

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I shall adhere to the spirit as well as the letter of that Act.

Hon. P. Collier: I think the hon. member was referring, not to that, but to assistance to prospectors.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I have given an indication that members representing goldfields constituencies may expect a heavy falling-off in the money available for the development of mining during the next 12 months. No one regrets that more than I do. Still, I shall have to bear any criticism arising in consequence. The member for Hannans had to bear similar criticism for a period after informing the people that the vote was exhausted. I am afraid that the criticism that fell upon him will also fall on me. Whatever can be done with the funds available will, I hope, be done along the lines which can show the best results. I heard a suggestion the other day that the thing to do with the unemployed was to transport them in train loads to the goldfields and let them engage in prospecting there. I have never heard anything more absurd. If we have erred at all in the past it has been in the direction of excess generosity towards people who claimed to be prospectors, but had really nothing to back up their assertions.

Hon. P. Collier: There might be some advantage in the suggestion if a number of the Blackboy fellows wandered away and never came back again.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A few of them are talking about marching to Canberra. I would go a long way towards helping them in that direction if they would give an undertaking not to return. It is just as unpleasant to me to have to issue this warning as it is to others to hear it. We have not the money available and shall have to suffer from a shortage for some time to come. I am delighted to meet some of my old friends, who have been absent from this House for a period longer than I have. I am also delighted to meet those who are here but were not there when I went out of Parliament some years ago. I wish to congratulate the new members upon the speeches they have made on the Address-in-reply. I hope that although our efforts here may be strenuous, and the criticism severe, the friendships we make in politics will long remain. Although I may in the heat of de-

bate, as some members opposite are prone to do, say what may appear to be unkind things, I would assure the House that in my heart there is no intention to offend. I would ask members when criticising the Government departments and existing conditions generally to keep in mind what the existing conditions are, and to remember that these conditions appertain not only to Australia but throughout the Empire as well.

Question put and passed; the Address in-reply adopted.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

1. Traffic Act Amendment.
2. Main Roads.
3. Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment.
4. Anatomy.

House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 16th September, 1930.

	PAGE
Bill: Roman Catholic New Norcia Church Property Act Amendment, 1R.	482
Return: Public Works expenditure	482
Address-in-reply, twelfth day	483

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

BILL — ROMAN CATHOLIC NEW NORCIA CHURCH PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT.

Introduced by the Minister for Country Water Supplies, and read a first time.

RETURN—PUBLIC WORKS EXPENDITURE.

On motion by Hon. A. Lovekin, ordered: That a return be laid on the Table showing—1, The expenditure for public works for the year ended 30th June, 1930, from

Loan funds (a) on material; (b) on wages paid to workers; (c) on salaries to officials in charge of works; (d) on administration. 2, The like expenditure from Revenue funds. 3, The total amount of Trust funds in the hands of the Government. 4, The amount thereof borrowed by the Treasurer for public purposes.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies laid the return on the Table.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Twelfth Day.

Debate resumed from the 11th September.

HON. J. T. FRANKLIN (Metropolitan) [4.37]: I should consider myself remiss in my duty if I did not follow the lead of other members in congratulating you, Mr. President, on the honour which His Majesty the King has conferred upon you. May I be permitted to express the hope that you will live for many years to enjoy the honour. I wish to extend my sympathy to the relatives of the late Mr. Brown, who was a member when I was first elected to this Chamber. Immediately upon my entrance here Mr. Brown came to me and extended to me a welcome. The late hon. gentleman also gave me all the information and assistance he possibly could. I regret his loss personally and on behalf of the House. May I also congratulate the new members on their election. I realise that they are imbued with the same ideals, and with the same wishes for the prosperity of the State, as are the older members. It is a matter of regret to me that some of our former members should be lost to the Chamber. Nevertheless, I congratulate the new members on their election. In my opinion it is not right for a member to take up a great deal of time on the Address-in-reply. When the various Bills come forward, there are opportunities for criticising or supporting them, as the case may require. Nevertheless, I feel that a great deal has been neglected by various Governments in the past as regards utilising lands adjacent to railways which have existed for a number of years, some of them constructed before some of our members ever came to this Chamber. In saying this I do not allude to one Government more than any other. It is not business policy to ask settlers to go into the backblocks, and later urge the Gov-

ernment to construct railways to outlying districts so that the new settlers may have facilities for getting their products to market. This course should not be adopted when there is alongside the existing railway system land granted to various people in the olden times, land which has not been utilised in the manner or to the extent I and other members of the House think it should be. An effort should be made to persuade the owners of that land to bring it into use. Unfortunately there are not, adjacent to existing railways, many acres of Government land that can be utilised; but there are hundreds of acres privately held, the owners of which do not utilise what God has given them. Western Australia, like the other States, has an unemployment problem. If we could persuade the owners of the lands in question to utilise them, many of our married unemployed would have a prospect not only of earning their livelihood but of paying their way. The single men among the unemployed should go to the wheat belt. They should be asked to join in co-operative companies consisting of, say, 10 or 15 men and go to work on the wheat belt. The Government should give such companies a fair contract price for the clearing of further land on the wheat belt. The resultant benefit would be not only to find work for the unemployed, but to establish for them an occupation in which they could earn a livelihood. I would not support a cut and dried policy of reducing the cost of work. I would take the average cost, and then I would tell the unemployed single men, "This is the contract price, and you will be paid that price for clearing undeveloped land." Thereupon farmers applying for blocks in the following year would be able to go on cleared farms and cultivate them straightway. The present procedure of the Government is, I understand, to throw open an area and to have the land classified by experts as first, second and third class virgin land, and then to make it available for selection in blocks of, say, 1,000 acres. Would it not be better to have the land cleared in advance so that men desirous of taking up farms could go on to blocks which would produce some revenue immediately? In my opinion that would be a business-like way of proceeding. The Government would not lose, though certainly they would have to find the money required for clearing purposes. In making this suggestion I do not lose sight of the

fact that the Government cannot at present obtain much money by borrowing. Whatever development work is done must be of a revenue-producing nature. If wheat farms could be cleared on the lines I have suggested, they would be ready for the plough when they were taken up. The cost of clearing would be added to the cost of the land. The farmer would have the opportunity of paying the cost of clearing by instalments, in the same way as he now pays for the cost of virgin land. The advantage would be that immediately on taking up the land he would have a revenue-producing business. But the other way, the way it is being done at the present time, is to throw open a certain area of land, and say, "Here is a farm of 1,000 acres. It is not cleared. It is virgin country, and you will have to clear it." Whereas if it were already cleared for them, they could go on to it, cultivate it, and so secure revenue straightway. Very few of those who take up farms are in a position to go on the farms and cultivate them during the first year or two. To begin with they have not the money to meet all the expense of clearing and cultivating straightway. Under the scheme I have outlined they would take over cleared country and could cultivate it and so make a success of it forthwith. I do not think the scheme would present a very serious problem in point of borrowing money, because the clearing of most of the farms I have in mind would not cost much more than £1 or 30s. per acre. As a rule the farmer, on going on to his land, does not clear more than a few hundred acres during his first few years; but, as I say, this scheme of mine would permit of a man going on to cleared land and immediately cultivating it for a good return. From articles in the newspapers during the last day or two we find that the Government are going to spend another £160,000 on increasing the capacity of the weir at Harvey. I have often heard it said that what is required in that district is a comprehensive policy. I am strongly in favour of the appointment of an honorary commission to go thoroughly into this matter. That comprehensive scheme, I understand, would include the clearing of the land from, say, Pinjarra to Brunswick, on the coast side of the railway where there is an enormous area of swamp land suitable for cultivation, land that would give an excellent return. None of that country would

