. per acre as a minimum for one watering, and 3s. per acre for each additional watering to a system of meter registration providing for minimum charges and excess water charges. In order to achieve his objective and get more income, why is it necessary for the Minister to install meters? Would not the same result be achieved by increasing the excess water charge under the old system of 3s. an acre for any additional use of water? Would not that have been the better way—to increase it to say 4s. or 5s. as the case may be in order to give the Government additional revenue?

I am quite certain that the Minister could not have had much experience in regard to the use of meters to assess the value of water. In my opinion, if these meters are established—and it looks as though they will be if this Bill goes through—there will be a very substantial increase in the contribution farmers are now making towards the liquidation of this debt. I agree that they are in a position today to bear some initial cost, but I hope the Minister will not make the installation of these meters widespread throughout the whole of the irrigation areas until the facts have become properly known, and he is better able to judge just what the result of that particular amount of payment will be on the farmers generally. When introducing the Bill I think the Minister was to some extent critical of the methods of farming in the irrigation areas and said in fact that the farmers were not irrigating their land properly.

There is not much use in the Minister's complaining that the farmers are not irrigating their areas efficiently when they have not the wherewithal to do it. What I want to know is what has the Government and the department done in order to provide suitable and adequate equipment for the grading of land in those areas so that the farmers there might be able to farm their properties more efficiently? I think that by putting in meters today we are going to increase greatly the charges on the farmer without doing anything to increase his efficiency. I feel the two matters are complementary and they should be taken together because the problem is not so much one of money—as to whether the Government is getting this or that back in relation to its capital outlay—but I think it resolves itself into what the Government is doing to en-

courage farmers in those areas to grow their crops and produce more efficiently than they are doing today.

The Minister should give some thought to that angle of the problem. I am not opposing the second reading of the Bill in any way at all, but I do think the Government should give some attention to helping the farmers in those areas to obtain the equipment necessary, and to assist them if this is required to purchase it on a co-operative footing. Possibly a sort of pool arrangement could be arrived at or the Government could provide the equipment on a contract basis. Something on these lines will have to be done otherwise, not only will the farmer not farm efficiently, but there will be a lot of water not used to the best advantage and being paid for under the increased charges.

The Premier: I think you will get some of the information you require on page 16 of the Estimates.

Mr. HOAR: I will be interested to hear what the Minister has to say. I support the second reading.

MR. MANNING (Harvey) [5.21]: Like the member for Warren, I also support the Bill, and would like to make some comment upon it. I will try to explain briefly how the present system of measuring water in the irrigation areas is being changed and its effect on the farmers and farming generally. As an illustration I will take a farm of 90 acres where a farmer is allowed to water one in every three acres. This would permit him to water 30 acres. There is a small area in the old Harvey district in which they water each and every acre and their rate for each of these acres is 9s.; they are allowed water for each of these acres. But in the new areas—apart from a small area in Harvey—they are allowed to water one in three acres of the total holding, that is if irrigable.

Under the system provided in the Bill, on a 90-acre farm the water will be measured in acre feet instead of under the present system of acres wetted—the farmer being allowed say three acre-feet of water for one acre of land each season. The question of water rights crops up. Under the old system, the farmer had a water right under which he was allowed to water one in three, or 30 acres on a 90-acre farm. We must have some method of assessing a water right. I would suggest that this be assessed by acre-feet. On a 90-acre farm, 30 acres of which would be irrigated, we would have three acre-feet of water per acre, allowing an average season, and for the 30 acres watered approximately 90 acre-feet of water.

I suggest that the farmer's water right should be worked out on a basis of 90 acre-feet of water per season for 30 acres. That is the system on which we should work. As the Minister stated, this measure has been asked for by the Irrigation Com-

mission and by a majority of the farmers. They are asking for this because of the basis on which it would be worked out. Where previously we were restricted to water one in three, or 30 acres only, under this system, if the water right covers 90 acres per season, then if the farmer is careful and thrifty and waters in such a manner as to accumulate a surplus of water, which he has not used, then it will be possible for him to water over and above the 30 acres. Thirty acres is just a basis on which to illustrate.

Most farmers like to start off their new clover in March with flooding by irrigation waters. This cannot be done under the present system unless one buys accommodation water, because the rates are assessed at 9s. an acre which entitled one to a first watering of each acre; after that one pays 3s. an acre. That is under the present system. If one wished to water three acres of dry land one would have to pay 9s. for the one and only watering. Therefore the farmer is looking to the new system of measurement in acre-feet. By this method, if a pasture has had five waterings, the farmer will feel that if he has a surplus of water and if his irrigation pastures require no further irrigation he can use what he still has in his water-right on these dry lands at no additional cost. Farmers are quite in favour of the method because they are looking to it to improve their farming practice.

The Minister and the member for Warren touched on the question of graders and the work they do in preparing land for laying down irrigation pastures. The whole of this State's main irrigation areas are in my electorate, and the position in regard to graders is very serious indeed. This year we have 850 acres of new land booked and waiting to be graded by the Government power graders. This is apart from the land that is being privately graded.

The Minister for Works: How many acres?

Mr. MANNING: 850 acres.

The Minister for Works: How many farmers?

Mr. MANNING: Four machines are necessary for this work but there is not a single machine in operation. The position is very serious because if the laying down of irrigation pastures is to be satisfactory it must be done without delay, otherwise the land will lie idle. The time for sowing pasture is November and early December; if it is sown later it will suffer from the hot summer days. If this pasture could be got down now or early in December it will be well under way before the full force of the summer is able to effect it. For the last month farmers have been preparing land for grading and now they find that no graders are working, and this creates a very serious position.

Mr. Perkins: What sort of graders do you want?

Mr. MANNING: The same type as is used by the Main Road Board.

Mr. Perkins: They use various types, some good, some medium and others entirely indifferent.

Mr. MANNING: Provided they work satisfactorily, they will do. Big graders are used but it is not necessary to have the biggest and heaviest graders, although they do a most efficient job and do it quickly. The member for Warren touched on one or two other points, such as additional irrigation from water. Looking at this proposed system, I do not see that that would offer any additional revenue to the Government. I look at it as water saved. The new system would encourage the farmer to be thrifty and to use his water to the best advantage.

Mr. Hoar: If it does not produce more revenue it will be a failure. That is the Minister's intention, and he said so.

Mr. MANNING: I was not aware of that. I would anticipate the Minister expecting from the altered system increased production rather than merely increased rates. In assessing the price of milk, irrigation rates are taken into consideration; and, if the irrigation rates are increased, the price of milk to the producer would also go up. The member for Warren mentioned the use of graders as the best means of increasing production and I regard that as the most speedy. The sooner land can be put under pasture the sooner it will come into production. Under the system proposed in the Bill the method of measuring water represents a considerable improvement on present-day conditions. Undoubtedly some objections will be raised to the Bill, because under the proposed scheme there must be a certain distance between the watering take-off point and the meter.

As members will appreciate, the meter is placed at the entrance to a man's property and the watering point will be on an average from two to 2½ chains away. The effect of that is to leave unwatered a considerable area of land adjacent to the meter whereas under existing conditions the water is sand-bagged up so that it can flow over all parts of the block. Under the new proposals the water will have to develop a flow in the distance between the meter and the watering point so that the water will pass through the gauge, and be correctly measured before passing into the head ditch. When the whole system is considered, I believe the new method will prove the more satisfactory in the long run because, with the extra speed of flow, the run of water over the property, will be far more efficient than at present. I realise there are arguments for and against the provisions of the Bill, but those in favour of it outweigh those against it.

I am glad of this opportunity to bring under the notice of the Minister the serious position with regard to graders. The farmers are becoming very anxious in that regard. Four graders are needed and none is available.

Mr. Perkins: Do you pay much for the use of graders?

Mr. MANNING: Yes. I think the charge is £3 15s. per hour, but I would not like that figure to be taken as definite.

Mr. Perkins: Why cannot private individuals supply the graders?

Mr. MANNING: Private persons are operating but not at present with actual land graders. What work is done along those lines is with bulldozers. These private contractors do bulldozing in the winter months and during the summer engage in land grading. However, the 850 acres I have referred to represent the area booked up to be done by Government graders, quite apart from anything done by private contractors with bulldozers.

Mr. Perkins: Would it not be possible to obtain graders from the Main Roads Department or the Public Works Department?

Mr. MANNING: No, because those graders are wanted for road work and, when not engaged in that manner, are used not for irrigation purposes but for road work for local authorities.

Mr. Perkins: They are borrowed from whom?

Mr. MANNING: From the Public Works Department. I support the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY

(Hon. D. Brand—Greenough—in reply) [5.35]: I was glad to hear members who represent irrigation areas expressing their opinions, from the practical standpoint, regarding the desirability of the Bill. Emphasis was laid on the point I mentioned with regard to the intention to obtain additional income as a set-off against the very heavy capital outlay over the years. I repeat that it is the desire of the department to secure a greater return, but it has not necessarily been established that, because of the installation of meters, there would be an increase in the income. The introduction of meters will lay down a foundation, and provide a system whereby greater economy will be exercised in the use of water.

All the water used will be paid for, and that should result in more efficient farming and greater economy in its use by individual farmers. That should have the effect of securing a better grading of the land and, by means of the better spread of water, more economic use of it. The charges per gallon for water through the meter have not been ar-

rived at; they will be decided by the commission itself. Nevertheless, once established, the meter system will ensure a finer adjustment in regard to increases in rates that may be made from time to time, and the charges will be equitably distributed over the areas irrigated.

One point mentioned was the acceptance of the meter system by everyone concerned. We know that such changes are not always acceptable to everyone immediately, but it is interesting to note that the metering system for water has operated in other States for a number of years, and no changes have been made. Therefore, the authorities and those concerned in the other States must be satisfied with it. With regard to the contention raised by the member for Harvey respecting the distance between the meter and the watering point, the same position must have arisen in other States and apparently it presented no difficulty there. If it has not been solved, I dare say that, by means of co-operation between the farmers concerned here and the departmental officials, some solution will be found and an allowance made if a farmer is suffering in any way.

As to the responsibility of the Government to supply graders to grade land, we come up against the point that has been made so often, namely, that there are not sufficient graders to go round. What graders are available have been used on the main roads and then subsequently are made available to local governing authorities. Graders have a very widespread use, and I can assure the member for Harvey and the member for Warren that the Government, equally with the farmers, is waiting—

Mr. Manning: Anxiously waiting.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY:—is anxiously waiting for more graders. The department appreciates the position and as soon as possible, taking into consideration the demand for graders in different parts of the State, will make some available.

Mr. Perkins: Why cannot the department use the graders available in the wheatbelt, where the local authorities have a surplus of them and are anxious to hire them to the Government at cheap rates?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY: That is another question which has been raised previously by the member for Roe from time to time. The Government endeavours where possible to encourage the Main Roads Department, as the hon. member himself knows, to use the machinery available from local governing authorities. If there are in the hon. member's district graders owned by local authorities, which are not in use and are standing idly in the yards, I feel the

position should be investigated immediately. I agree whole-heartedly that something should be done in that respect, but I am sure the member for Roe appreciates the fact that what is applicable in some parts does not apply in other instances.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Perkins in the Chair; the Minister for Water Supply in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Section 59 amended:

Mr. HOAR: I omitted to mention, when speaking to the Bill a little while ago, the advisability or otherwise of striking out from Section 59 the words which the Minister proposes shall be deleted, namely, "subject to the provisions of this Act" with a view to inserting in lieu the words "with the approval of the Governor." This applies to a district irrigation board, which has power to make bylaws. The board should at least make those bylaws "subject to the provisions of this Act."

I believe that nearly all Acts of Parliament are governed that way. When a board such as this has power to make bylaws it should be specifically stated that they must be according to the Act. It is not my intention to move to endeavour to defeat the Minister's suggestion to include the words, with the approval of the Governor" because such approval is necessary for a board of that description. But I do not think the matter should be left open for any board to make bylaws outside the scope of the Act, and it is as well to leave the other words in and to include after them the words "with the approval of the Governor."

I also want a clear definition of proposed new paragraph (6a). Do the words "minimum quantity of water to be charged for" mean the minimum quantity on the basis of a minimum amount of money in respect to a meter? For instance, in a house where a meter is established for water purposes, one knows how much water one can buy for a certain amount of money. Is that the purpose of the new paragraph, or is there any other significance attached to it?

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY: I am advised that owing to the fact that Section 25 of the Act, dealing with bylaws, was repealed, this amendment, substituting for the words "subject to the provisions of this Act" the words "with the approval of the Governor" became necessary.

Mr. Hoar: That section deals entirely with regulations and not bylaws.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY: Yes, it was a specific point made by the Crown Law Department, and I regarded

this as just a machinery provision, made necessary because of the repeal of Section 25.

Mr. Hoar: It would be wise to leave the words in just the same.

The MINISTER FOR WATER SUPPLY: I will have that point clarified and, if necessary, will have an alteration made in another place. The point raised in connection with the new paragraph (6a), prescribing scales of charges for water supplied and the minimum quantity of water to be charged for is made clear when we recall that meters are being installed for the registration of water for irrigation purposes. Scales of charges for quantities of water supplied must be provided for in bylaws to be made. The provision in the amending clause for a minimum quantity of water to be charged for is necessary in the same way as in the previous arrangement where the minimum watering of five acres is to be charged for on the basis of 3s. per acre, even though a lesser acreage is involved. A farmer may call for a couple of acres to be irrigated. A certain amount of work is involved on the part of the officer concerned, and it is necessary to have a minimum charge. The proposed new bylaw works on the basis of a minimum quantity of water rather than on that of a minimum charge or acreage.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 8, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

**BILL—LOTTERIES (CONTROL) ACT
AMENDMENT.**

Message.