cost much to clear and to bring into a cultivable condition. I think the Government should take that comprehensive scheme into serious consideration. In the past we have gone in for group settlement, but unfortunately under that system we have attacked at all events some areas of land that have not been entirely suitable for the purpose. I am not saying that all the land treated under the group settlement scheme is not good land, but I do say that certain failures, or partial failures, have occurred through the extraordinary amount of money required to clear the land before the settler could get any return at all. I understand that engineers have reported on this question. Personally I should be glad if some other member of the House, better fitted than am I, were to look into this matter and see if we could not have an honorary commission appointed to determine whether we could not utilise the land of the South-West; because it is near to existing railways and near to seaports, and any success achieved in the cultivation of that land would serve as a big fillip to the dairying industry. Now I should like to say a word or two about the Hospitals Bill. I know that those of my fellow members who were sitting on this side last session very much regret that the decision of this House was not adopted in another place. It will be remembered that a certain portion of the Hospitals Bill of last session was passed by this House. We thoroughly agreed with a number of the provisions in the Bill, whereas we disagreed with others. If we are honest in our convictions and earnest in our desire to assist those who are suffering, we must deplore the fact that what was recommended from this House was not adopted by another place. Had that been done, we could have had an amended Bill to put on the statute-book, and so we would have relieved the troubles of our hospitals. As I have said, there were in the original Bill clauses with which we did not agree; but I maintain that half a loaf is better than no bread, and that if we cannot get what we go out for, then we ought to be satisfied with something that is at once beneficial, convenient, and suitable for the requirements. However, our decision was not adopted by another place. Why, I do not know. I with other members, am very sorry that it was not adopted, because our decision, had it been put into practice, would have been found to be in the best

interests of the State. Again, I think the time is opportune for the Government of the day to bring in a Bill under which a board would be appointed for the administration of the various public utilities in the metropolitan area. There is no development of the sort in the metropolitan area which does not concern all of us, whether as ratepayers or as taxpayers. I am not blaming one Government or another; certainly the present Government have not the money with which to do these things. But in my view now is the time for the appointment of a board to carry out these public utilities, for if we had such a board it would be empowered to borrow money for its own requirements, just as are the boards at present existing in Victoria and the other States.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But would a new board be given that power now?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: I notice that in the Eastern States one such body—I think it is the Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works—is about to borrow half a million of money for some projected undertakings. If they can do that, surely the board I propose for Perth could do the same.

Member: But that board in Melbourne has special powers.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Well we could get special powers for the proposed board also. At the present time no Government could be induced to authorise the borrowing of a million of money to carry out works for which, after all, the people of the metropolitan area will have to pay in interest and sinking fund. If such a board as I propose were appointed it would take over the tramways, sewerage, water supplies and other utilities. We have an object lesson in the water and sewerage board in Melbourne. I think there is a similar board in Adelaide, although I did not have an opportunity to go through its plant and system. But I did have the opportunity to inspect the works of the board in Melbourne. There the sewage is utilised by taking it some 25 miles from Melbourne to Werribee. In its passage, I understand, it is enclosed for the first five miles from the city, and moves by gravitation. Thereafter it has to be pumped. I went through the Werribee farm in fairly warm weather, and as for the existence of any nuisance, I can honestly say I

did not notice it. But I fully realised that the duties of the Melbourne Water and Sewerage Board were carried out in a businesslike manner, that instead of wastefully disposing of good material, it was profitably utilised in large paddocks to grow grass for the fattening of cattle for the metropolitan market. Exactly the same thing could be done here. Already we have the Midland Junction saleyards and abattoirs with sheep and cattle coming down in immense numbers from the outlying districts. As a rule, I suppose, they come down in larger numbers during the dry season than when food is plentiful. What could be better if we had some means whereby we could instal a sewage farm on which to depasture those cattle for a week or so in order to put them into prime condition for the market? I feel sure that many members will agree with that policy. In any event, the sewage farm would not be a very expensive experiment. My idea is that the proposed farm should not be up in the hills, but out in the Wanneroo district, where there are but few inhabitants. There, even if it proved a failure, it would not prejudicially affect any of the surrounding country. Moreover, if it did prove to be a failure, the effluent could go right into the sea, just as it does at present. I understand there is a fall of 8 feet from the septic tanks at East Perth to the ocean. That 8 feet fall would serve to conduct the crude matter from the septic tank a considerable distance, after which it would have to be pumped. However, I am given to understand it would not be a very expensive undertaking. I have read in various articles that if we were to take the sewage from the Perth area—the metropolitan area, of course, includes Claremont and Fremantle, the sewage from which it would not be necessary to include in this scheme—and treat it in the manner suggested, there would be a distinct revenue derived from it. And, moreover, it must be realised that although the Government would have to find the money initially, it is the people themselves who would have to pay the interest and sinking fund, and so in the end the Government would be recouped. Altogether I am convinced that if we could have appointed such a board empowered to borrow money for its own requirements, it would be of considerable assistance to the progress and prosperity of the State.

Hon. C. B. Williams interjected.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Whether or not it was done well by the previous Government, the metropolitan area deserves all the support and encouragement it can possibly get. As for the eastern goldfields, we are at one with them; not, as in years gone by, when we were not in accord with them. At present the metropolitan area is hand in glove with the goldfields in their requirements. So if the hon. member persists in that suggestion, we will have to withdraw our support from him, and where will he be then? The next subject I wish to discuss is that of the gold bonus. I understand Mr. Williams is not in favour of the gold bonus.

Hon. C. B. Williams: No, we do not want it.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Apparently the hon. member does not want to see the goldfields progress. Throughout my public life I have been in favour of a gold bonus and have consistently supported it during the time its advocacy has been State-wide. I am sorry to hear that Mr. Williams is not in favour of the gold bonus, for he should know more than I do about the disabilities of the eastern goldfields. Still, as a visitor who seldom goes there, I never find myself in Kalgoorlie without keeping my eyes open and looking around. I ask the hon. member to consider what a vast difference it would make to those goldfields if the Commonwealth Government were to give us some assistance under which the low-grade mines could be properly developed. In those circumstances, the tone and business capacity of the goldfields would be increased a hundredfold. In the past, of course, some of the big mines on the Golden Mile have returned substantial dividends to their shareholders and paid bonuses to their staffs, whereas lately they have been practically shut down and have let portions of their leases to tributers. Those tributers, I am informed, are making a very good thing of it; earning very good wages indeed. I understand that those tributers are quite satisfied with the position in which they find themselves. They deserve all that they are getting because they set themselves out with a full determination to make good. Quite a number of mines in the past have been abandoned because the holders thought they had petered out. Tributers, however, were not of the same opinion and, as I have said, took up the leases and worked them

satisfactorily. There are only one or two other items to which I wish to refer, because I consider we should not make long speeches on the Address-in-reply, especially as another place has concluded its debate, and we should do our utmost to follow its example as quickly as possible. At the same time, I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying a few words on the subject of the reduction of members salaries. I desire to make this as plain as I possibly can, that I am wholeheartedly in accord with the proposal to reduce the allowances of members, whatever that proposal may be. I think there are some hon. gentlemen here who are even prepared to work without remuneration for the advancement of the State. Personally I would not mind if I were paid just what I receive as Lord Mayor of the City.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Just the 3 per cents!

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The Lord Mayor of the City gets nothing.

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Anyway, I do not wish to pursue that argument, but I certainly do think that members should submit to a reduction in salary.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Why don't you be optimistic and suggest advancing the salaries of members by a couple of hundred?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: If we had many members like Mr. Williams to represent Western Australia, God help the State, especially if he desired to raise his salary on every possible occasion. Another matter I wish to urge is that we must be very careful in our advocacy of any system of reduction of wages.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: It is wonderful to think that the hon. member agrees with that. I repeat, we must be careful that we do not reduce wages unless there is a corresponding reduction in living costs; otherwise we shall be in a worse position than we occupy at present. If we can formulate a scheme whereby wages can be brought down at the same time as the cost of living, I do not think any objection will be raised by any section of the community.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Are not wages based on cost of living figures?

Hon. J. T. FRANKLIN: Yes. We hear the argument advanced that wages must be reduced. We cannot advocate any reduction in wages unless we reduce our own allowances as well. There is only one other

matter to which I shall allude, and I suppose I shall be repeating arguments that have already been used all over the State. It is that we should urge everywhere and on every occasion the purchase of locally manufactured goods. We should make that our strongest point and let the world see that we do practise what we preach. First we should purchase locally manufactured articles; then if we cannot get what we want amongst the locally made goods we should buy those made in the Eastern States; and failing there, purchase goods manufactured in England. But our slogan should be, "Purchase locally manufactured goods," because we can manufacture all the articles we require to enable us to live in this glorious State of ours. In conclusion, may I be permitted to say that although we are all up against it, we realise that while we have a hard time before us, each and every one of us must put his shoulder to the wheel so that we may come out on top. I say as emphatically as I can that Western Australia will be the first State to recover from the depression.

HON. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [5.7]: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, but before doing so I cordially endorse the remarks of previous speakers with regard to yourself, Mr. President. I, too, regret the absence of those members whose faces became familiar in this Chamber for many years, and I welcome the new members, who come to us in a time when the State is in financial difficulty, when we have to live within our incomes and when, as it might be expressed, the State has to tighten its belt. The Speech of His Excellency does not occasion any mirth. Nobody can be thrilled or pleased with the idea that we have to focus our attention chiefly on matters relating to finance. We might say that the days of "Squander mania" have passed and that in the future the flow of goods or gold will have to precede the flow of loans. Thoughtful citizens will appreciate the situation that pending a readjustment we shall have to face realities. Some did forecast that it was inevitable there would be a financial storm; I think there were a few who realised, perhaps, the severity of it when it reached us, particularly as it would apply to unemployment. Members of Parliament have been relying on the cap-

tain of the State ship to steer a course clear of the rocks. Of course, it is difficult to allocate the blame for our present position, but the fact remains that we have been steered on to the rocks, and that that is the situation of the States and the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister who appreciated what was apparently inevitable, asked, I believe, that some of the directors of the Bank of England should tender us advice so that we might get out of our troubles. Our position has been investigated very thoroughly, and what we are up against was committed to writing so that everyone should have the opportunity of studying it. Now we find that there is a section of the community desirous of ignoring the advice that has been tendered, and proposals have been advanced in the Eastern States which would lead us into further difficulties. It has been said by prominent Labourites in the Eastern States that there was an unholy alliance between certain Treasurers, comprising both Labour and National Treasurers and Premiers, and that the old saying that politics make strange bed fellows was applicable at the present time, when we found representatives of the States and the Commonwealth pledging themselves to endeavour to respect the advice given to the State and render all the assistance possible. That really means that the States are determined to alter the standards that have existed for so long. Of course there was no classification, but it was resolved to give effect to the decision arrived at at the Premiers' Conference, and it obviously meant that reductions would have to be made. For 20 years past Treasurers of the States have had an uninterrupted succession of deliriously happy days and years, and in that time they have been piling up deficits, except perhaps on two occasions, when they juggled the figures in order to show a credit balance. All that is to end, and the remedy has now to be sought. It means that we are to do now what should have been done years ago. We have borrowed not only for the purpose of developing the State but also to pay interest falling due on loans. The other evening I heard the Premier and ex-Premier explaining to members in another place what the position was, and it was clearly stated that money had been borrowed to pay our sinking fund and our interest bill. I thought it was an awful admission to have to make

that we had been borrowing money with which to pay interest.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That, surely, was not declared at the time the loans were raised.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I do not think it has ever been declared by Leaders of the parties, and I do not think that members realised that that was the position, even though it had been incidentally mentioned in debates at different times. Now, however, the declaration has been made by the leaders in another place. As a rule, we were informed that whenever a loan was raised the money was used for reproductive works.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The hon. member knows that often money borrowed for specific purposes, was never applied to those purposes.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes. An adjustment was made on the principle agreed to. The State had borrowed roughly £86,000,000 in that period and paid off, including inscribed stock, £8,000,000, plus the goldfields water supply loan, £2,500,000. Over a series of years we had the sinking fund, and we paid off that indebtedness to the extent of £15,000,000, leaving us, in round figures £70,000,000 in debt. When those figures were quoted, I heard Mr. Collier say, "Actually, we have paid for nothing because there were deficits in previous years." In the closing days of the Collier Government, the finances were in a bad way, but that fact was kept a profound secret from the public and, it is said, from many members of Parliament as well. The actual position may have been known to the other seven members of the Collier Cabinet, and if so, those Ministers discreetly kept the information to themselves during the time they were on the hustings, with the result that the public had no knowledge of the real position. In fact, the present Premier, when he was Leader of the Opposition, did not know. He has since admitted that he did not know what the financial position was at the time, and that had he known it, he would not have made his promise of work for all. We know that the Premier has not been able to fulfil that promise. When Mr. Collier was before the public in 1924, he rejected the idea of borrowing at the rate of £3,500,000 a year. There was a suggestion by the Government of the day that they should borrow certain sums of money for various purposes, and in

his policy speech at Boulder, Mr. Collier said—

With the small increase in the population of this State, they could not afford to spend anything like £500,000 a year. This huge expenditure was going on while the rate of interest on borrowed money was higher than ever.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Was Mr. Collier then in opposition?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, and he was appealing to the people to give him control of the Treasury bench. During the course of his policy speech at Boulder, he pointed to the heavy interest burden such borrowings would impose upon the workers of the State. I suppose he was appealing to the prejudices of the electors, for he said to them, "Are you prepared to vote for a Government who propose to borrow millions, squander the money all over the State, and you will have to pay the interest." The people listened to that teaching.

Hon. G. Fraser: Like they listened to the promise of "Work for all."

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, they swallowed the dope; I presume that is what the hon. member suggests. In the first year of the Collier Administration, the Government exceeded the £3,500,000 about which they complained, and spent over £4,000,000. During the six years the Collier Government were in office, I believe they spent on public works upwards of £25,000,000, chiefly from Loan Funds. That expenditure entails a very heavy interest burden on the people, and if the electors who were then so enthusiastic in voting in support of him at that time, take the information at their disposal now and analyse the figures, they will appreciate what it really means to them. We have in Australia to-day unfortunately—perhaps it is more intensified in the Eastern States—a number of people who are attempting to repudiate the interest on past loans, or at any rate desire to have the amount of interest payable reduced. From time to time Mr. Holmes has told us that a contract is a contract. Irrespective of the fact that a loan may expire at a given period, the investor receives merely the rate agreed upon when the loan was originally floated perhaps 20 years before, and in the interim new loans may have been floated at a higher rate of interest. Even Mr. Collier has complained about the rate of interest. Although the rate of interest had increased gradually during his regime, Mr. Collier

continued to borrow, notwithstanding increased interest charges. As to the question of repudiation, if we looked into the loans and the purposes for which they were floated, we might find that they were mainly in the interests of the soldiers who went overseas with the Australian Imperial Forces. That was at a time when John Bull had his back to the wall and was fighting for his life. In more recent years we have been afforded the spectacle of the Federal Government attempting to repudiate the pledges made to ex-service men who went overseas to fight the battles of Empire. That attempt at repudiation had not progressed very far before Federal Labour Ministers found that the various legislatures and the public were opposed to their proposals, and I am pleased to say they were withdrawn after a very brief period.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: They reneged!