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

Second Reading.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. V. Doney—Narrogin) [5.51] in moving the second reading said: This Bill seeks to amend several of the provisions of the principal Act, the view being to bring the law regarding lotteries more into line with present-day requirements. It is a little surprising to me that a measure which has been so much in the public eye as this one for the past 18 years should, for the whole of that period, have continued in operation without major amendments of any kind. There have certainly been a couple of small amendments dealing with the fees payable to the chairman and the commissioners; but, apart from that, there have been no amendments whatever; only a string of continuance Bills.

The Lotteries (Control) Act, which was passed in 1932, conferred upon the Commission constituted thereunder power to conduct lotteries in order to raise money for charitable purposes and to regulate

and control raffles, art unions, sweepstakes and a number of other similar devices which were then being promoted throughout the State on an increasing scale. Several amendments embodied in the Bill have become necessary owing to the marked expansion of the Commission's activities, resulting, as one can easily assume, from the greatly increased public support of State lotteries during recent years.

It will be appreciated that certain provisions of the Act, which originally allowed for the conduct of only 15 consultations per year, must necessarily be amended in order to meet the altered circumstances of today, circumstances which were certainly not contemplated when the measure was first passed. By comparison with the 15 lotteries I have just mentioned, there are now no fewer than 70 consultations per year, and it is quite on the cards that even that number may be substantially increased in the relatively near future.

In most countries lottery legislation creates quite a deal of heat, not only in the Parliaments of those countries but also in public places. Having that in mind, it is heartening to realise that our State lotteries have operated with a minimum of criticism for slightly over 18 years and during that period—and the figure I am about to quote may surprise some members—hospitals and charitable bodies have benefited from the consultations by no less a sum than £2,500,000.

It is not my intention on this occasion to indulge in a review of the Commission's activities. Members may recall that this was fully spoken to by me as recently as last year when the Bill to continue the operations of the measure for a further three years was before the House. Parliament's decision on that occasion to extend the life of the legislation from three years to five years represented surely—and I know very well all members will contribute to this conclusion—an acknowledgement of the very efficient and impartial manner in which the Commission over the years had discharged its responsibilities to the public.

It might be appropriate if at this juncture I were to do what I have done before and compliment Hon. James Kenneally, the chairman of the Commission, on his wholly just, certainly wise, and very certainly equitable attitude towards his responsibilities. I would also like to praise the work of the secretary to the commission, Mr. Jack Green, who, in my judgment and knowledge of his work and general character could not be improved upon. Equally, too, from inquiries I have made, one might offer compliments as well to the three commissioners, for whom the chairman himself had nothing but praise when I was discussing this matter with him recently.

Members who are in the habit of perusing the tabled reports of the Auditor General will have noticed that attention has been drawn by him to the discontinuance by the Commission of the preparation of statements covering each lottery. Members will find that this is required by Section 15. For reasons I will explain in the Committee stage it is proposed to amend that section to permit of a continuance of the present practice of furnishing consolidated statements covering a group of lotteries instead of a statement covering one lottery.

There certainly has been some little infringement of the law in the discontinuance of the habit of submitting one report on one lottery. I think the negligence commenced something like six or seven years ago and since it was not unduly criticised by the Auditor General, the practice, which is quite a harmless one, continued. It is thought wise, under the present measure, to ask the House to legalise the practice. The amending Act of 1938 provided that unexpended profits from lotteries should be paid into a special bank account. That account was built up during the war period, and since then, by moneys held for approved commitments which, for various reasons—principally the shortage of building materials and so on—could not be proceeded with.

The Auditor General considers that the Commission's action in investing a substantial part of those funds in Commonwealth inscribed stock, although certainly not strictly in accordance with the requirements of the Act, was, nevertheless, reasonable in the circumstances. It is therefore proposed to amend Section 10 in order to authorise such an investment and provide that interest and profit on the sale of stock shall be applied, as in all other cases, to charitable purposes. Approval is also sought for the disposal by the Lotteries Commission of premises known as 107-111 Murray-st. That structure was purchased in 1946 for the purpose of accommodating the Commission's rapidly growing staff, and to provide permanent facilities for the conducting of lottery drawings.

The Commission, when it purchased that building, held the view that it would be entirely suited to the purposes mentioned but, when the question of alterations, renovations and so on was referred to the Principal Architect, Mr. Clare, the decision was that by far the best course to follow would be to demolish the whole structure and rebuild it. That was something of a setback to the Commission, but it must not be taken as implying that the structure would not be suited to some other purpose. The fact is that the building is just not suited to the purposes of the Commission, and so it became necessary

to acquire another property. That acquired is situated at 108 Murray-st. and is therefore almost immediately opposite the other building.

This more recently purchased structure is likely to be ready for occupation by the Commission as soon as the present tenant can acquire alternative office accommodation. This leads me to an announcement of the fact that the Commission, under the present Act, although it is empowered to buy real property, is not empowered to sell it. The Bill, therefore, contains an amendment seeking authority for the disposal of the property at 107-111 Murray-st., which the Commission has no wish to retain purely as an investment. The policy of the Commission in relation to the regulation and control of raffles has been to limit the number of raffles that an organisation may conduct in any prescribed period and, in addition, to fix the minimum subscription and the price of tickets, and generally to ensure that raffles are conducted in a regular manner so that the interests of subscribers are adequately safeguarded.

The Act provides that the Commission, before recommending any application for permission to conduct a lottery, shall refer the application to the Commissioner of Police for investigation and report as to the suitability of the person or persons desiring to conduct the proposed raffle or lottery. The Bill proposes that the referring of applications for police investigation shall henceforth be at the discretion of the Commission. Having had long experience of those bodies that regularly apply for permission to conduct raffles, the Commission no longer needs advice as to their character and ability properly to conduct raffles, and so, in future, all that will be necessary will be for the Commission to submit to the police, at its own discretion, the cases of new applicants or of such of the old ones as, for any reason, may appear in a rather dubious light.

There is only one further amendment to which attention need be drawn and it is designed to relieve the Commission of any penal consequences in relation to the payment of prizes to infants, or persons suffering any other legal disability. Those that I have referred to and a few other contentious amendments will be fully explained when the measure is in the Committee stage. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. B. Sleeman, debate adjourned.

BILL—WHEAT MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT AND CONTINUANCE.

Council's Message.

Message from the Council received and read notifying that it had agreed to the Bill subject to an amendment.

Standing Orders Suspension.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable Legislative Council's Message No. 17 to be taken into consideration forthwith.

I am asking the House to agree that the Standing Order, which prevents the Legislative Council's message being taken into consideration on the day on which it is received, be suspended, because it is necessary that this amendment should be considered and, I hope, agreed to, today, in order that the measure may be passed before the 31st October, which is the date of its expiry. As today is the 30th, it is obvious that action must be taken promptly. Members may rest assured that the amendment is a simple one, following on an undertaking given by the Minister in this House that it would be moved in another place.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The Minister for Education spoke to me about this a few moments ago and gave me to understand that the proceedings now under way would take place after the tea suspension.

The Minister for Education: I expected the previous speaker to continue a little longer.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I have no objection to the Government asking for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable this House to complete consideration of the amendment made to the Bill by the Legislative Council, as I quite understand that the matter is urgent in view of the fact that the parent Act expires tomorrow.

The Premier: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was quite agreeable to the amendment.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: How do you know?

The Premier: Because he said so.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I cannot allow the Premier to urge me at this stage. I am not raising any objection to the suspension of the Standing Order but am pointing out that, until a few moments ago, I was under the impression that the move to suspend the Standing Orders would not take place until after the tea suspension.

The Premier: It will not, unless we are pretty quick.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: I am sure it will not. I am hoping that before we are called upon to give consideration to the amendment some, if not all, members will have opportunity of seeing in black and white what it is all about.

Mr. Marshall: I have looked for it, but it is not on the notice paper.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: The amendment made by the Legislative Council to the Bill is not on the notice paper, and could not be because the Legislative Council did not receive this measure until this afternoon. The progress of the Bill in another place was well organised, because it was dealt with expeditiously and passed through all stages there this afternoon. The Bill was amended in Committee and the amendment made by the Council is now to come before this House and will, with the passage of the motion with which we are dealing, have to be considered by members.

The Premier: For the benefit of the member for Fremantle, I would point out that it is merely desired to give a vote to the suppliers of wheat to flour mills.

Mr. Marshall: Was the Bill introduced into the Legislative Council this afternoon?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! There is too much heckling going on.

Hon. A. R. G. HAWKE: You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the third reading of the Bill was dealt with in this House this afternoon, following which the Bill was transmitted to the Legislative Council, where it passed through all stages.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER EDUCATION (in reply): It has been suggested to me that I did not make perfectly plain to members the amendment proposed by the Legislative Council and for which the House was asked to suspend Standing Orders. I had thought it was more desirable to give full details of that when the matter was being discussed in Committee, but in order to satisfy members that the suspension of Standing Orders is not unreasonable I would like to say that it followed a suggestion made here that certain wheat-growers would be disfranchised if only the roll of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. was accepted as the basis of record for their votes, and the suggestion was made in another place that provision could be inserted that those who supply wheat to flour mills in various parts of Western Australia could also be included. That is what the amendment purports to do, and the suspension of Standing Orders has been moved now in order that this message may be dealt with because it is the only way to have this legislation completed before the 31st October. I therefore ask the House to agree to the motion.

Question put.

Mr. SPEAKER: As there is an absolute majority of the House in favour of the motion, and there being no dissenting voice I declare it passed.

Question thus passed.

Council's Amendment.

Amendment made by the Council now considered.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Education (for the Minister for Lands) in charge of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The Council's amendment is as follows:

Clause 5—Add after the word "recorded" in the line shown as line 35 the following words "and growers who deliver wheat to the various flour mills throughout the State."

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: If members will look towards the end of paragraph (b) they will find it provides that only the growers so recorded by Co-operative Handling Ltd. are to receive the right to vote. By adding the words proposed by the Council, so far as can be ascertained all deliverers of wheat will be entitled to the franchise. I move—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. T. TONKIN: This puts right something which definitely would have been wrong if the Bill had been passed as first introduced, because it would have had the effect of disfranchising a number of growers. Those men are indebted to the member for Mt. Marshall for obtaining the right to vote because it was he who first saw the possibility that the Bill did not embrace them. This amendment will now remedy the position, and provide that the real growers of wheat shall have the opportunity of deciding who shall be their representatives upon the board. I have no objection to the amendment because it is very necessary and I hope it will be passed and be included in the Bill.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

BILL—PIG INDUSTRY COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

BILL—NATIVES (CITIZENSHIP RIGHTS) ACT AMENDMENT.

Message.

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

Second Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR NATIVE AFFAIRS (Hon. V. Doney—Narrogin) [7.39] in moving the second reading said: This amending legislation, which, incidentally, in no way conflicts with the Bill brought down

roughly at this time last year by the member for Kimberley, has been framed mainly for the purpose of correcting anomalies in the Act and smoothing out, as it were, its administrative requirements. In particular, the Bill aims at lessening the number of mistakes made by the allotment of citizenship rights certificates to natives by increasing the numerical strength of the bench and the sum total of reliable knowledge and evidence. Personally, I readily admit that I would grant a certificate to the greatest possible number of natives, but yet, at the same time, I am keen to lessen the number of those who get that certificate but do not know how to handle the privileges and obligations which it confers upon them.

The Act, as I think it may be generally agreed, imposes upon a magistrate sitting in sole jurisdiction, an extremely difficult task. I think it is generally known that by granting an application brought under the provisions of the Act, the magistrate has now to satisfy himself that the applicant has, for two years immediately prior to the lodging of his application for citizenship rights, adopted the manner and general habits—of what we know, anyhow—of civilized life. Obviously, no magistrate could possibly be satisfied on such a point unless he is prepared to accept the assurance of the native himself. Members will, I think, appreciate the highly unstable manner in which the vast majority of natives live, and it makes it almost impossible for anyone to decide, that is with any degree of certainty, that an application has actually and satisfactorily fulfilled this first and very important requirement of the Act.

Under the Bill now before us, as a holder of a certificate of exemption the applicant will first be under the surveillance of the field officers of the Native Affairs Department and, assuming that he satisfies the departmental requirements over a two-year period he then, of course, would be entitled to favourable testimony before the Court by the Native Affairs Department. It can hardly be surprising that many mistakes have occurred during recent years for which the magistrate, in my judgment, can be held fully responsible, anyhow. The magistrates, as will be generally agreed, are busy individuals and it is unreasonable for them to leave their offices or, in a judicial sense, their benches, for the purpose of satisfying themselves at first hand that a native application has, in fact, complied or otherwise with every requirement of Sections 4 and 5 of the Act.

The Native Affairs Department need not come into this matter as far as a court case is concerned. The Act places upon the applicant himself the onus of satisfying the magistrate that he is a fit and proper person to obtain a certificate of citizenship. Unfortunately, it needs to be understood, and probably generally is

understood, that the Commissioner of Native Affairs, or any person nominated by him, is entitled to appear to support, or, if he wishes for any sound reason, to oppose the application. In quite a number of instances, objection to the granting of a certificate has been lodged by the department and, in the presence of the native applicant and other natives who might be in the court, the court has over-ruled the Commissioner of Native Affairs. That, as members will appreciate, creates a most embarrassing position for the head of the department or his nominee. Partly for that reason, and maybe for others as well, the Commissioner or his representative in such cases usually adopts a neutral attitude, merely placing a precis of the departmental records before the magistrate.

The substitution of a board constituted by the Governor and consisting of a magistrate and a person nominated by the Minister as a district representative, as provided by the Bill, represents, I believe, a great improvement upon the old method. It is well-known to me that members of local authorities have frequently complained bitterly because certain natives, well known to them as being unworthy of the privilege of holding a certificate, have nevertheless been granted citizenship rights. It is claimed that this measure, permitting as it will a representative of the local authority to sit on the board, will be a great improvement.