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I do not desire to dwell on that subject and shall make merely a passing reference to it. As Mr. Seddon said the other evening, had the Federal Government persisted, they might have found the people divided on that issue even to a greater extent than they were divided on the conscription issue during a time of national crisis. Since the prorogation of the Thirteenth Parliament, there has been a general election and it is a coincidence that the close of the Thirteenth Parliament also witnessed the termination of the Collier Administration.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: That was their unlucky number.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Some people say they were lucky; some say they were unlucky. For my part, I claim the Collier Government were particularly lucky to vacate office at a time when difficulties were commencing to heap up before the State Treasurer.

Hon. A. Lovekin: So was Mr. Bruce.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, equally so. We can now look round and ponder on the result of that general election. The Collier Government lost control of the Legislative Assembly and their representation in this Chamber was also diminished. When he was a member of the Assembly, Mr. A. Thomson constantly referred to "Lucky Collier." He said that Mr. Collier was almost embarrassed with riches, and that he had had money showered upon him by the Federal

Treasurer. We know that during the six years the Labour Government were in power, they enjoyed a buoyant and expanding revenue; they had plenty of cheap money and a large grant from the Federal Government, partly in recognition of the recommendations of the Disabilities Commission. The amounts received from 1925 to 1927 represented over £500,000. In addition, they had the advantage of the writing off of £750,000 from the capital cost of soldier settlement, in which respect the Federal Treasurer was in agreement, and on top of all, good seasons and good prices ruled. In fact, when one payment offered by the Federal Government did not meet with his approval, Mr. Collier said that he hardly felt like accepting it because the amount was so small. The position is changed to-day. The present State Treasurer would be glad to accept the offer of 6d. from anywhere.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Mr. Collier inspired confidence; that is what you want.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Did the hon. member say "confidence"?

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Inspired confidence in whom?

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: Confidence trick!

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Now Mr. Collier is in opposition, he and his colleagues are able to sit back and criticise every act on the part of the present Government and particularly of the Treasurer, at a time when he is engaged in looking round for means by which he can balance the ledger. The Collier Government came into power not by any accident of circumstances but as a result of insidious propaganda extending over a long period, propaganda that included such catch-cries as the 44-hour week, long-service leave for wages men, and what they called the "sandalwood scandal."

Hon. E. H. Gray: Your party supported long-service leave.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am merely pointing out the propaganda indulged in. The Labour people also denounced the Collier coal agreement and told the public that it was another scandal representing one reason why they should vote against the Mitchell Government. The Labour Government were returned to power to represent a minority of the people. I will not read the figures at length because they already appear in "Hansard."

Hon. W. H. Kitson: That statement is not correct.

Hon. E. H. Gray: You have not referred to the uncontested seats and you are wrong.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, I have and have quoted them on the 75 per cent. basis. The Collier Government secured power as the representatives of a minority of the people. In the record of their regime there is the following statement:—

It is a fundamental of British Parliamentary Government that the majority of the people, through their elected representatives, shall govern.

There were many matters they were pledged to accomplish if returned to power, and one had reference to the introduction of the Redistribution of Seats Bill on an equitable basis. The Labour Government failed to do that and did not make any attempt until just before the 1927 election, which was determined on the old boundaries, and therefore the Labour Government were again returned to power on a minority vote. After the door of Parliament House was closed at the end of last session, the Government had to go to the people again. On that occasion the industrialists employed by the Government throughout the State reminded them of the promises they had made regarding long service leave. Recognising that the State was getting into financial difficulties, the Government had avoided fulfilling the promises they had made along those lines. When returned to power, the Labour Ministers promptly surrendered, and, behind the backs of Parliament, granted long service leave.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And a lot of them who will get it, voted for you.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That does not alter the fact that pressure was brought to bear on the Labour Government, who were told that a condition for their support was that the Government should grant long service leave.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And do you agree with that?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That means that 20,000 Government employees receive a privilege while 110,000 workers outside State employment have that privilege denied them. The latter section of workers are not in a position to coerce their employers to secure similar privileges.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We must get a start somewhere.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That administrative act has cost the State a lot of money and will lead to many arguments, some of which have already started with the suggestion that in these times that particular privilege should be dispensed with.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You do not agree with that policy?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: After another three years of minority Government, there was a redistribution of seats under which the 1930 general elections were held. That redistribution was not considered by many people to be on an equitable basis, but nevertheless it was a redistribution of seats. Mr. Collier, in his policy speech at Boulder, said his Government regarded with satisfaction the fact that they had faced and dealt with the position in a fair and fearless manner irrespective of possible consequences to themselves. To show how fair and fearless the Government were, let me remind members that they endeavoured to defeat their own Bill. Although Mr. Collier's following in another place numbered 27, the Redistribution of Seats Bill was passed by just the absolute majority and no more, and 14 of the majority were Nationalists and Country Party members. But for their support, the Bill would not have been passed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That goes to show that Labour members are free, and are not bound, as you always say they are.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I did not catch the hon. member's interjection. In 1924 Mr. Collier referred to the outrageous travesty of the representation, but he allowed it to continue in 1927 and endeavoured to defeat a Bill, ostensibly introduced to remedy the position, in 1929. Fortunately the electors have better representation as a result of the passing of that measure.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Collier Government ought to have the credit for it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I would be prepared to give them the credit for it if they had voted for it, but a majority of Labour members were opposed to it. If any credit is due for passing the Bill, it should go to Nationalist and Country Party members, through whose support it became law. Mr. Collier, in his policy speech at Boulder, was pleased to quote the statement of Mr. Davy, M.L.A., who had said that the voice of the people on this occasion would be given a real opportunity of being heard, whereas in

the past it had been, to say the least, distinctly muffled. Mr. Collier quoted that, taking to himself the credit for having given the electors that opportunity. The inevitable happened, Mr. Collier's Government were defeated, and the Government who have succeeded them are more representative of the people than any Government the State has had for the last 14 years.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I disagree with that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I expected the hon. member to disagree, but I shall quote some figures in support of my statement.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The goldfields have no representative in the Cabinet.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It does not matter who has the representation in the Cabinet.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You said the Government were more representative of the people.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, but the hon. member is complaining because there is no representative of the goldfields in the Cabinet. I do not think the people of Geraldton, Fremantle, Albany or Bunbury are satisfied with the representation, but portfolios cannot be made representative of every area in the State. At the Assembly elections 116 citizens anxious to serve their country for their country's good nominated. Of the 50 seats, 39 were contested, 34 between parties, and five by the representatives of one party. The high percentage of polling was almost a record for the State. I have taken some pains to look up the previous figures, and I find that as far back as 1911, 74.88 per cent. of the electors recorded their votes. On this occasion the percentage was 74.44. The highest voting was recorded in the Sussex district with 89 per cent.; the lowest was in Kanowna, a scattered electorate, with 59.47 per cent. There were 10 electorates that recorded votes of 80 per cent., and nine that recorded 75 per cent. Whilst the State average was 74.44, the highest for 19 years, that average was exceeded in 19 districts. Whether that was due to the efficiency of the Electoral Department, I cannot say, but no fewer than 11 seats were uncontested, which gave the department an opportunity to devote their energies to the other districts. There is another matter arising out of the elections, one of first-rate importance to members here, because it particularly affects the Legislative Council, and for their action the Collier administration deserve the

strongest condemnation. To suit one of the candidates for South Province, Mr. Heenan, who would have been only 29 years of age at the usual time of issuing the writs, the Government allowed only nine days from nomination till election day. The Government were quite within their legal rights in so doing, but never in the history of the State had such a thing been done. Lest some future Government be tempted to do the same thing, I suggest to the Minister that it would be opportune to amend the Act so that electors would be assured of an opportunity to record their votes.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Was it never done before?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Never in the history of the State.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Did not the same thing occur when Mr. Griffiths was elected to this House?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The late Mr. Griffiths was a member of the Labour Party—

Hon. C. B. Williams: Did not the same thing occur then?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There is a story attached to that, and if the hon. member interjects too much, I shall tell how that gentleman was defeated, together with the story of the selection ballot. It would be very wise for the hon. member to leave the selection ballots of the North-East province severely alone.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Griffiths was elected to this House.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The tactics adopted to enable Mr. Heenan to nominate did not reflect credit on the Government. From the party point of view, Labour members were probably very keen to have him as a candidate, but having regard to the huge area of this State and the difficulties of transport in districts where there is a mail only once a week or once a fortnight, the action of the Government was unfair. Many electors did not have an opportunity to learn the names of the candidates, much less to vote for them.

Hon. G. Fraser: Which province was most affected?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not bothering about that. I know that dozens of votes arrived a week after the poll had closed. Although electors cast their votes immediately the names of the candidates were available, they did not reach the returning officer until after the poll.

Hon. E. Rose: What about North province?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I think Mr. Miles adequately put the case by describing the Government as a crowd of bushrangers. Therefore I need not express any opinion about North province. I am merely directing the attention of the House to the fact that electors were deprived of the opportunity to record their votes when there was no necessity for it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There was a very large poll in that province.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not complaining of our winning North-East or South provinces.

Hon. C. B. Williams: But the poll was much larger.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The point is that many people were denied the opportunity to record their votes. Some members may not be aware that the Act operates automatically as regards redistribution. Section 10, Subsection (2), states that such proclamation shall be issued if by the report of the Chief Electoral Officer to the Minister it appears that enrolments in five electoral districts fall short of or exceed by 20 per cent. the quota under the Act. We had more than that number above or below the quota before the election was held. When the Bill was before this House members pointed out what the effect would be. The Act provides that if five districts are above or below the quota, a redistribution shall be directed by proclamation, but the quota is a fixture. There is no provision for the natural increase of population within the period of three years. There should have been some arrangement for a flexible percentage of rise or fall, having regard to the variation in population. If this is not altered, we shall have a redistribution of seats every three years. Unless the Government decide to extend the term of the present Parliament, I suggest that it would be well to remedy this error. It has been said that a re-arrangement of Council boundaries is overdue. Having regard to the fact that there will be a biennial election in 18 months' time, it would be wise for the Government to take steps for a redistribution at an early date. I wish to say a few words regarding the poison gas offensive being launched—

Hon. E. H. Gray: By you.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No, by Mr. Gray's friends, regarding retrenchment, rationing,

the standard of living and unemployment. With wild hurricane phrases and battleaxes, Mr. Williams led the way, followed by Mr. Fraser. I was also interested to hear some members speaking on that subject in another place. They all claimed to be greatly annoyed because the decision of the Premiers' Conference was to be put into operation. They said there was a conspiracy to cut down wages, and to lower the standard of the man on the breadline.

Hon. E. H. Gray: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: To bring them down to the bread and dripping line. These are the things that have been put up, and yet their own representatives, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Lionel Hill, and Mr. Scullin, all sat at the Premiers' Conference and decided that the cost of government must come down in each of the States.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: The unemployed are below the bread and dripping line already.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Some members would rather repudiate the interest due to bondholders. Another matter was in relation to the abolition of district allowances. Why did Mr. McCallum, when Minister for Works, make agreements for living allowances and other agreements with industrial unions? Why were they registered in the Arbitration Court? It was to preserve to the unions what had been given to them from the Treasury. We provide by the Industrial Arbitration Act that if anyone is dissatisfied he can bring his grievance before the court. The tribunal was set up specially to protect the standards that might be granted by the court, which is an independent authority, in which every person aggrieved should have confidence. It is for the court to determine these matters. The tribunal was of their own making, and the president of their own selection. I have never heard a word of protest against Mr. President Dwyer. When Mr. Drake-Brockman was appointed—and he was in the political world, just as the present holder of the position was—all kinds of resolutions of protest were carried against the appointment.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: Was he not president of the Employers' Federation?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He may have been president of sixty societies. Mr. Justice Dwyer was the representative for Perth in the Legislative Assembly. When

he was appointed to the position of president those who opposed him in political life had not one word of protest to offer. It was this House which provided for the appointment of a permanent president for life. The Leader of the Opposition did not make any drastic electioneering promises to the people. He did not say that he would provide work for all. He knew the financial position better than most other people did. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, the Prime Minister for England, said he looked with dismay at the dole system, and would provide suitable work for the unemployed instead of putting them on the dole. The number of unemployed has swollen considerably since then. Mr. Scullin came in as Prime Minister and made the same promise. Mr. Lionel Hill, the South Australian Labour Premier, did the same.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And so did Sir James Mitchell.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, and not one man has been able to redeem his promise. In his policy speech Mr. Collier said that unemployment was world-wide, and would not be solved by any country. Those words were very true. We have unemployment, and shall probably have it for a long time. It is costing £27,000 to £28,000 a month to do what is being done for the unemployed, and the numbers are being augmented all the while. If there is going to be a balancing of the Budget, I suggest there should be a tax upon those who are in employment to provide the necessities for those who cannot find work.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The unemployed voted for the Mitchell Government because they assumed that work would be found for them.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: What did the party to which the hon. member belongs suggest at their conference in Melbourne? When asked for a solution, they said, "Put on all the printing machines, and let us print £20,000,000 worth of notes." This was all that was forthcoming from the best brains of the Labour Party in Australia. They were not anxious about rectifying the trade balance.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It could not be better than it is now, when there is one person in six out of work.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: They said that was the way to find jobs for everyone. The Premiers, whether Labour or otherwise,

were unable to overcome the difficulty of unemployment. Their duty therefore is to do the best they can on behalf of the State in which they are interested.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Everything that is being done is against Labour. That is admitted now.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There are accusations that the standard of living is being attacked. We may say of some members of Parliament that they are always harping upon something. If they may not harp in Heaven, they are certainly harping here.

Hon. C. B. Williams: This is our Heaven, and we are not going to leave it.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I should like to know from Mr. Williams what the standards are, and upon what they are based. There was a time when 20s. bought a pound's worth of goods, but to-day it takes 35s. or 36s. to buy the same quantity. What are our standards? They cannot be said to be permanent. The only thing that is permanent is the value of our coinage. You buy a certain weight of fine metal, add a little alloy, and you get a coin that has a standard value or price. It does not vary. What are standards based on? I hope before the debate closes some definition will be afforded to us under that heading.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Perhaps the quality of the paper we use.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I ask this of Mr. Williams: Are the standards based on political favours handed out by Ministers? What is the standard of the old-age pensioner? At one time the standard was 10s., but subsequently by half crowns it was put up to one pound.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It ought to be more now.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member has a Labour Government in power in the Federal sphere, and can urge that question with them. What is the farmer's standard? I understand the standard is what he produces. I do not know of any other.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Unfortunately it is low at present.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: There may be others who will come down to that standard yet. The hon. member argues that if a person is fortunate enough to have a wage based on what the court may say the industry can carry, he must continue to get that

though the industry can no longer carry it.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Or pay.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, in some instances. In the gold mining industry the matter was regarded from the point of view of what the industry could pay. Thus we have unfortunate miners on the Golden Mile working for 12 months for 2s. a week less than other workers in the metropolitan area. We can take it that some standards are fixed permanently and some are not; and some are fixed on what the wage-earner produces, and others on what we get for the amount paid.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: It should be on what we get.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Perhaps someone will tell me what is the standard of a cricketer. What is Bradman's standard, for instance? Does it depend on the runs he makes?