The amendment to Section 6 of the Act by deleting the words "shall be deemed to be no longer a native or aborigine" is, in my judgment, very necessary. No Act of Parliament should have the effect of depriving a person of his race, which apparently is what was intended by the words in Section 6 proposed to be deleted. Merely to say that a native shall no longer be regarded as a native or aborigine has actually no effect whatever because that does not in any way affect his status. He still remains a native, or an aborigine.

A Chinese might be a natural-born Australian, a citizen of the Commonwealth, a subject of His Majesty the King, but in reality he is still racially Mongoloid and not Caucasian. Consequently an aborigine or part-aborigine never can be a European, and there seems to be no sound reason why Parliament should seek to make him other than what he is. On the contrary we should give him every incentive to be proud of his race and certainly not ashamed of it. Several other amendments are included in the Bill, but in the main they are not of great consequence and are largely self-explanatory or consequential to the two or three major points to which I have directed attention. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Sewell, debate adjourned.

BILL—FREMANTLE HARBOUR TRUST ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 25th October.

HON. J. B. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [7.51]: I support the measure, which is long overdue. In looking up the records, I find that the Trust commenced to function in 1903 and that the amount of two guineas was provided in the original legislation, at which figure it has remained ever since. In those days wages were about 7s. per day, and we should consider the rise in wages that meanwhile has taken place in all other industries or callings.

I find that the earnings of the Trust in one year amounted to £1,497,000 and that as much as £311,000 was paid into Consolidated Revenue in one year. The Trust consists of five Commissioners, the chairman receiving four guineas a sitting and the other members two guineas a sitting and the maximum that may be paid to any Commissioner is £150 a year. I find that only on one occasion has the £150 been paid, so members will realise how cheaply this business has been conducted for the State.

Every man is worthy of his hire and, if a Harbour Trust Commissioner is not worth more than that at present-day money values, we should get rid of him. I maintain that any Commissioner is worth more than that. There are companies in the city with much lower earning capacity than that of the Trust and those in charge receive much more.

One point I do not care about is the proposal to increase these fees by regulation. It would be preferable to set out in the measure, as is stipulated in Sections 10 and 11 of the Act, the amount to be paid to the Commissioners. I do not know why the Minister wishes to prescribe these fees by regulation. I should say that these positions are worth at least double what has been paid.

Section 55 provides for cheques to be signed by two Commissioners, one of whom shall be the chairman or acting chairman, and countersigned by the secretary. The bulk of the cheques are signed on Fridays when the Commissioners are present, but when cheques are required, say, on Thursdays, a messenger has to be sent out to get the chairman or acting chairman and another Commissioner in order to have their signatures. Very few companies work under a system of that sort. Two responsible officers of the Trust should be authorised to sign cheques, just as is done by ordinary companies.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Hill in the Chair; the Minister for Education in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Section 10 amended:

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: Will the Minister explain why he desires to fix the fees by regulation? I feel inclined to agree to anything he desires, but the amount should be stated in the measure.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I think I mentioned on the second reading the reason why, in the circumstances prevailing at present, it was considered desirable to proceed by way of regulation. There has been a big gap of years, during the latter part of which at least some alteration should have been made. Under existing conditions, one might decide upon four guineas for members of the Trust and six guineas for the chairman, and perhaps by next year, as a result of basic wage increases, five guineas and eight guineas might be more equitable. This would necessitate bringing down amendments to the Act, which seems quite unnecessary, and the fixing of the fees by regulation is the more reasonable course to adopt. The regulation would be tabled and any member would be at liberty to move for its disallowance.

Mr. MARSHALL: If the amounts were stated in the measure, we would know what was happening, because an amending Bill would have to be brought down before they could be altered. Regulations, however, are tabled by the hundred and in many instances they go through without our having the slightest knowledge of what they contain. A Minister may submit 20 or 30 regulations at the one time, and he reads off the list speedily, and very often in a tone not understandable and often not heard by members on this side of the Chamber, and so we do not know of them. Our first knowledge of them comes when somebody challenges the increase and we are informed that it was done by regulation tabled on a certain date.

No matter how strongly opposed I may be to a regulation, once it is passed I have no opportunity to challenge it; nor has any other member of Parliament, with the exception of a Minister of the Crown. It is legislation of a most dangerous character, because having become law it is immune from interference by any private member. I ask the Government, wherever it can, to place in the Act itself everything that is possible. Any member can challenge what is in an Act, but we might have some doubt, if we do not notice a regulation going through, as to the honesty of purpose of the Minister concerned.

Mr. BRADY: The member for Murchison is on the right track. It is a dangerous precedent to allow the fees of members of boards and trusts to be increased without the knowledge of members. Although it is their business to

know what is contained in regulations, it sometimes happens that regulations are laid on the Table of the House and members do not know the details contained in them. I do not say there will be abuse in this particular instance, but I think the Minister should add a proviso to Clause 3 as follows:—

No fee in excess of £10 10s. shall be made without an amendment to the Act.

Some unscrupulous people might go the whole hog and pass a regulation providing for the full amount, although I do not think it is likely. I can understand the Minister's position. He does not want to be introducing amendments every two or three years. I think the position would be met by striking a happy medium and providing something along the lines I have suggested.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The member for Murchison, of course, is entitled to any opinion he may care to hold in regard to regulations, and I do not criticise him on that ground, but I would remind him that I sat on the other side of the Chamber for longer than he has, and I know all about regulations. Just as many hundreds, and probably more, were laid on the Table of the House when I sat there than have been since he sat there, and I tell him that I knew something of the regulations that were tabled, and so should he if he takes any interest in the affairs of this House, because every "Hansard" has a list of the tabled papers and a reference to what they are. So the hon. member has ample opportunity, as has every other member, to ascertain what papers are tabled, and if he is inquisitive in regard to what is being done with respect to any particular statute he can examine the regulations so tabled, as I had to do on many occasions. I moved to disallow some regulations, but not always with success, admittedly.

Mr. Brady: It was not usual to introduce regulations of this kind.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It was usual to introduce regulations to fix fees, and do all sorts of other things. The member for Guildford-Midland suggested that a precedent was being established. Well, if he could search through the statutes of this State dealing with the payments to members of boards and other authorities, he would find that six out of every eight, at the least, prescribe that the fees to be paid shall be those determined by the Governor. It is rare, by comparison, to find the fees stipulated in the Act. I would not have risen to make these points had not the member for Guildford-Midland talked of establishing a dangerous precedent. A dangerous precedent would be something new.

Mr. Brady: Two wrongs do not make a right.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It is not a question of two wrongs, but of 552 or more.

Mr. Brady: We should not encourage it.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The hon. member knows perfectly well that there are very sound reasons why these fees should be fixed by regulation.

Mr. Brady: There should be a limit.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: He also knows perfectly well that if the regulation is unsuitable to him he can move a motion of disallowance as soon as it is tabled, and the opinion of the House will then prevail in regard to it. I do not want to press the point any more than the member for Murchison does, but I do not want the idea to get abroad that this is something new, and that it has not been practised before.

Hon. J. B. SLEEMAN: I must say I do not like legislation by regulation, but I am not worried by the fears of the member for Guildford-Midland, because no Government yet has been over-generous. That is proved by the fact that £2 2s. has remained in the Act since 1903. I am satisfied we will not wake up one morning and find these people are being paid too much; rather, that they are being paid too little. However, I do not want the Minister to take this as a precedent and to tell me, when I object to some other regulation, that I agreed to this one. This regulation can only affect five people. If their rates are to be reduced we will soon hear about it; and on the other hand, I do not think there is much danger of the rates being increased too much.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 to 6, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1951-52.

In Committee of Supply.

Debate resumed from the 23rd October on the Treasurer's Financial Statement and on the Annual Estimates, Mr. Perkins in the Chair.

Vote—Legislative Council, £4,955:

MR. ACKLAND (Moore) [8.10]: When studying the Budget and comparing it with those of previous years, one cannot help but be struck by the fact that money in ever-increasing volume has become available to the Government of the State yet, because of ever-increasing costs the additional money is of little, if any value, to succeeding Governments. It is of interest in this Jubilee year to go back 50 years and realise that the revenue of the State was then £3,078,000. But even in that period the Government finished the year with a deficit, yet at that time the State had considerable taxing rights

and control over its fiscal policy, so that it was able, within limits, to raise the revenue it considered necessary to carry on its work.

We find that in the year just completed the Government had a revenue of £28,156,181, and the Treasurer, with the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, finished the year with a slight surplus. It is also interesting to note that during the past 50 years the various State Governments on only 13 occasions finished the year with a surplus, and on 37 with a deficit. It is also interesting to realise that on the four occasions when the present Premier has presented his Budget to the Chamber, there has each year been an increase in the revenue over the previous 12 months. When he presented his first Budget in 1947-48, the revenue was £17,710,310. During the next four years, until the end of the last financial year, it had increased to more than £28,000,000—a rise in revenue of something just under 60 per cent.

In the course of his speech on the Estimates, the Leader of the Opposition stated, if I remember correctly, that each 1s. rise in the basic wage meant an additional expenditure to the State Government of £66,000. When the McLarty-Watts Government was returned to the Treasury bench, the basic wage was £5 7s. 1d., whereas today it has risen to £10 5s. 8d., an increase of 90 per cent. During the same four years the revenue of the State increased by a little less, 60 per cent. If the figures of the Leader of the Opposition are correct, and I have no reason to believe otherwise, they show that over that period the Treasurer has had to find an extra £6,500,000 in wages for Government servants; that is irrespective of all the other charges which are passed on to the Government by industry by way of stores and supplies and increases in contractors' tenders.

It stands to reason, when we take all those items into consideration, that they must of necessity have more than evened up the £10,445,000 extra revenue which the Treasurer has had available to him over those four years. It is 12 years since the commencement of hostilities in 1939 and since that time the basic wage has risen by something like 150 per cent. It would appear that during the first eight years of that period the basic wage must have risen 60 per cent. and it has risen 90 per cent. during the last four years—the four years in which this Government has occupied the Treasury benches.

It would be futile to argue that we are not in a period of inflation. I believe that the skids are off and that inflation is gathering momentum almost daily. What appears to me to be an unusual position is that the average person, whether he be a wage-earner, a salary-earner, or anybody else in the community—with the exception of that very small percentage who are on fixed incomes, and certain other

incomes which cannot be increased—has never been so well off, certainly during my life-time.

Mr. May: What is wrong with that?

Mr. ACKLAND: I am not complaining about it.

Mr. Marshall: But you will be before you sit down.

Mr. ACKLAND: I think it is something to marvel at. People today are buying things that they had never thought of buying previously.

Mr. Marshall: They never had the money to buy them before; that is the trouble.

Mr. ACKLAND: They did not think of buying them before.

Mr. Lawrence: You cannot buy houses.

Mr. ACKLAND: It does not seem to matter whether those items are essential or unessential, or whether they are of any real use or are simply gadgets or toys. Irrespective of the cost, we find that the money is forthcoming. I think that the position has been brought about by a sort of mob hysteria and that the attitude of all people today is a case of "Let us eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die." Perhaps a more apt way of putting it would be to say, "Let us spend every penny we can put our hands on today because tomorrow the purchasing power will have decreased, and we will have lost the value of the money which we have in our pockets." This in itself is one of the main reasons why ever-increasing costs are taking place. Those increasing costs are very quickly followed by increased prices and one seems to be chasing the other at an ever-increasing tempo.

In the interests of all our people, I am convinced it is time that the Government took a hand in trying to do something definite to bring about a cessation of this ever-increasing price rise, and attached to it the ever-increasing basic wage. It is not only the duty of the Government at this time, but also of all parties in Parliament, irrespective of party politics, to treat this matter as one of urgent and natural necessity.

Mr. Graham: You should have thought of that in 1948 when the prices referendum was held.

Mr. ACKLAND: I lay no claim to being an economist—

Mr. Marshall: You would not be flattering yourself if you did.

Mr. ACKLAND: —or a monetary reformer, like my friend, the member for Murchison.

Mr. Marshall: You could not make a bigger mess of it than they have done if you tried.

Mr. ACKLAND: I know as much about poverty as any man in this Chamber, and I have no wish whatever to see this

country once again enter a depression like we had in the 1930's. I am either innocent or ignorant enough—members opposite might think—to believe that it can be stopped, if we have the will to do it. I believe it can be done by taking three steps, every one of which is contingent upon the other. One of my suggestions is of little or no value whatever without the others. I believe the whole answer to the question is an increase in the amount of goods which we are able to buy. I suggest to the Premier and his Cabinet that they approach the Arbitration Court with the object of having an increased working week.

Mr. May: You would?

Mr. ACKLAND: Yes, I would, but I would tie it up with two other most important actions. One of the other proposals is that for all the increased production, for all the extra endeavour which may be brought about by that increase in production, there should be compensation by way of payment for the extra services which have been rendered to the community because of that action.

Several members interjected.

Mr. ACKLAND: And thirdly, if I may be permitted to proceed, an approach should be made to the taxation authorities so that no taxation shall be placed on the extra wages earned—

Mr. McCulloch: No taxation at all.

Mr. ACKLAND: —no extra taxation on the production or services rendered to the community because of that extra endeavour.

Mr. W. Hegney: What would you say the working week should be?

Mr. ACKLAND: I can see smiles on the faces of members opposite.

Mr. W. Hegney: What would you say the working week should be?

Mr. ACKLAND: I am not competent to judge, but I should say that a return to a 44-hour working week would be adequate.

Mr. Lawrence: A working week of 144 or 44?

Mr. ACKLAND: Under present conditions we are not even working a 40-hour week.

Mr. Marshall: You are slandering the farmers—the people whom you represent. Tell me, why does wheat cost so much to produce today as compared with your young days?