Hon. W. H. Kitson: On what he can make.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He delivers the goods. I want to know where the standard begins and ends. Many people are raving about the supposed attack on the standards. What do they mean?

Hon. E. H. Gray: The standard of living.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Is the standard of living fixed by a member of Parliament, or by a Minister, or upon what a man produces? If members will put forward some concrete proposition they may assist the Government to find out what can be done.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I am not going to assist your speech.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: My colleague dealt exhaustively with the financial position. He stressed a very significant point; that, if we are to balance the ledger, we must show a surplus of £56,000 a month from now to the end of June. Some members say that is impracticable. I will not say it is impossible, but if we cannot do it we must at least do our best. The efforts of all the people must be put forth to assist the Government in this direction.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You may show it on paper, but it will not work out in practice.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I believe the Mitchell Government are endeavouring to fulfil their obligations and conform to the wishes

of the conference of Treasurers in the other States. To achieve that a sacrifice must be made practically by everyone. Almost everyone who has written to the Press or made speeches in public has desired to start on members of Parliament. It is evidently intended to make them serve as the example. The Treasurers have agreed to do certain things, and the policy is to carry them out. I do emphatically protest against domestic fools who consider we should start at the bottom and work up. If we want to pull down a structure and get the work done quickly, all we have to do is to cut away the foundation. The rest will then topple over.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And cut you down, too.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We should be in the debris. The same thing would apply in this instance.

Hon. C. B. Williams: We would never go on strike.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I say "Hands off the man on the bottom rung until we deal with the man at the top." All the higher grades need attention first. I find that the highest grade of salaries coming under special Acts covers the Chief Justice and his colleagues on the Bench. In 1927, by an Act brought down by the Collier Government, the salaries of judges were increased by £300 a year. The proper place at which to start retrenchments is at the £2,300 level, working down on a graduated scale and on a pro rata basis to the lower levels. We increased the salaries of judges by about 18 per cent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And the salaries of members were increased by 50 per cent.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I am not forgetting the members. Many civil servants come under special Acts, and some attention should be devoted to them before members of Parliament are reached. The latter will be reached in their turn as the pruning knife goes deeper in. I hope the Government will not wait until they are forced by circumstances to attend to this matter, and that they will at an early date make an announcement of what they propose to do.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: The commercial world has had to do it.

Member: What about the Governor's salary?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We did not increase the Governor's salary. When he retires the question of reducing the salary of the new Governor may be taken into consideration.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Let him have a spell.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: And appoint the hon. member in that position.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Let him have five years off, or let the Governors go altogether.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Looking up the special Acts, I see they cover judges, Ministers of the Crown, the President of this Chamber, the Speaker, members of Parliament, the Public Service Commissioner, the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of Railways, the members of the Arbitration Court, and many other officers. There are 160 civil servants in receipt of salaries exceeding £600 per annum. According to the "Government Gazette" of the 19th August, 1930, 130 civil servants receive payments totalling £109,509. In addition, there are the higher grades under special Acts. On a rough calculation I would say that about 350 salaries exceed those of members of Parliament. The highest-paid civil servant receives £2,400. The total of the permanent staff employed in the public service is 1,735 with salaries totalling £574,257.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How much is that apiece?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I have not worked it out, because a reference to the Public Service List shows that a number of civil servants receive district allowances and other emoluments. A police sergeant may be, in addition, a clerk of courts, or local bailiff, or registrar, such additional office carrying another payment. A large number of civil servants whose total pay exceeds £600 per annum are not indicated here. I have not dealt with any civil servants below that salary. However, so many people are calling for reduction of the salaries of members of Parliament that it is perhaps appropriate to quote the salaries received by some other sections.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do you say they were not earned?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: As to that we will say what has been said about standards. That is the standard given to some civil servants by Act of Parliament and to others by the Arbitration Court.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: What about incomes apart from wages?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I would start at the top with about 20 per cent., and proceed on a graduated scale coming down to 1 per cent.

Hon. C. B. Williams: In the case of all?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No. Possibly when we come to the question of an unemployed sustenance tax there will be a chance for the Government to include them all.

Hon. C. B. Williams: What would you do with the primary producers?

Hon. V. Hamersley: They have nothing to take.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: When speaking on the results of the last general election I omitted to quote certain figures, and I will supply them now. As a result of elections for 34 contested seats, Labour received 52,825 votes, Nationalists 47,742, Country Party 19,404, and Independents 2,536. Those figures represent first and second preference votes added together. There remain 16 seats. Seeing that 74.44 per cent. of the electors recorded their votes, I have taken 75 per cent. of the numbers on the roll for these seats, and I have applied 75 per cent. of that figure to the party which claimed the seat and 25 per cent. to the other party.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Very conservative, are you not?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No. I am particularly liberal to the Labour Party. In the case of nine uncontested Labour seats, I have applied 75 per cent. of the votes to Labour and 25 per cent. to Nationalists. That is most generous. In the case of one uncontested Nationalist seat I have applied 25 per cent. to Labour and 75 per cent. to Nationalists. Then I take the Mt. Magnet seat, which was contested by Labour only, and allot 75 per cent. of the votes to Labour and 25 per cent. to Nationalists. In the case of Perth, which was contested by Nationalists only, I apply 75 per cent. to Nationalists and 25 per cent. to Labour. In the case of Pingelly, Beverley and Wagin, three seats contested by Country Party candidates only, I have applied 75 per cent. to Country Party and 25 per cent. to Labour. On that basis I arrive at the following totals:—Labour 78,526, Nationalist 61,309, Country Party 28,434, and Independent 2,536: or a total of 170,805, which figure represents almost 75 per cent. of electors on the roll. Taking the votes opposed to Labour, we

find they represent 27 seats with 92,279 electors, as against 23 seats for Labour, with 78,526 electors. I quote these figures to emphasise the point that the present Government are more representative of the people than the previous Government were.

Hon. E. H. Gray: That table will not stand investigation.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member may be interested to look up the figures and ascertain what the Labour Party would have if we allowed them 100 per cent. of the three-quarters of the electors. He would discover that Labour had not a majority even in that case. However, I thank the hon. member for his interjection. Now I wish to say a few words on the gold mining industry, the industry that has consistently contributed to the welfare of the State. Its regularity in that respect has been such as to justify gold producers in believing that no further burdens will be cast upon their industry. The decline in the gold yield was recently brought under the notice of the Federal Government, who received the delegation most courteously but informed them emphatically that mining was a wasting asset, and that the policy of the Federal Government was to assist only such industries as could be firmly and permanently established, so as to stand on their own feet—galvanised iron, wire netting, and so forth. We were extremely disappointed with the results of the delegation to the East. Since then the tariff has been so altered as to inflict further hardships on the mining industry. The bulk of them fall on gold mining, although in one or two respects, such as firewood, a little relief is granted. We hope that the State Government, in their effort to balance the Budget, will see fit to steer clear of any further taxation on gold mining. Recently the mines have had imposed upon them the full burden of insurance of compensation under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act, and for ordinary accidents. I believe the expense pans out at between 1s. 5d. and 1s. 6d. per shift for every man engaged in the industry. That is a severe burden. The previous Government had paid some of the cost out of the disabilities grant, but I understand that the whole of that grant is now exhausted and that each company has to pay the full amount of its own insurance. Some people have an idea that gold is only good for the purpose of gilding picture frames,

filling teeth, and a few other purposes; but if we had in Western Australia the use of the gold that is produced in the State, it would be a great advantage to the Treasurer. Our gold production, however, is under the aegis of Canberra, and we can do nothing. It has been a great asset to the Commonwealth. Realising that fact, the Federal Government have commandeered our gold. If Western Australia had the benefit of the gold produced within its borders—75 per cent. of the entire production of the Commonwealth—it would materially assist, as Mr. Glasheen has said, both the wool grower and the wheat grower of this State, the two producers who, Mr. Glasheen claims, will save Australia.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Cannot we get the value of the exchange on it?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We are getting the value of the exchange, which undoubtedly is a benefit; but if we had the gold to export ourselves, or if it could be sold to the State Treasurer and he could utilise it with the Westminster Bank, the result would be infinitely better for Western Australia. Of the State's mineral production, gold is valued at £1,602,142, and other minerals at £485,751, a total of £2,087,893. Hon. members will notice that roughly three-fourths of the value of minerals produced in Western Australia is represented by gold. During 1928-29 the grade of gold-bearing ore treated throughout the State was reduced by 1.18s. per ton.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Before tea I was pointing out that the gold-bearing ores treated throughout the State had decreased in grade by 1.18s. per ton, and that the East Coolgardie goldfields has usually produced 75 per cent. of the State's yield. Meanwhile the grade of ore in that locality, where the majority of the gold is won, has reduced from 56.64 to 52.48 per ton crushed, or a reduction of 4.16s. per ton. Likewise, our tonnage treated has fallen by 17,082 tons per annum, and taking the number of men on all classes of mining the tons per man have decreased from 171.39 to 157.02, or a decrease of 14.37 tons per man. The lower tonnage does not indicate that the men are going slow, or doing less in the industry, but that the mining is being carried out on a smaller scale owing to the fact that the higher grades of ore have been extracted

from the mines. This is reflected as I have indicated. When we summarise the whole thing for the year we find that everything has been reduced, ounces by 16,232, grade by 1.18s., and tons per man by 14.37. My object in referring to this is to point out that whilst the State is in financial difficulties, the mining companies are similarly situated, and that whilst the golden grain, as the farmer's representatives here call it, has been of great assistance to the Government and the State generally, we certainly have to await an opportunity to sell that commodity, whereas gold, immediately it is won and refined, has a standard value and is also of very great assistance to the State. As for dividend-paying mines, we have practically got down to one, and the management of that mine has just indicated that, the costs being so high, they will have to reduce the grade of the ore and, correspondingly, the dividend that will be paid. Now I wish to remark upon a certain proposal made by Mr. Seddon, Mr. Allsop, and me, and submitted to the Minister for Mines when recently he visited the goldfields. The proposal was in regard to sustenance to prospectors. There is no doubt whatever of the very great number of men whom the Government are providing with sustenance in Perth. Numbers of those men formerly lived on the goldfields and may be termed qualified prospectors. Instead of the Government granting sustenance to those men, capable men, here in Perth, we suggested that a sum of money be set aside for prospectors and that those prospectors be drawn from the men now unemployed in Perth. What it would cost the Government in addition to the actual sustenance would be merely tools, and in many instances the Government would have a supply of tools from which to assist those men. The prospect of a prize would be quite sufficient incentive for any man accustomed to mining to go out and earn his sustenance in the bush. As to the provision relating to miners' phthisis, there is in the Speech no reference to the proposed consolidation of the Miners' Phthisis Act and the State Insurance Act. The operations of both deeply concern the goldfields, and from time to time on the floor of the House we have submitted that the Government should give consideration to the amalgamating of the two departments. Also we have directed attention

to the effect the Act is having on men afflicted with phthisis, as well as on those suffering from tuberculosis. Recently there was pegged out a new field that hon. members may have heard of, a field in which there are the Patricia leases, in the Edjudina district. It is there we have had the revelation of the Miners' Phthisis Act operating harshly. Men who are tubercular are not allowed to work in the mines on the Golden Mile because they are a menace to their fellow workers. But at the Patricia, many of which leases are covering a big salt lake, we find that those men are prohibited from working even there, unless they own their own leases. We have instances of men who pegged out leases and worked them for themselves; but immediately they sold their leases, or gave options to companies, and a company was prepared to employ those men, merely because there were other employees the tubercular men who had previously held the leases had to be discharged from work. It is virgin country where loaming is necessary, and where the experienced prospector is essential. Yet the young inexperienced man is frequently brought in to do the work, whereas the most experienced is not even allowed to wash off a prospect. As for a T.B. man being a menace to his fellow workers in the open country such as that at the Patricia, the argument does not apply at all. It is very necessary to have the existing precautions prohibiting tubercular men from working in a deep mine. An instance may be given of a tubercular man who had been well-sinking on an adjacent pastoral lease. That man is prohibited from working on the sinking of a shaft in a mine. Yet he can go 100 miles away and sink a shaft for a pastoral company looking for water. As a tubercular patient he cannot contaminate any gold that is in the mine, but he can contaminate the water in the well. Yet whilst he is prohibited from working in a mine, he is not prohibited from sinking a well for water. We also have on the goldfields the Mine Workers' Relief Committee, representative of the employers and the employees, with the warden as chairman. For years they have been administering the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. To the Government looking around for opportunities to effect economies, I suggest they might

well consider handing over the administration of the Miners' Phthisis Act to that committee or board, which is an independent one and quite capable of doing very effective work. Another point for consideration, particularly in these times of stress, is the loss in production of gold to the State by the closing down of the industry whilst the annual holidays are taken. Arbitration Court awards provide that the men are entitled to 12 days' holiday. Unlike the men in the post office or in the railway system, the miners do not take their holidays at various periods of the year. The mines closes down for 12 days, and that means that every man has to take that number of days whether he is entitled to two, three, or more days. Quite apart from the national loss entailed, which I say is not justified, the objection has been that if a man was entitled to his holidays at, say, this period of the year, he could not get a cheap railway pass at holiday rates, as he could at Christmas time. I understand that matter was submitted to the previous Government and they indicated that it was impracticable to amend the existing system. But we find it is done in other industries. Throughout the farming areas special railway facilities are granted to those desiring to come to the city for the annual Royal Show. And if the farm employees cannot come then, they can come along at some other period of the year. I submit that the Government should make the necessary provision that on a man signing an application countersigned by the mine management, he should be supplied with a ticket that would allow him to travel at excursion rates at any period of the year. I spoke to the Minister about it only a few minutes ago and he said there was no difficulty in the way. I suggested that if that were so, we should be pleased if he would be good enough to make a public declaration on the goldfields to that effect. Recently a number of men have been put off the mines—54 were put off one mine last week—and the manager informs me that he will reinstate them in two or three weeks' time. If those men could now take their holidays, they could work through the Christmas period, when other men were going off on holidays.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Provided the men were willing.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Of course so. I know some men up there who are anxious to come down to the Royal Agricultural Show.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I know 1,800 that do not want to.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Others would like to come down at Easter time. If we were to apply to the railways and the post office the system that obtains in the mining industry, everybody would want to go on holidays at Christmas time.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You are advocating rotation of holidays.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes, and I say it is a shame that so much revenue should be lost to the State through the industry closing down for 12 days. I know that Mr. Williams and others associated with the A.W.U. have vigorously opposed this, but for my part I could never see any real objection to it. When I was working in the industry I was always anxious to get away at any other than Christmas time, when the travelling facilities were more attractive than at that period of the year. However, if as the Minister says there is no difficulty in the way of establishing a better system, I should like him to make a public declaration to that effect.