Mr. ACKLAND: The farmer is just as guilty as any other section of the community and, if the member for Murchison will only let me proceed, I will give him some figures to prove that the farmer himself is one of the culprits.

Mr. Marshall: You have no right to be slandering them; you have no conception of it.

The Premier: You do a lot of talking; why do you not do some listening?

Mr. Marshall: You take £560,000,000 out of the pockets of the people in 12 months and you expect prices to be kept down. I guarantee the figures the Premier sends over are sufficient to cover his taxation returns and those charges go on to the goods produced.

Mr. Griffith: He is doing what you do; saying what you think.

Mr. ACKLAND: If I may proceed, I would earnestly suggest to the Premier that this Government take steps to approach the Arbitration Court for the institution of a longer working week. I would not, for one moment, suggest that it should be done by legislation—as was done by another Premier years ago—and so ignore the Arbitration Court.

Mr. May: The Premier does not seem very keen about that.

Mr. ACKLAND: I think, too, that the employers should be persuaded—and they are in many cases today—to see that the men in their employ get the fruits of the extra work for which they are responsible.

Mr. Brady: Like they got in the Arbitration Court yesterday?

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe that the Commonwealth Government would be acting only in the interests of itself and of the people if it could be made to see the wisdom of letting people produce more, on the understanding that there should be no taxation whatever upon that portion of production brought about by this extra endeavour.

Mr. Brady: Why do not the wheat farmers produce more wheat?

Mr. Marshall: We are down 1,000,000 acres in Australia this year.

Mr. ACKLAND: I would like to make some reference to primary producers generally. In this Parliament, for instance, I know of two primary producers who have never had any labour troubles in all the years they have been farming. This has been brought about because those men have given the people in their employ an interest in what they produce. They have done it for years and they are still doing it, and I will guarantee that the men working on those properties never have any wish to leave; they have an interest in everything that they do. The same applies to many firms. Even the farmers' own co-operative wheat handling company, in its 20 years' operation, has never had labour troubles with its permanent employees. The reason is that all the employees have an interest in the company and they are virtual shareholders of that company today. The staff are well-treated by generous superannuation schemes, social benefits and the provision of amenities. Today, the 9,700

shareholders of that company are paying to their 220 permanent employees one-third of the profits that the company is making. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that that company makes profits because of the loyal service given and interest taken by its employees in their work.

Mr. May: That has always applied.

Mr. ACKLAND: It has applied right through. As it happens, the payment made to these 220 employees represents a very fine financial addition to their salaries at the completion of the financial year, and one would have a job to get any of those fellows—or girls for that matter—to take a position anywhere else. Those 9,700 shareholders, with very few exceptions, are fully appreciative of the position that has been created, and they give full credit to those people who have taken such an interest and pride in the company for which they work. I believe there are other industries doing much the same thing. We shall not get very far at all until we have a feeling of mutual trust and respect between both employer and employee and, in fact, between all sections of the community.

Mr. Brady: You will not get it by advocating a 44-hour week.

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe the 44-hour week would be of greater benefit to the wage-earners than to anybody else. Since the introduction of the 40-hour week, I think they suffered more than any other section of the community.

Mr. W. Hegney: We had the same argument when you tried to take it from 52 to 56 hours.

Mr. ACKLAND: I put this up as a suggestion. I do so with no apology but in all sincerity. I do not think there will be any improvement until there is more production and realisation of the responsibility that every one of us owes to the other fellow. I believe that most sincerely. In mentioning these three suggestions to the Government, I think there is a germ for improvement in the position. There should be some attempt to work if not along those lines then along the principle of the necessity for getting greater production, and the reasonableness of seeing that those who contribute to this greater production get the benefit of it. The Commonwealth Government should be asked not to tax that portion of a person's income which has been brought about by increased production.

Mr. W. Hegney: To what branch of production are you referring particularly?

Mr. ACKLAND: I am referring to everyone, and I will refer particularly to wheat production if members will give me an opportunity to do so. At the end of hostilities in 1945 I believe that Australia

found herself in one of the most advantageous positions compared with any other nation in the world. We were all geared for production. Unlike so many countries, particularly Great Britain and the countries of Europe, we had not had any destruction from the hand of the enemy, and we had an obligation to a war-weary world to produce for it foodstuffs particularly those which we find ourselves by nature most able to produce. I think Australia had an opportunity to rise to very great heights indeed, and I say that we have dishonoured those obligations to the rest of the world, with great discredit to ourselves. I have mentioned before that Australia is first and foremost a primary producing country.

Our geographical position and climate, together with our huge areas, make it possible for us to increase all production in this country—I speak of Western Australia particularly—a hundredfold. Yet we are producing less and less every year and we have this hungry world crying out for our foodstuffs, and we are not paying any heed whatever to that call. We are not likely to be allowed to go on in this way very much longer because, if we are not going to use our great advantages, they will most certainly be taken from us, and generations to come will say, "Quite rightly so, too." Members have interjected several times about the wheatgrower. I fully intended to have something to say about the lack of responsibility of wheatgrowers, in common with the rest of the community in every industry, both primary and secondary. There is no foodstuff needed so badly in the world today as wheat and flour.

Hon. E. Nulsen: We have increased our acreage of wheat.

Mr. ACKLAND: We have over the whole of the Commonwealth decreased our acreage of wheat.

Hon. E. Nulsen: And increased it in Western Australia.

Mr. ACKLAND: I will make some mention of that presently, if the hon. member will permit me to do so. We find, however, that during the last five years our production has decreased to such an extent that we are producing practically half the wheat for export we were producing five years ago. We have not even met our commitments under the International Wheat Agreement this year. Over the five seasons, our wheat production has decreased by 23.6 per cent. By 1947-48, we should have sufficiently recovered from the war to have been in a position to start on a very large increase in all production, but more particularly in regard to wheat. We find in that year that Australia planted 13,818,000 acres; in the following year, 1948-49, 12,883,000 acres; in 1949-50, 12,240,000 acres, and

last year, 11,868,000 acres were planted, and it is estimated that for this year there will be 10,600,000 acres.

Mr. May: How do you account for that?

Mr. ACKLAND: This is a reduction of 3,380,000 acres for the five years. As the member for Eyre has remarked, it is true that over that period we in Western Australia have increased our production by 8.7 per cent. Yet we find during the last year we were very nearly a quarter of a million bushels less in our production than we were the year before. I mentioned that it will be a lot more than a quarter of a million bushels this coming year because of conditions that exist today. In Western Australia in 1947-48, we grew 3,000,000 acres of wheat. Last year we grew 2,760,000 acres; that is, 200,000 acres down on the previous period. Last year, in this State we produced 46,000,000 bushels of wheat. This year we hardly anticipate marketing 40,000,000 bushels. I believe there is no country that could produce more wheat more quickly than we could, and I venture to say, not without some foundation, that instead of growing 40,000,000 bushels, Western Australia could grow 80,000,000 bushels without any difficulty at all.

Mr. May: Not without super.

Mr. ACKLAND: We could grow this amount, provided there was sufficient labour, materials and machinery available, and also provided that we could overcome the growing sense of injustice in the minds of wheatgrowers, which is based on the conviction that the industry is harnessed more to other industries than the wheat-growing industry itself. In my opinion, the greatest contributing factor is that wheatgrowers have lost the incentive. This brings me back to what I said earlier; that, although all of us should be prepared to produce more, the only way to bring that about is by giving people the incentive to do it and making them realise it will be worth their while, and that the tax collector will not take the fruits of their labour because of that extra endeavour. That does not apply any more to wheatgrowers than it does to every individual in the community. I believe that most emphatically.

Mr. May: That is not the principal reason.

Mr. ACKLAND: The hon. member can tell us what is the principal reason when he gets up to speak.

Mr. May: You know how they have been restricted.

Mr. ACKLAND: Wheatgrowers have not been restricted in recent years.

Mr. May: They have.

Mr. ACKLAND: The hon. member can tell us what he knows when he gets up to speak.

Mr. May: You tell us the truth.

Mr. ACKLAND: I most earnestly ask the Premier to give some thought, if not along the lines I have suggested then along the lines of making it worth while for people to produce more, whether it be labour or whether it be goods.

The Premier: I have no control over taxation, of course.

Mr. ACKLAND: I know the Premier has no control over taxation, and, if he had listened to what I said earlier, he would have remembered my saying that taxation remissions were the concern of the Commonwealth. I have just returned from a trip to the South-West where we took evidence as an honorary Royal Commission. We were questioning one of the witnesses interviewed as to why he did not do something different from that which he intended to do with one of the fields on which he was going to start operations. He gave us a little quotation which I think was extremely apt. He said—

A wise man makes the fruits of action attractive to those attached to the fruits of action.

I think a wise Government would give an incentive to people to produce more, particularly at such a time as this. We will never get any increase in production until we have peace and contentment in industry and in all sections of the community.

Mr. Brady: You will not get it if you complain about the 40-hour week.

Mr. ACKLAND: I do not know whether I will or not; but I think that if members opposite were honest with themselves they would realise—possibly better than I do; I think very much better than I do—that the people they represent, and I believe they try to do it honestly, have lost more than any other section of the community because of the shortage of goods occasioned by the lack of endeavour amongst all the people in the community.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Did this Government oppose the granting of the 40-hour week?

Mr. ACKLAND: I was not in Parliament at the time.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: I think you were.

Mr. ACKLAND: I think the hon. member is far better able to answer the question than I. I do not care, however, what action is taken by Governments or trade unions or by industry to increase production, there will be no progress unless the communist menace is tackled properly in this country.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Bob will fix that for you!

Mr. ACKLAND: I believe also that practically all the people in Western Australia are absolutely opposed to communism. When we realise that at the last Federal

election only a little over 2,000 people out of 277 odd thousand who went to the polls favoured communist candidates. I think it stands to reason that there is only a small minority of people here who favour communism, or Russian communism as we see it in operation in the world today.

Mr. Graham: You people make a big noise about it.

Mr. May: And do nothing!

Mr. ACKLAND: Although these people are numerically weak, I think their power for evil is tremendous in proportion to their numbers. They are absolute fanatics and they are willing to go to prison and, if necessary, to die in furtherance of their objectives. We have had some illustrations of that in the last few years. During the last referendum, the people of Western Australia indicated very clearly their attitude towards communism, and the majority in favour of handing authority to the Commonwealth Government to deal with them was 30,492, representing a little more than 55 per cent. who went to the polls in this State. During that referendum campaign, both the Premier and the Deputy Premier gave very vigorous support to those who favoured a "Yes" vote. Further, they indicated their willingness to introduce legislation to assist the Commonwealth Government—

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: This is going to be awkward!

Mr. ACKLAND:— should it be necessary to give full implementation to the Commonwealth Government's plans throughout Australia. Unfortunately, Australia refused to give the Commonwealth Government the powers which it sought by that referendum; but although the Menzies-Padden Government has been frustrated in not gaining the majority it needed—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: They will get less support after the latest Budget proposals.

Mr. ACKLAND: —to bring its legislation into effect, the people of Western Australia expressed themselves so emphatically that I believe the State Government has a mandate from them to suppress communists as far as possible, particularly in the Government service. It is known that there are communists in the civil service in its various branches in this State. Although only 55 per cent. of the people expressed their willingness to give this control to the Commonwealth, I believe that nearly all the people who voted "No" are just as much opposed to communism as those who voted "Yes," but they were not prepared to give the Commonwealth the extra powers it sought. So the Western Australian Government would have the people behind it if it would deal with the communist menace amongst those it controls through the civil service.

I think it is only natural that nearly everybody in this country should be opposed to communism, because communists are people who take their orders from a foreign power. Western Australians believe that communism is unchristian and is founded on violence, anarchy, revolution and destruction. I want to read a section of a leading article which appeared in "The Record" of the 13th September, 1951. I am told that "The Record" is the official organ of the Roman Catholic church in Western Australia. I do not intend to read the whole of this article, although it would be well worthwhile doing so, but only to read those portions that are relevant. I quote as follows:—

Australia faces the greatest danger it has ever known in its short history. Surrounded by enemies without and weakened by enemies within, we must be ready to face the fact that the enemies who are working to overthrow our nation from within constitute a fifth column whose sole purpose is the overthrow of our nation, who are actively working for the most vicious, diabolical power ever seen in the history of the world. They are not just another political party; they are traitors to our country.

There can never be any compromise with communism. We hate it because we hate sin; we hate it because it is the enemy of God, the instrument of evil; we hate it because while there is a single communist in our midst there is a traitor to our country, a menace to our freedom.

Despite what politicians may say to the contrary, the growth of communism in Australia has been fostered by their own ineptitude, shortsightedness, and failure to place the interests of our nation before the petty squabbles of inter-party strife.

Mr. Graham: You should look at the Premier when you read that.

Mr. ACKLAND: The article continues—

No matter what they might say, no matter how they may condemn communism, the fact remains that for years the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church alone, has recognised and fought this menace, often, indeed, hindered in its fight by those very politicians who now so ardently champion the anti-Red campaign.

Legislation must be uniform and Australian-wide to fight this evil. The Crimes Act, which the Opposition states gives the Government sufficient power to deal with the Red menace, is the very thing that the recent Trades Union Congress wanted abolished . . . The Prime Minister has access to knowledge denied us, has sources of information which should lay bare to him the whole

ghastly pattern of deceit and treachery which menaces our country, and he has the distinction of having taken the first major step to closing our enemies' bridgehead.

There has been a lot of talk about the possible destruction of our liberties should this legislation be passed. Most of this, however, seems to be hysteria without foundation, as the proposed Bill deals with communists and communists alone.

Not only is communism unchristian but I believe it is anti-christian.

Mr. W. Hegney: Yet you used it to stab Harry Webb in the back.

Mr. ACKLAND: I have no hesitation in aligning myself with every word of that article in "The Record." Although some members here may say how foolish or unwise it is to bring sectarianism into this matter, I say that as a Protestant I greatly deplore the fact that Protestant churches did not align themselves—

Mr. Graham: With Menzies!

Mr. ACKLAND: —with the Catholic Church in this matter. Not with Menzies but against communism!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: The Premier looks happy!

Mr. ACKLAND: As a Protestant, it has been bitter to me to know that several high dignitaries of both the Anglican and the Nonconformist churches have seen fit to find excuses for dealing with communists in the only way they can be dealt with. If we see a black snake we destroy it with any weapon at hand.

Mr. Marshall: I would destroy a white one, too!

Mr. ACKLAND: Communism is more deadly than any black snake, and I would use any method available to stamp it out from our midst as far as possible. I am sincere when I ask the Premier at least to clean up communists in his own civil service. I believe this House would support him in that action.

Mr. Marshall: We will, too. The Government has done nothing.

Mr. ACKLAND: I wish the trade unions would follow the example of Canada in stamping out communism that may exist in the trade union movement. I would like to read an extract from "The West Australian" of the 20th October under the heading "Unions in Canada 'Clean out Communism.'" It is at follows:—

"If Canadian unions find communism in their ranks, they clean it out themselves," said the Canadian High Commissioner in Australia (Mr. Fraser Elliott) at a civic welcome in Perth yesterday.

Mr. Elliott said, in reply to addresses by the Lord Mayor (Mr. J. Totterdell, M.L.A.) the Deputy-Premier (Mr.

Watts) and Cr. S. Glance, that industrial relations were good in his country.

There were two labour organisations, the Canadian Congress of Labour and the Canadian Federation of Labour. "They are led," he said, "by two distinguished men who have the interest of their country at heart as well as the interest of unionists, and they manage to combine the two very well."

As an instance of how they dealt with communists Mr. Elliott said, at a big union meeting at Halifax recently a representative was not allowed to take his seat because he was a declared communist.

A newspaper man who published a communist newspaper was similarly not allowed to take his place at the Press table.

The Labour Party, said Mr. Elliott, did not enter politics as a party.

Labour leaders believed they could exercise power to greater advantage by making representations to the Government in power at the time.

I do not agree with that last sentence. I believe that every section of the community must have political assistance if it is to get very far.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: Do you believe that Harry Webb is anti-Christian? He is just as good a Christian as ever you were.

Mr. ACKLAND: I think it is the responsibility of every section of the community to have its political representatives in Parliament, and that includes the primary producers. Communism is not a political party—not by any means. It is an organisation which is taking its instructions from the dirtiest crowd the earth has ever seen. All the trouble in the world today is brought about by these communists. Our boys are fighting in Korea today because the Russian communists are supporting the Chinese there.

Mr. McCulloch: Shame on you!

Mr. ACKLAND: In Indo-China, Malaya, India, Persia and Egypt all the trouble is being brought about by communists today. I have here another article which appeared in "The West Australian" of the 20th October, 1951, and which reads as follows:—

Russian agents undoubtedly had lent conspiratorial hands to troubles which had recently flared up in Persia and Egypt, the Commissioner General for South-East Asia (Mr. Malcolm MacDonald) said in a broadcast tonight.

Mr. MacDonald said that every country in the East was faced by threats which might either grow or diminish, but the fact remained that

since they over-ran China the communists had met with disappointments in Asia.

When they met with those disappointments in Asia they turned their attention to Persia and Egypt. I know I have created a lot of amusement this evening for members on the other side of the House, but in their hearts they know that every word I have said is true.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Every word? You said you were not in Parliament when this Government took action in connection with the 40-hour week, but you were.

Mr. ACKLAND: I have never, since I have been in Parliament, given up trying to impress upon the Government the necessity to clean the communists out of the Public Service. There are other matters on which I desire to speak, but I will deal with them on the various items.

MR. LAWRENCE (South Fremantle) [9.51]: I will speak on lines that may appear to members to be somewhat unorthodox, but I take this course because I feel it is the only avenue of approach that will truly emphasise my views of the serious position that has arisen in our country and in other great countries of the world. I do not wish only to point out the seriousness of the situation, but also to appeal to the Government to take some positive and decisive action to rectify the calamitous state of affairs into which this country has fallen, with particular reference to the main ill that assails us today: I refer there to the huge rearmament programme that the Liberal Government of Australia has undertaken, and which, to my knowledge, is sponsored by the Government of this State. To cover the argument fully—this may appear somewhat unorthodox—I shall tell of my experience as a young lad, as a youth, as a soldier and then, when repatriated, as a citizen. I shall speak later as a parliamentarian.

I had a reasonably good education given to me by my parents, and there I refer to a scholastic education, but I fear I was not given what might be called a very good every-day education. I trust that not only the Minister for Education but also the Government will take note of this. Like most other lads I had certain chores to do around my home and at that time I was given, by my father, the princely sum of 3d. or 4d. spending money per week. When I received my payment I used to proceed to the newsagent and buy certain magazines which, from memory, were called "The Champion" and "The Triumph." Unfortunately one of those weekly magazines depicted the story of the yellow man, the Chinese and the Japanese, and told how he would steal upon you in the dark and stab you in the back.

Such was the literature published in my young days, and it still prevails! That sort of thing is education, to no small

degree, when it is absorbed by the immature mind, as I will prove later. The other publication gave a story depicting not the German, but the Hun, the filthy Bosch, and again related how he would subject you to all sorts of tortures with thumbscrews, how he would pull your finger nails out, and the Lord only knows what. The effect of that type of education on an immature mind is conclusively demonstrated when, due to mis-government throughout the world—I do not blame any specific Government—we hear the war drums beat.

At the back of the minds of our youths today are thoughts of the tortures inflicted by people of these foreign races with whom the capitalist governments of the world desire to engage in war for their own profit. Immediately, the youth of our country—which is the real wealth of the country—flock to the banner. They sail from our shores with hatred in their hearts against people of other races, whether black, brown, white or brindle; people that have been born of woman as they themselves have, people who feel injury and pain in exactly the same manner as we do. Each and every one of our young men and women who has left these shores has, by leaving, depleted the true wealth of our country. I will return to this subject later and prove my contention.

I sailed from the shores of Australia in 1940 and the first foreign place I visited was Colombo, where the conditions that I saw appalled me. I saw natives there bunkering ships, with baskets of coal on their backs, and they did not walk up the gang planks. Believe me, they had to run and they did that for the princely sum of 1s. per day. At night-time, we could not walk along some of the footpaths because the natives were sleeping on the pavements in all types of weather. Yet when one went to other parts of the island one could see the tea planters with their huge plantations and glass houses, living in splendour. They lived in splendour because the natives had been exploited—this poorly paid labour—

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That is what breeds communism!

Mr. LAWRENCE: The natives were exploited because planters, and others like them, were protected by this rotten system of capitalistic government. There can be no argument against that, as I will show later in my address. In Bombay the same conditions prevailed, and in fact they were probably worse than in Colombo. In India conditions were no better, and the same applied to Egypt—I heard the member for Moore utter the name "Egypt" this evening. What did I see in Egypt? Disease was rampant among the people, and yet the Egyptian Delta, which would be one of the richest tracts of country known in the world, was producing untold wealth. In Palestine, under British

mandate, we saw the same set of circumstances. We went to Syria and we saw the same thing again. At that time, Syria was under French rule, and France had a capitalist government along the same lines as the English Government of that time. The whole flour quota for Syria was controlled by a single French family, and the natives were sent out to work and received a modicum of flour for their week's work.

What was the result of this? It became convincingly clear to me, after the war had been going for some time, that England, when she had her back to the wall and was almost on her knees, did not have a friend. Our country certainly stuck to her—Australia, Canada and like nations, but did India, Malaya, Egypt, Palestine, and Syria stick to England? We know very well that they did not, and this was for a specific reason. They did not do so because their countries had been exploited by a capitalist system that was absolutely rotten. I heard the member for Moore refer to people being communists. If that sort of treatment would not drive anybody away from a system like that, to try some other system that they may not know, then I do not know what would.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: That breeds communism.

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is becoming clear to me that that is what is happening in Australia today. Our system of government—that is the Commonwealth and our own State Government—by its treatment of ordinary working-class people will no doubt push people over to socialism quicker than any other method.

Mr. Manning: That is a very sweeping statement.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Then we shall see. The war was completed, and fortunately the Allies won. We won all right, but we won with disastrous results both to the victors and the vanquished in that we lost, this country and other countries of the world, our true wealth. We lost our young men and women. Despite the terrible lesson that should have been of paramount importance to the people or the Governments of the countries of the world, and hardly had the guns been silenced than the Liberal Government of Australia—the Commonwealth Government—comes out and says, "There shall be another war in three years." What a true and just reward for the people who went to the war and fought for this country to be told that! That has been stated by the Prime Minister.

The Premier: He did not say, "There shall be another war in three years." He did not say that.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: He went pretty close to it.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If that was not the intention of his statement, then I do not know anything about English. The Premier, by interjection, says that the Prime Minister did not say that there shall be another war. But he made it quite clear to the people of Australia that there probably would be another war in three years.

Mr. Nimmo: Did not he get that advice from Mr. Atlee, when he was in the Old Country?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Did he? I do not know. I was not there. However, because this statement has been made, that there might be another war in three years—let us put it that way—

Mr. Manning: That is fairer.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I will be quite fair.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It was much stronger than that.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We find today, after that statement has been made, that this country of ours is faced with a £300,000,000 per annum armament programme.

Mr. Griffith: Would you agree that Great Britain has been re-arming heavily in the last three years?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I do agree, but would the hon. member agree with me—

Mr. Griffith: And they had a socialist Government.

Mr. LAWRENCE: —that Great Britain is 10,000 miles nearer to the supposed enemy?

Mr. Manning: No.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member would not?

Mr. Manning: No.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Then he does not know geography.

Mr. Manning: Who knows where the next attack will come from?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Apparently the hon. member does.

Hon. J. B. Sleeman: He said the communists.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I believe that that £300,000,000 is the evil that is causing the ills that assail our country today—the ills which are sapping our strength. It saps our strength to the extent that we are paying into industry—the industry which makes armaments—£300,000,000 and thus forcing up taxation. Eventually, in my opinion and in the opinion of many members of this Chamber, this will bankrupt the country. Not only is that £300,000,000 being spent but we are creating £300,000,000 worth of guns, bombs and various types of armaments that will be used to smash down industry, to smash down homes and to smash down bodies that are our true wealth. Further, it is

withdrawing from the market labour which should be used for the building of homes to see that this country produces its true wealth.

Mr. Brady: Where is the member for Moore now?

Mr. LAWRENCE: If we have 50,000 men and women employed in making armaments, those 50,000 people are denied to the building industry.

Mr. Nalder: Do not you believe in defence?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I will come to that point, and will do so now. I firmly believe, as do all other members in this Chamber, that defence is a most important issue in this country, but while I re-affirm my belief in that statement I also castigate the Commonwealth Government for its method of defence of our country. I intend to show in my further remarks that the system we are laying down, or the Government of Australia is laying down, for the defence of this country is based on sand. Eventually, if it has a sandy foundation, it must topple. Our method of defence is based on transferring men from the production of true wealth to the production of armaments, which method is based on the education—or, should I say, uneducation—of the public mainly carried out by the daily Press and sometimes by people—who, I would say are irresponsible—who broadcast by radio. I intend later to touch on the question of the Press.

Let me now return to my earlier statements on true wealth, and let members cogitate on what it really means and what is the difference between true wealth and what is termed wealth. True wealth is produced as a result of union between man and woman, that is to say, children. It is considered wealth in this sense: That nothing can be produced except by manpower because if we do not have it we cannot produce other articles such as machinery, bricks, cement, foodstuffs or any other product that one would care to mention. It would then mean, on the point of the true defence of the country, that we cannot expect to defend it unless we have true and loyal citizens and we cannot have them unless we are prepared to produce them.

It is all very well to say that we are bringing in a great number of migrants to this country. Personally, I castigate the Commonwealth Government again on its migration policy because the Labour Party stated during the last Commonwealth election, "Let us cut it in half," but the present Government said "no." I visit the port often and see the types of migrants that are entering this country, and they leave much to be desired. I know that we cannot exclude all of them because it is desirable to introduce some migrants here, but surely we can set up some sort of economic and industrial stability in this country to ensure that we increase our

own natural population. The subjects on which I have spoken most certainly link up with one another, because there is a relationship between rearmament, the housing shortage and the decline in the birth rate.

The Premier: Not in recent years; there has been a very substantial increase in the birth rate.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I might agree with the Premier, but I say that the increase is not sufficient. In fact, a few days ago I read an article in a newspaper which gave a rather peculiar story, because it stated that tables to seat six people had not been produced in this State for many years. In the days when the Premier was very young it was nothing to see 10, 12 or 14 children in the one family, but today one could count them on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. Manning: The women are working a 40-hour week.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The women are working? Well, shame on the country! With that link-up we find that we are approximately six years behind with our housing programme.

Mr. Manning: Let us get back to the 40-hour week!

Mr. LAWRENCE: I will get back to that later; we will probably be here till 2 a.m. Because the houses are just not there people find it difficult to decide on wedlock, but if they do they have to accept accommodation in rooms or even in a single room, and it is found that they do not produce children who, as I have pointed out, are necessary for the production of the true wealth of this country. The reason for that I lay exclusively at the feet of the huge rearmament programme, and the method adopted by the Commonwealth Government on defence.

As to housing, I have found, in my short time in this sphere, examples of treatment of certain people by the State Housing Commission which, in my modest opinion, leaves much to be desired on the question of fairness. I find that spec homes are erected in four or five months, but I also find—and quite frequently—men who went away from this State and fought for this country and who were promised anything while they were away but who, when they returned, have awaited their priority patiently for a war service home and some of those homes have been under construction for as long as 18 months and still remain uncompleted. That is how the promises to the ex-servicemen have been kept. It is a crying shame and a disgrace to any Government.

Mr. Nalder: Who was in power when that promise was made?

Mr. LAWRENCE: That promise was made not by any party in power but by the people of Australia. That is who

made the promise! I know of other instances. In one case I went to see the person concerned and asked him if I could use his name on the floor of this House. His name is Ian Donald McCrae.

Mr. Hoar: A good name.

Mr. LAWRENCE: And not a bad type, might I suggest to the hon. member. He fought for this country for 6½ years, but he was evicted in 1947 from a house in Mandurah-road, South Fremantle. At that time he had a son aged 17 and a little girl practically seven years old. The only alternative accommodation he could get was a single room in South-street, South Fremantle, with part use of the front verandah, and with the stipulation that no children could be taken into the house. That stipulation, of course, did not cover the lad aged 17, but certainly covered the little girl aged seven.

Perforce, because there was no further alternative accommodation, McCrae and his wife lived in that room, the son slept on the front verandah, partly sharing it with an old-age pensioner, and the daughter was put in the Salvation Army Home, Mosman Park, because there was nowhere else for the poor little mite to go, and she has been there for two solid years. Yet this man who fought for 6½ years for his country has a priority for a State rental home in 1947. I have been to the Housing Commission about this and have had no satisfaction. In fact, I have had a lesson taught to me and have learned something that I never thought would go on in this State. His file was produced and shown to me and on it was recorded that he had had an argument with his wife—just as I might do with my wife—

Mr. Hoar: That is not a file; that is a dossier.

Mr. LAWRENCE: In reply to that I would say, "Let him who is without sin, cast the first stone." However, this man and his wife separated and subsequently she took out a maintenance order against him. In his wisdom, or maybe stupidity, he thought he would be just as determined as she and refused to pay her any maintenance. When the pressure was put on, however—I got this story from the man himself—he went to see his wife, they came together and have lived happily ever since. That was shown to me on McCrae's file. When I asked the person concerned at the State Housing Commission what that had to do with the matter, the answer I received was that if he could not pay his wife maintenance at that time how could the Commission expect him to pay it rent in 1951? If the member for Moore was here—

Mr. Hoar: He never is here.

Mr. LAWRENCE: —I would tell him that as bad as Russia is and as bad as he portrayed it, I doubt whether we would

find there anything to compare with the example I have quoted. I was so perturbed about this that I went further and saw McCrae and his wife together. Before I proceed further I might say that another extraordinary thing on that file was that the child was a truant—the child is a kiddie of seven years.

Mr. Brady: They must have a gestapo down there.

Mr. LAWRENCE: After I had approached McCrae and his wife I proceeded further with my investigations, and asked them if they could show me any proof that they were living happily together. They even went so far as to produce their bankbook for me to inspect, and at that time their bankbook showed a balance of £452. When I went through that bankbook, and the bankbook before it, I found that they had been putting away weekly sums—one week £1 would be put away and another, say, perhaps 30s. representing regular savings—which showed that these two people were genuinely trying to make a place for themselves in the world and endeavouring to get this kiddie of theirs out of the home. I went to see the matron at the home; the letter is on the McCrae file, stating that the matron thought that that child was considerably improved and that she should be with her parents. I certainly agree with that opinion. However, there is still no relief for that man. What is his attitude going to be? Can he believe in the Government that rules here today? If the Opposition were the Government and we carried on in that manner, could we expect anybody to support us?

Mr. Hutchinson: You could not satisfy all the deserving cases at once. I think they could be alleviated.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is my whole argument. If the Government would only stop this silly, stupid talk of war and rearmament, and appreciate what is the true wealth of this country and the people who put it there and to whom they are responsible, maybe we might alleviate some of that suffering. That child has been separated from her parents for two years, and the Government says there are so many deserving cases that it will have to let some of them go by. But that does not satisfy me and it does not satisfy Mr. McCrae.

Mr. Griffith: You would not throw the defence of the country to the wind?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I certainly would not.

Mr. Griffith: You should not, with your experience.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have shown conclusively and I will repeat it for the member for Canning, that I defended this country for six years and, if necessary, against true aggression I will defend it for another 66. I mentioned before that this country must be defended but it must

be defended on a sane basis. But the Government is depleting the strength of the country by the system on which it is trying to deal with the matter today. The way the Government of the country is carrying on today this country will no doubt be bankrupt, and I do not mean so far as pound notes are concerned, but insofar as the true wealth of the country is concerned.

Mr. Griffith: You must then decry the policy of Great Britain.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I do not because I think it has been on a saner basis, of defence than has been the case in this country. I wish the member for Moore were here because I feel sure that if I asked him who he thought the real enemy was there is no doubt that he would nominate Russia and it would seem that the member for Canning would agree with him. If he did that I would immediately suggest that that country is 10,000 miles nearer the centre of trouble than we are; it has a bigger population and is more vulnerable. So, naturally, it would spend more on defence than we would.

The Minister for Housing: Does not the hon. member recognise that in Great Britain they are called up for twelve months and not three months, consequently depleting the industries of a considerable amount of their time?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am well aware of that fact but, as the Minister also knows, they have a greater population than ours.

The Minister for Housing: That does not get away from the fact that they are called up for twelve months as against our three.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is true.

Mr. Griffith: Do you suggest that because they are 10,000 miles nearer that we should do less by way of preparation for defence?

Mr. LAWRENCE: The member for Canning is hard to convince, or perhaps I am not lucid enough in my argument. I said quite distinctly that I believed in full defence of this country, but that the system of defence should be a sound one. I do not believe that guns are going to defend this country properly.

Mr. Griffith: Have you ever heard of a global war?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Has the hon. member been reading "Superman?"

Mr. Griffith: That still does not answer the question.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I asked the Minister a question about a man named Charles Frank Arthur Grimes. He is a resident of Coogee Beach and lives in a tent. This gentleman was in the Forces for approximately six years. Prior to his joining up he worked on a dairy farm where he had accommodation. When he returned from

the war he decided to marry and thought he would settle in Fremantle. He went into a certain property on a rental basis and eventually was evicted. I do not know the address, but if the Minister is interested I can find out. When evicted, he had to go to live at Coogee Beach, and he has lived there for the last 18 or 20 months. He has a boy of five months, a girl of 18 months and a girl of three years, and they and himself and his wife live in one tent. Some six or seven weeks ago a heavy blow occurred and Grimes's tent was blown down. He approached me for relief and, after making an inspection, I found that the tent was beyond repair.

I approached the Housing Commission and was told that it could not do a single thing to help him. Grimes also had a priority for 1947—speaking from memory, September, 1947. However, I sent Grimes to see the Housing Commission after having been informed that the file stated that the conditions in his camp were not satisfactory. I could quite realise that that was so, with three little children living in a tent. That must be obvious to anyone. I let that go and sent Grimes to see the Housing Commission.

Grimes is employed in the wool scouring section at Jandakot, and anyone who has been near scouring works knows the high odour that emanates from them. That odour gets into the worker's clothes and is not noticeable to the person concerned. He is a good type of man because he did not want to waste too much of the time of his employers, who had given him a very good deal and, incidentally, I may mention that he is in line for advancement in the company.

He mounted his bicycle, rode into Fremantle and came to Perth by bus in his working clothes, and presented himself to the personal inspection of the committee. When I next went to the Housing Commission, I inquired how Grimes had got on and was told that he had borne out the statements of the inspector. I was told, "You can smell him." That may sound funny to some members, but I think he would smell funny considering he worked in that atmosphere. Because he did not want to waste the time of his employers, about which the member for Moore was so grieved, he was put further down the scale in the matter of cleanliness.

Grimes could probably have taken a day off—that would not have made him bankrupt—taken a bath in the sea—there are no facilities at the camp—put on his good suit and then gone to the Commission. But what would the result have been then? It seems to me that it would have been the same. However, Grimes can get no help from the Commission and he and his wife and many others of those people are at Coogee Beach at the moment. I asked the Minister some questions about the Coogee Beach campers, and let me say at this stage that I know that all

the people at Coogee Beach are not genuine, but I do know that 17 to 20 are genuine cases that have been evicted and have nowhere to live and are being prosecuted by the road board, some of them twice. Where are they to go? I realise the extent of the problem confronting us, but surely we can be humane about it!

Mr. May: That sort of thing breeds communism.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I asked the Minister for Housing whether he was aware that the Fremantle Road Board was prosecuting the campers at Coogee Beach and he replied that he was. He also admitted that he knew that at least one camper had been prosecuted twice. In reply to another question, whether he was aware that the State Housing Commission had refused these campers any assistance—and that includes the whole of these campers—he replied—

The Commission has stated that it could not extend special priority to those persons who chose to camp on the Coogee Reserve—

Chose! Let members note that.

—but each applicant would be considered when his turn on the priority list was reached.

It will be too bad for him if he has a priority for 1949 or 1950 because, if the prosecutions continue, by that time he will be cutting out his fines in gaol for the next 50 years.

Mr. Manning: Cannot the Fremantle Road Board be persuaded to discontinue those prosecutions?

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member should address that question to the Minister for Local Government. In reply to a further question whether the minister would be prepared to suggest some solution for these campers' problems of finding alternative accommodation, the Minister replied—

It is suggested that each applicant should consider the erection of a modest home on a self-help basis.

I feel sure that that was not the Minister's own answer, and I do not know that I should proceed to deal further with it because it would not be fair to waste the time of the Chamber.

Going further in my electorate to stress the terrible and grave position of housing, let me mention the Base flats at Fremantle. People have been put into those flats. I know of one case where the conditions of living were so bad in one of those flats that a man named Hawkins paid £60 out of his own pocket to have the place renovated, and he has not had a penny of that money returned to him by the Housing Commission or anyone else. He also had a priority to build in March, 1947, but he is still in that flat.

We pass further afield to Naval Base where evicted tenants are being located. I have inspected the buildings there and consider them a blot, not only on the countryside but also on the intelligence of the people who designed them. To begin with, they are unlined. We may not object strongly to that, seeing that the position is so grave; but where the corners of the wall come together daylight can be seen. I have asked many women there how they got on in the wintertime, and a number have told me that their children have awakened at night crying with the cold, because the wind has come through the walls. Furthermore, the bedclothes have been damp from moisture. Heaven only knows how it will be possible to live in those places in summer, because they will be absolute furnaces. The Minister tells me he does not consider the buildings are substandard as dwellings for humans. In this country that type of building is definitely substandard.

The Minister for Housing: Are they not preferable to the street?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I agree. But I do not agree that people should have to live in the street, or that they should be placed in substandard dwellings.

The Minister for Housing: Unfortunately there are not enough homes.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I know; and I am telling the Minister the reasons, and how to overcome the problem. If the Government does not move in this matter, I warn it that it will be tossed out on its head at the next election.

Mr. W. Hegney: It deserves to be!

Mr. LAWRENCE: I asked the Minister about these places, which are supposed to be temporary accommodation. I inquired what was the maximum time families would be allowed to occupy them. The answer was that these buildings were to provide temporary accommodation only for evicted families until such time as they could find more suitable accommodation. They look like having grey beards when they get out of those camps! I then asked the Minister had he received reports from tenants or inspectors regarding the suitability of these places as dwellings, and he said no reports had been received. I asked whether, if he had had no such report, he would take steps to procure some? Apparently he decided that reports were not necessary.

The Minister for Housing: As a matter of fact, I went out personally and inspected those camps on no less than four occasions.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Did you like them?

The Minister for Housing: They are preferable to being in the street.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is what I cannot undersand about the Minister or the Government. We are not asking whether people should be out on the street. We

are asking whether people who have been away and fought for this State should come back to this country and be forced to live under those conditions. There is no suggestion that they should be on the street. Whose fault is it if they are on the street? It is the result of maladministration and misgovernment if such a position exists.

Mr. Hutchinson: There are limitations in labour and materials.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Due to the rearmament programme! I explained that.

Mr. Styants: In 1947 there were not.

Mr. W. Hegney: The member for Cottesloe did not say that at the election.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If the hon. member will cast his memory back to the 1930's, he will realise that it was because of the ineptitude of his Government that homes were not constructed then that would have stood this country in good stead today.

The Premier: Not only this Government.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I make no reservations to the Premier whatsoever. I say that any Government that goes along on those lines is not entitled to govern.

Mr. Hutchinson: Do you realise that 23,000 migrants came into this State in 1950?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I know that, and I suggest to the hon. member that those 23,000 migrants are not as good as 23,000 Western Australian-born children. Let us build our own population instead of importing it. What does the Government consider is the effect of this state of affairs on the psychology of the people? I reiterate the statement I made when the member for Moore was present.

Mr. May: He is in bed by now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If ever I heard a belated attack on any political party it was the one made by him on communism, because he is a follower of the Government that is pushing people towards communism by its inability to provide healthy living conditions for them. It is the Government's fault because it supports the Commonwealth Government, which is the main cause of our ills.

Mr. Manning: Compared with Ceylon and India we do not seem to be doing so badly as far as living conditions are concerned.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I agree; but why are the people of those countries in that condition? It is because they have been misgoverned and exploited by the Government of the day.

Mr. Manning: Are we being exploited too?

Mr. LAWRENCE: Yes. The people are being exploited. I am being exploited by the Government.

The Premier: I do not believe that.

Mr. Manning: I find that difficult to follow.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Would the hon. member like me to explain why?

Mr. Hoar: Have you seen any Tory Government that did not exploit anybody?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have not got my own home and I will have to wait another three or four years for it, unless I can find a nook or cranny somewhere.

Mr. Griffith: Your heart must bleed for the New South Wales Government.

Mr. LAWRENCE: My heart bleeds because I cannot get a home for my wife and children.

Mr. Brady: All the material has gone to Winterbottom's and Mortlock's to build factories.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I think I am entitled to a home. I have put more effort into this country than have a lot of members of this Chamber of my own age. I fought just as strongly and am just as sincere in my desire to see the country go ahead.

Mr. Griffith: I do not think for a moment that anybody doubts that, but the housing shortage is not confined to Western Australia.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am not denying that. I am pointing out in answer to the hon. member—

Mr. Griffith: You are trying to blame this Government for all the ills in existence.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I do blame this Government.

Mr. Griffith: You do not realise that the Labour Government of New South Wales is in a similar position.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If I put my head in the fire, would the member for Canning do the same?

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: Yes, of course he would!

Mr. Marshall: He is silly enough for anything.

Mr. LAWRENCE: We find that the hospital situation in this State, especially in Perth and Fremantle, borders on chaos.

Mr. May: It is going to be all right at Carnarvon.

Mr. LAWRENCE: On the 31st August, the Minister for Health, in reply to the member for Leederville, calmly gave the information that there were 859 people awaiting entry to the Royal Perth Hospital. I suggest to the Premier that that is a delightful state of affairs!

Mr. Bovell: When this Government took over there was nobody in the Perth hospital. There were no patients at all. We removed the cobwebs from it.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That shows how well and contented the people were under the Labour Government! In Fremantle, there were 160 people awaiting admission to the hospital on the 31st August. I do not know how this country is going to get on if we cannot even look after the health of the people; if we are going to let them live and sleep under bad conditions and then, when they become sick, are not able to put them into hospital for treatment.

The Premier: Enormous sums of money are being spent on hospitals.

[Mr. Hill took the Chair.]

Mr. LAWRENCE: I am going to send all my electors to Pinjarra when the new hospital is built there. I appeal to the Government to make all endeavours in the matter of giving our juveniles true education. I appeal to it to see that toys like guns and bombs, stupid wishy-washy comics and unsuitable magazines are done away with, and that a sane system of defence is undertaken. I know it is not within the State Government's power to say what the defence system shall be, but it certainly has some pull on the Commonwealth Government. When we get back to a sane system of defence, the Government should see that the home-building programme is pushed ahead, that the migration policy is cut and that a sincere effort is made by the Government to increase the birthrate of the State. We will then be able to see what the difference is so far as production is concerned. If production goes forward, we will certainly do away with the inflation problem.

Mr. Manning: Do you think a return to the 44-hour week would increase production?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I shall speak on that in a moment. I wish now to speak on industrial matters, in which I can deal with the question of the 44-hour week. I heard the Premier say, when introducing the Budget, something to the effect that he wished to thank the people of the country for the industrial peace that had pervaded the State over the last 12 months. However, we find that not long ago prosecutions were carried out against a certain trade union in this State. They arose out of the prosecution of the general secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation in the Federal Arbitration Court. That charge was made because a certain person, James Healy, general secretary of the Waterside Workers' Federation, as a servant, obeyed the instructions of the members of his union.

After those instructions were carried out in a true and faithful manner, the security police raided the offices of the federation, the Seamen's Union and one

other union. From the waterside workers' office they took certain minutes—or should I say verbatim minutes—of a meeting of our federal council. The federal council, after due deliberation, had arrived at a certain conclusion and, as a result, decided that a certain policy would be undertaken to protect its own interests. The federation's interests, the council considered, were closely linked with the New Zealand waterfront stoppage, and therefore it was decided that the members of the federation would not handle any ships coming from New Zealand that had been loaded by what was termed "scab" labour. Healy proceeded, under instructions, to the port of Melbourne and told the members there that they were not to handle the cargo of a certain ship, and the members refrained from doing so. Because this showed in the minutes which the security police obtained, Healy was charged that he individually stopped these men from working.

I know positively well, because I had a copy of the minutes and perused them, that Healy acted strictly under instructions. He obeyed the people who employed him, just the same as you, Mr. Chairman, or I would. As a result of his prosecution, he was sentenced to six weeks' gaol on one charge, six weeks' gaol on a further charge and fined £100. Immediately this was known throughout Australia, every waterside worker in the Commonwealth—and there are 26,000 of them—walked off the job. They are probably 26,000 communists, according to the member for Moore.

Mr. Manning: You are pretty hard on the member for Moore.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have not started on him yet. The waterside workers and the members of the Dock, Harbours and Rivers Union heard the news, not as unions but as individuals. The seamen also heard it individually, and their principles of trade unionism were so violated by this action of the Federal court in sentencing this fellow to six weeks' gaol that they decided to down tools as a protest. The reason they took that action was because these 26,000 men had said to one man, "Go and do this as our servant," and as a true and faithful servant he went and did what he was told; and he took the kick for 26,000 wharfies. Because he was unfairly penalised, these other unionists, in all fairness, said, "We must protest against a savage action like this," which they did.

But it is to be noticed that when these men stopped work they made no demand upon the employer for increased wages, better conditions of work or for any amenity whatsoever. They just refused to work, as a matter of protest. Following that, we find that although the docks union, the seamen, the shipwrights and waterside workers walked off, only one section of those people in this State was prosecuted—the docks men. They were

prosecuted under Subsection (1), paragraph (a) of Section 132 of the Industrial Arbitration Act, which provides—

No person shall take part in, or do or be concerned in doing any matter or thing in the nature of a lock-out or strike.

A strike is defined in the Act as follows:—

"Strike" includes any cessation of work or refusal to work by any number of workers acting in combination or under a common understanding with a view to compel their employer or to aid any other workers in compelling their employer to agree to or accept any terms or conditions of employment or with a view to enforce compliance with any demands made by any workers on any employer.

The point is that these men at no time made any demand on the employer, yet they were attacked under this section and fined £5, with £3 9s. costs, and in default 15 days as His Majesty's guests. Peculiarly, these men from the union were tried not by an industrial court or an industrial magistrate, but by an ordinary police magistrate, and it was probably the first time he had read that section of the Act. Even though the seamen on the "Koolinda" walked off at the same time on the same day they were not prosecuted. I have made many efforts to find out why they were not prosecuted, but nobody has come forward to let me know. I can suggest only one reason why they were not proceeded against. Surely the Government had some incentive to move when it found that one of its Ministers was held up from 11 p.m. till the next morning on the "Koolinda," and the "Orontes" was held up also.

I say it was due to lack of courage on the part of the Government that action was not taken against the seamen. The Government preferred to attack a small union. I do not say it was the Premier personally who was responsible, but the men concerned felt the position so strongly that they asked me to approach the Premier and request that he receive a deputation to discuss the remission of the fines. The Government, through the Premier, flatly refused to meet the deputation. The Premier was approached further by another member of the Opposition, who also met with a refusal. I want the Premier to recall his words thanking the people of this State for industrial peace, and I warn him of how these men are feeling at the moment. They have been prosecuted and I would point out that their services are necessary for the handling of the tugs on the Fremantle waterfront.

None of the big ships can be got in or out of the harbour without the danger of serious loss or damage unless the tugs are present, particularly in squally weather, and these men feel that, because they are not even to be allowed a deputation, they will go to gaol and cut out their £5 fines, which

means that the port will be without the use of tugs for 15 days. I feel the position very keenly because I know that we are a long way behind in our handling of cargo. We have ships queueing up and we cannot get berthing space for them and cannot get the cargo carted away from the wharf quickly enough, so that the position is becoming catastrophic.

If we have this further hold-up of the tugs I do not know what will happen to the industry in the port, but I would suggest to the Premier that, unless he or one of his Ministers can see fit to meet these men and talk the matter over, the blame for any further serious holdup or loss of time in handling cargo will rest with him and not with the men. I have here a communication from the Seamen's Union and I think the Premier has a copy which was sent to him. It reads as follows:—

The rank and file members of the Seamen's Union are deeply incensed at the fining of members of the Coastal Docks, Rivers and Harbours Union of Workers re their stoppage on the 19th July, 1951, and would urge the Premier to intercede for the remission of the fines so that industrial peace can be maintained in the industry and further urge that the Premier receive a representative deputation of port union members to discuss the position that has arisen.

That is a plea from four or five unions, and surely, in view of the many deputations that the Premier and his Ministers must receive, the Government could make time available to meet these men on a serious question such as this. I do not know whether the Premier will reconsider his decision, but I earnestly hope he will give the question considerable thought, as it will not be long before these men are called upon to pay their fines and they have intimated strongly to me, without coercion or urging from any quarter, that they do not feel inclined to pay the fines and that, if the punishment is enforced, they will serve it at His Majesty's pleasure. That should give the member for Moore some thought.

The more I listened to the member for Moore the more and more I became convinced that his policy is more and more work, more and more sweating, less pay for the workers and more and more profit for the member for Moore.

Mr. Manning: That is a little unfair.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I know when I am being unfair and I know when other people are unfair. The member for Moore made the rather peculiar statement that our people are better off today. I do not say they are better off today and, in fact, I know they are worse off. We are 6,000 or 7,000 houses behind our requirements and people are being evicted, which they were not in the days that the member for

Moore talked about, when there were plenty of houses. There is not sufficient hospital accommodation nowadays, and we are threatened with another war. When the member for Moore says that our people are better off today his statement should be taken with a grain of salt because it is not a statement of fact. It is true that the basic wage may have risen by 150 per cent.

Mr. Brady: And margins have come down.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Prices have risen also by 300 per cent.—that is when you can buy the article you require.

Mr. Manning: I take it you are advocating greater production.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have already stressed that to the hon. member. It would be interesting to notice—as the member for Moore has quoted figures—that the ship-owners, who comprise a big capitalist body, have increased their holdings in the last ten years from £310,000,000 to £900,000,000. That is proof that profits have risen by 300 per cent., prices have risen by 300 per cent. and yet the basic wage has lagged, having risen only 150 per cent. Yet the hon. member says that we should increase our hours of work to 44. I could never agree with that.

I have just finished with the case of the prosecutions against the Docks, Rivers and Harbours Employees, and the Government on the one hand refused to intercede in a matter of justice. But the member for Moore, a supporter of the Government, now wants the Government to intercede with the State Arbitration Court to get further hours of work for the employers. That does not work out in fairness, in my opinion. If the Government will not intercede for justice on the one hand, how can it intercede for the employer on the other hand? These decisions of the Arbitration Court are arrived at after lengthy consideration. The decision concerning the 40-hour week was given after medical advice had been obtained. That decision was made by learned men—men much more learned in that sphere or field of thought, than either the member for Moore or myself. Every Arbitration Court in Australia decreed that 40 hours was the proper length of time that the human body should be asked to slave or toil.

Mr. Ackland: What about work?

Mr. LAWRENCE: The member for Moore stated that he had worked terribly hard all his life—nobody has seen more poverty than he has and nobody has worked harder than he has. I worked jolly hard myself and probably just as hard as the member for Moore. I do not want to see people going back and working as hard as we did, or as hard as the member for Moore declares that he worked. The courts have decided that that is a fair and humane thing and that

those hours of work are as much as the human body can sustain. Now the member for Moore wants to change it.

Mr. Nalder: Has the British race deteriorated to such an extent that it can't work more than 40 hours?

Mr. LAWRENCE: When I sometimes look around I would say that it has, in places. The member for Moore wants more co-operation between the employer and employee. When speaking to the Address-in-reply I laid particular stress on the urgent need for co-operation between the worker and his employer. I made the same plea to Senator McLeay when he was in this State, and absolutely nothing has been done about it. It seems strange that the hon. member has not raised this point before. If he considers the position is so urgent, why did he not raise the question before this? I believe in co-operation but co-operation can come only from two sides and, unfortunately, as in the past, the worker is on the receiving end again.

Mr. Nalder: The receiving end all right because I believe that some men, operating that wheat ship, drew up to £62 each in one week.

Mr. LAWRENCE: To what wheat ship is the hon. member referring?

Mr. Nalder: The wheat ship in Fremantle; the one with the damaged wheat.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The hon. member is referring to the "Navarino"—a bulk wheat ship which contained bad wheat. I pity the hon. member for believing such a stupid story, and I trust that he will go back to the person who informed him and tell that person that he is either very much misled or he is telling deliberate lies. If the hon. member had read the paper he would have seen that there was a stoppage on that ship and that the men received 1s. 9d. an hour over and above 6s. 10½d. If, at eight hours a day, seven days a week, that works out to £62 for the week, then the hon. member is a super-economist or mathematician. To put the hon member on the right track, I will be quite fair with him and tell him that I know of one person who did earn £62 in one week, but not on that ship. That money was earned on the ship which caught alight and the men went to work in the hold at the risk of their lives to get out the cargo. Some of the foremen worked round the clock and received £62 in that week—that was for working round the clock, seven days in the week.

Mr. Nalder: I was told it was the men working on the wheat ship.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is not so. In his outburst about communism the member for Moore forgot to explain one thing to my satisfaction—that was his definition of a communist. He told us that a communist was a black snake; somebody

interjected and said that he might even be a red snake and somebody else said he could be a white snake. What a scoundrel he was! I do not know. I have never been to this place called Russia, and I do not know whether the hon. member has been there or whether he knows any communists. I do not know whether he has ever studied the doctrines as expounded by Marx or Engels. I certainly have not but I was wondering what the member for Moore, after his most vicious attack on the president of the State executive of the Australian Labour Party in his pamphlet issued at election time, considers is a communist. I know what the hon. member thinks is a communist—that is a militant trade unionist; a man who will stand up for his rights and demand them and fight until he achieves that object.

Mr. Manning: What do you think he is?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I told the hon. member that I have not been to Russia; I have not studied Marx or Engels and I do not know what a communist from Russia is like because I have never met one, and I do not know one. I have met so-styled communists and I have seen nothing wrong with them; some of them are quite good fellows. They may be reactionaries—

Mr. Grayden: It depends on your point of view.

Mr. LAWRENCE: No, it does not.

Mr. Griffith: You say that you have never met a communist?

Mr. LAWRENCE: I said that I have never met a communist. I said that I did not know what a communist was but I have met so-styled, so-called communists. That is what I stated.

Mr. Grayden: And you have found nothing wrong with them?

Mr. Griffith: Purely a courteous inquiry, you know.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Referring to one who comes immediately to my mind, I will quote the case of my general secretary, who held office when I was secretary of the Waterside Workers at Fremantle. He was a man who has spent almost all his life in this country. He fought in the first world war in defence of his country, in England, and he came over here. The roots of his existence are in this country; his grandchildren, his wife and the rest of his family.

As you, Mr. Chairman, will readily realise, holding the position you do as member for Albany, there are many complex problems involved in the waterfront industry. When I first took over this job there were many times when I was stumped for an answer. I say this in all truthfulness: That I have telephoned James Healy as general secretary of the Waterside Workers' Union, and asked his advice as to whether we should create a stoppage on

the waterfront to win our case or carry on working and thus lose our case. On quite a number of occasions Healy has said to me, "Don't be silly, Lawrence; get back to work." If he is one of those fellows who, the member for Moore has said, is a treacherous snake, will smash the country and kill our women and children and God knows what else, then the opportunity was staring him in the face to create disturbance on the waterfront, but he rejected it.

Mr. Hutchinson: Perhaps it was not the appropriate time.

Mr. Grayden: Perhaps it did not fit in with his objective.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I feel sorry for the hon. member when he talks like that because I know he is most unlearned.

Mr. Hutchinson: To whom are you referring?

Mr. LAWRENCE: All of the members or, should I say, the members in the back bench.

Mr. Grayden: Why don't you stop patting them on the back?

Mr. Griffith: You are just like the fellow who was out of step; all the rest of the Army is wrong.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I could not agree with the hon. member on that.

Mr. Grayden: Have a look at the faces of your colleagues!

Hon. A. R. G. Hawke: That would be much more pleasing than looking at the faces of the young Liberals.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If the member for Moore and his Government made an attempt to legislate properly and ensure that better relations were kept between employer and employee, they would find, on waking up one morning, that this terrible phobia from which the member for Moore suffers—communism—would be non-existent because I tell him now that, in a country such as Australia if the legislation and the conditions are good there never will be communism and no need for it because the people will be satisfied. We have been told that communism arises from revolution.

Mr. Manning: That is what we read.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I have read and I feel that if we carry on as we are doing there will be a revolution, and I do not want to be in it.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: There will be a revolution if the Government does not hurry up with the rent Bill.

Mr. Hutchinson: Will you lead it?

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LAWRENCE: The other question I want to touch on is the market gardeners' dispute. In the Spearwood district and adjacent areas, which are in my electorate,

there are quite a number of market gardeners and I, together with quite a number of other members of this Chamber, know something about market gardening and the conditions that prevail in the industry in which they produce their wares.

Mr. Grayden: It is not so interesting now.

Mr. LAWRENCE: As I have found them, they are good citizens, excellent producers and they work very hard indeed, as do their wives and children.

Mr. Manning: On a 40-hour week?

Mr. LAWRENCE: No. However, they are now engaged in a dispute in which, as far as I can see, the Minister for Agriculture and the Market Trust appear. To be brief, we find that the origin of this dispute lies simply in the fact that the producer wants to sell his goods separately from his container, but nobody will listen to him. It is peculiar to note that the system in operation today has been carried out over the years and has become customary, but it has only become customary because the secondhand bags, in which the products have been placed in years gone by, have cost 2s. to 3s. per dozen but now we find that the cost of those bags has risen to approximately 57s. per dozen, which means that each bag costs the grower 4s. 9d. The practice today is that the grower takes his bag of cauliflowers, beans or whatever else the produce may be, to the market; it is weighed and he is paid on the weight of the bag, plus the weight of the vegetables, which is the gross weight. If it weighs 20 lb. he is paid for 20 lb. of beans, which means that if beans are 1s. a lb. he will be paid £1 for that bag of beans. The bag itself weighs 1 lb. which means that he has 19 lb. weight in beans for which he should reasonably get 19s. and then he should get 4s. 9d. for the bag because it is his and he is entitled to retain it, but instead, he gets 1s. for it which means that he loses 3s. 9d. on the deal.

Mr. Grayden: What is the average amount paid per bag by weight?

Mr. LAWRENCE: It all depends on the bag. A cornsack weighs 2 lb. and a half-sack 1 lb.

Mr. Grayden: Until you work out the average weight you would not know the amount he was to be paid.

Mr. LAWRENCE: Yes, it is worked out on the weight of the bag plus the weight of the vegetables.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It all depends upon what he is selling. He would not get as much for cauliflowers as he would for beans.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I will explain it to the hon. member. If he is selling cabbage at 3d. a lb. he receives so much, which includes the refund on the bag. Before he can take his vegetables to market he must

pay for the bags, which means that he loses money before he gets the produce to the market.

Mr. Grayden: You said that a bag weighed only 1 lb.; that he gets 6d. for the bag when the vegetables are 3d. and you say, therefore, that the bag must weigh 2 lb.

Mr. LAWRENCE: If the hon. member had listened he would have heard that I said that a cornsack weighs 2 lb. and a half-sack weighs 1 lb. If a grower has a bag of cabbages he puts them in a big bag, which weighs 2 lb.

Hon. J. T. Tonkin: It is too much for the member for Nedlands.

Mr. Marshall: Get Professor Copland to explain it to you.

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is found that a position such as this would arise. That if the Government found me a home and I furnished it, and then decided to sell it and I went along to the auctioneer and asked him to sell that house with the furniture, the result would be he would sell it with the furniture; but if I said he was to sell it without the furniture and sell the furniture separately and, if the member for Canning was an auctioneer—although I doubt whether he has enough brains to be one—what would he do with the furniture.

Mr. Griffith: There is one thing: we can always expect insulting remarks from the other side of the House.

[Mr. Perkins resumed the Chair.]

Mr. LAWRENCE: I know what the member for Canning would do: He would sell the house and then sell the furniture separately. That is exactly what the market gardener wants. We find that when the cray fishermen take their bags of crays to the markets they sell the crays and get the bag back or receive payment in lieu of the price of the bags. If the grocer that comes to our door every week brings the groceries in a box, he wants the container back as the customer is only buying the groceries in the box. That is exactly parallel to the position of the market gardeners. We find too, that the Press has some part to play in this. On market days there may be a small dump of top line commodities—probably three or four bags—and the rest of 40 or 80 bags will contain an inferior article.

When the Press quotes the price of vegetables it quotes the prices of the top line commodities. This instantly misleads the public into thinking that the market gardener is being paid for his bag at the highest cost of the prime article in the market. But as there are only two or three bags of that top line commodity, out of the 80 bags of inferior quality, what would be the use of that price? I would now like to refer to the action of the Government in regard to this matter. I

asked a series of questions of the Minister for Agriculture in relation to this subject. On the 17th October I asked the following question:—

Is it a fact that the grower is not paid by buyers at the metropolitan markets for bags and crates used to contain garden produce?

The Minister replied—

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

The first part of that answer satisfied me. The growers are paid for bags. Actually that is not so; they are not paid the true value of the bags. If a bag costs 4s. 9d., and one pays 2s. 4½d. for it, one has only paid half the amount and still owes the shopkeeper another 2s. 4½d. The same applies here. The Minister is trying to evade the issue. The Government talks about peace in industry but if this is an example of what goes on we will have no peace in industry at all. On the 17th October I also asked the Minister—

Has he authority under the Metropolitan Market Act or any other Act to intervene and ensure fair treatment for the growers?

The Minister replied—

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

Since the Minister was so caustic in his article in "The West Australian" this morning with reference to me I am afraid I must be just as caustic. I asked the Minister if he had any authority and he said "No." Why then does he waste the Government's time, which is paid for by the taxpayers; why does he waste the market gardeners' time and everybody else's time when he knows he cannot do anything about it? Why did he receive a deputation? It appears to me that it was another case of mismanagement as far as the Minister was concerned.

When he states that the position now appears back to normal, I can assure him that the position is not back to normal with the market gardeners. I met them last Friday morning. They were very incensed at his attitude and propose to take some further steps if the Minister does not do something in the matter. This is how the Minister has been treating us all along. I know the Premier is not listening, but I think he should because we are here to do some good for the people of the State. When I get this sort of Tommy-rot dished up to me by the Minister, who tries to misrepresent the whole issue, I feel it is incumbent on me to take the matter back to the people I represent and let them know the true state of affairs. On the 24th October I asked the Minister the following question—

What is the cost of second-hand and new bags per dozen that are used by market gardeners to deliver their produce?

The Minister replied—

Prices are subject to orders issued by the Prices Control Minister.

I am well aware of that fact. I did not ask him whether prices were controlled; I asked him what the price was, and he just could not answer that, or he did not want to answer it. It appears to me that the Minister did not want to answer it. Why, I do not know. Again I asked the Minister—

What is the weight of bags used by market gardeners?

His answer was—

Weights are variable.

That is all right as far as the answer goes. He does not agree that the producer is receiving unfair treatment, when answering this question. The next question I asked the Minister was—

If he has no authority under the Metropolitan Market Act to intervene and ensure fair treatment to the producer, would he consider amending the Act?

In reply the Minister says he does not agree that the producer is getting unfair treatment. Under Section 13, Subsections (4) and (5) of the Metropolitan Market Act we find that the Trust may make by-laws for all or any of the following purposes:—

Regulating the conduct of persons using the market, resorting thereto, or buying or selling therein.

Regulating the method of selling in the market and preventing every kind of fraudulent device in relation to the sale of marketable commodities and prescribing that sales by auction or otherwise may be conducted by officers of the Trust.

That is quite specific in its intent; that is that the Trust itself can make by-laws for the purposes I have mentioned. The Minister no doubt could have, if he had so wished, asked the Trust to make that by-law. He said, however, he would not move in the matter. I do not know that there will not be a fair bit of trouble over this. These gardeners are mainly Yugo Slavs and Italians and, although they are pretty peaceable people, if they are treated as shabbily as they have been they do not take to it kindly, and unless the Government asks the Minister to make some move in the matter I can foresee possible repercussions. Before I conclude I must refer to the Minister's statement which appeared in this morning's paper. It reads as follows:—

Some members of the Market Gardeners' Association and some Labour members were making the composition

of the Metropolitan Market Trust a political football, the Minister for Agriculture (Mr. Wood) said last night.

If this is the expression the Minister likes to use, I might say that in football there is a certain amount of kicking; I would further suggest that it is the market gardener who has been kicked by the Minister, or through his fault. It is high time that he did something about it. As to the Metropolitan Market Trust, the growers are asking to be allowed to elect their own representative on the trust and the attitude of the Minister, as mentioned in his statement, is that the gentleman concerned has been elected by the Government, has held that position for some time, and in fact has been re-appointed seven times. I agree with the growers that it is only fair and just that they should be permitted to elect their own representative, just as the Government of the day is entitled to elect a Speaker for this Chamber. The Minister stated that we had tried to convince ourselves that the Minister had power to do certain things. I suggest to the Minister that if it is otherwise, he might tell us what he is doing as Minister in charge. If he has no powers, he is wasting his time by taking on that job and, if he is aware of it, it is time he brought down an amendment to the Act. This we have asked for and he has refused.

In his statement, the Minister for Agriculture went on to say that it was time to tell the public something about the Metropolitan Market Trust Act and the Trust but, in his rambling way, he told us nothing about it. I challenge the Minister to let the truth be made known. If he so desires, we are prepared to meet the Minister in public debate so that the facts may be made known to the public. The market gardeners have nothing to cover up but, from rumours I have heard, I conclude that certain people who operate have something to cover up. That thought is in the minds of the market gardeners and, while the thought persists, we cannot expect to have any real peace in the industry. The Minister for Agriculture went on to say—

Mr. Lawrence had said that when the public started screaming, the Minister would crawl down very smartly. As Mr. Lawrence was a newcomer to politics, he should be informed that Ministers, whether Labour or anti-Labour, did not crawl down smartly to any pressure group.

In reply to the Minister, I admit that I have not been here very long, but in my opinion the Minister has been here too long.

Mr. W. Hegney: The Ministers have crawled down to the Legislative Council.

Mr. LAWRENCE: The statement that they would not crawl down to a pressure group impressed me as being peculiar. I am not very old in years, but I have seen

it happen many times, and so have other members of this Chamber. If the Minister for Agriculture was surprised at my statement, evidently there was relevance in the reference that the market gardeners would not sell their vegetables if they did not get what they wanted. Though the Minister expressed surprise at my having made a statement of that sort, I would inform the Minister that I am not ashamed of it, though I am appalled at the inability of the Minister to inquire into the matter to ascertain what these people want. I can tell Ministers what they want in one word—they want justice, and that is all. The Minister proceeded to pat himself on the back because he had appointed to the trust a "friend" of the member for Moore. I refer to Mr. Harry Webb. I do not know that there is anything praiseworthy in that. Then the Minister proceeded to say—

The consumers could be just as well represented by the secretary of the Liberal Party or any other organisation, such as the Housewives' Association.

I agree with the Minister. I should like to see the secretary of the Liberal Party appointed as representative of the consumers. By his own statement, however, he admits that the representative of the consumers should be a consumer—in effect, that he should be elected by the consumers—but when it comes to the producers, the market gardeners, the Minister will not play ball by bringing down an amendment to the Act and allowing the market gardeners to elect their representative, because the Minister himself wants to do that.

In conclusion, I trust that, though I have been speaking quite a while, I have conveyed to the Government an indication of the serious state of affairs that exists generally in my electorate, and mainly in certain small portions of it, and I appeal to it to take notice of what I have said on those questions.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.