Hon. C. B. Williams: There are family men and others who could not get away at Christmas time.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Of course it would not suit everybody. There must be exceptions. However, I submit the suggestion to the Minister and I hope he will consider it. I commend Mr. Miles for the exhaustive analysis he made of the Collie coal file. He referred to the Collie coal scandal of the 1923 elections when Mr. Scaddan had signed a certain agreement, and showed that almost word for word a similar document was signed in 1927. I remember mentioning that there were eight men within the precincts of this House who threatened the Government that if they did not sign an agreement in the same terms as the previous one, it would be a question of their going on strike. The Government signed the agreement, and we have evidence of the renewal of the agreement as indicated by Mr. Miles. This was apparently done against the wishes of the Commissioner of Railways, that he should further investigate the matter relating to coal supplies and hold it up for six months. We are indebted to Mr. Miles for having thrown the spot light on the

transactions of the Collie coal companies and the union representatives. I was amazed to find that members of industrial organisations, as disclosed by the file, should have met in the Commissioner's office and practically dictated to him.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: In the buyers' office.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Commissioner is supposed to be free from political influence, and yet we find representatives of the Trades Hall, Mr. Barker, Mr. Mooney and others, dictating to him in his own office.

Hon. C. B. Williams: All the Bolsheviks.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I do not say so, but will accept the hon. member's definition. These men sat in the Commissioner's office and practically laid it down that a certain percentage of the coal from each of the respective mines should be taken by him as per contract.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And you have just found that out.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I was not aware of it.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Nor were any of us aware of it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You have been neglectful of your duty.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I had no opportunity to look at the files, but after doing so I am amazed at what I read. It is suggested that all the file is not here.

Hon. C. B. Williams: It was all in the "West Australian" newspaper. I have read it hundreds of times.

Hon. G. Fraser: You are a long time waking up to the fact.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: It is better to be late than never.

Hon. G. Fraser: It has been going on only for nine years.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is nine years too long.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: The full story has not yet been told.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The Commissioner must, we understand, buy in the market to which he is directed by a political organisation. I want to know whether all the steel, coal, or oil handled by Government departments is ordered in the same way, by a deputation of unionists.

Hon. G. Fraser: Do you know how it all started?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: We know something about that, but I want to know who is

going to finish it. Mr. Miles has suggested the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Member: That would be too costly.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: He did not tell you the whole story.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I hope the hon. member will tell us that which has been left unsaid. When the Government suggested going to the Arbitration Court with regard to district allowances and the hours of labour for unionists that are employed in their service, I, and other members, received a long letter from various organisations. I propose to read a short extract from this circular letter, which is signed by about a dozen industrial organisations and is directed to every member of the Legislature. The paragraph in question reads—

It is our desire to approach the Government by means of a representative and influential deputation to seek the withdrawal of the proposal referred to, and I am directed by my union to ask if you will personally take part in and support the deputation with this objective.

I was astounded to receive a letter couched in that language from an industrial body registered in the court and working under a registered agreement. When an aggrieved party desires to have its differences settled, it should go to the tribunal appointed for the purpose, but in this case an endeavour was made to induce members of the Legislature to make this a political question. They were to organise together and say to the Government, "You bring your influence to bear to prevent the Commissioner from having this case heard by the Arbitration Court."

Hon. C. B. Williams: It was intimidation, was it not?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes. It showed the weakness of their case that they wanted to prevent its being heard. I have never been able to find a reason for putting forward this proposition, but after reading the file dealing with the coal contracts I can understand the whole reason for the wish to make this a political issue. We have seen the manner in which these Trades Hall organisations have their dealings with the Commissioner, and how they dictate to him in his office. Whether he refused to meet them or not I do not know. The fact remains, this circular letter was issued as I have stated. It was suggested that influence should be brought to bear through political sources to prevent the case from being

heard. I have solved the problem of the reason for the writing of the letter by the file in connection with Collie coal.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I think it was a little bit of a feather in our cap.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member, as well as myself and others, supported the establishment of a tribunal so that matters of this sort might be brought before an impartial body. That is the proper place to which such a case should be taken. I regarded that as the proper thing to do, and notified the organisations concerned accordingly. From what I can see of the whole business an investigation is necessary. I hope Mr. Miles will call for the other files dealing with former contracts so that we may know more about the transactions, and if afterwards he moves a motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission I will give it my support. There were 544,719 tons of coal raised last year and a standard price was fixed for the purchase. This included the transport from Collie to Perth. A large percentage of the coal was also used at Bunbury, Albany, and other places. It would be interesting to know whether a smaller charge was made for hauling the coal to the places where it was used over short distances, or whether a charge was made on a flat rate on the basis of what it would be at this end. Mr. Williams the other night was rather vigorous in his remarks. Whilst I do not say they were the reddest of the red, I must say they had rather a red complexion.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Rather pink.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: They went somewhat beyond the pink colour.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You can put me in the red class any time you like.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He told us in clear language and emphatically that he would repudiate the bondholders before he would repudiate the unemployed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is correct. I repeat that definitely.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He was definitely opposed to the rationing of work. In the many cases that have come before the court, which is set apart for dealing with such things, the rationing of work has been allowed.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is not to say it is right.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the hon. member not to interject.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member has expressed his opinion, and I intend to express mine. If the sum of £5 were available to be split up amongst five men, four of whom needed work, but one of whom was in work, the hon. member would not ration that £5 but would give it to the man who was in work and thus provide him with full wages and full meals. The others would get no money and no meals. I would not agree to that principle. Then he referred to members of the Legislature. He does not approve of reducing their salaries. He takes up the stand that the salaries of members should not be reduced in times like this, because it would be a sign of weakness indicating that members believed in a reduction for the man on the lower rung of the ladder.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You speak for yourself. Do not try to speak for me.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member said he did not believe in reducing the salaries of members of Parliament.

Hon. C. B. Williams: The salary of anyone.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That remark entirely emphasises my point.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought he said, members of Parliament.

Hon. C. B. Williams: I said, of anyone.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: His object in opposing this reduction was that he might protect the man who was receiving between £1 a week and £4 a week. He said he would repudiate the bondholder, but not the unemployed. Then he tackled the question of interest charges. Let us see who the bondholders are. If we look at the records we will find that such societies as the A.M.P., the National Mutual, and others took up millions of pounds worth of war bonds and loans.

Hon. C. B. Williams: And the A.W.U.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Those societies are made up of people who insure their lives for the protection of those dependent upon them. They are the thrifty people of the community and are the workers in a great majority of cases.

Hon. C. B. Williams: How many of the millions would they own?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The hon. member suggests that their interest should be repudiated, the interests of the worker, of the man who through an unfortunate set of circumstances cannot get any employment. The

hon. member has said, "I will see him starve because I would repudiate the interest due to bondholders." He would see him starve and lose his interest of a few shillings a week, that is filtering through to him by means of his investment in these bonds. I will leave the matter at that. I merely wanted to know where the hon. member stood, because occasionally he changes his mind.

Hon. C. B. Williams: He knows where he stands.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I suggest to the Leader of the House that he should make an effort to bring down a Hospitals Bill, deleting from it the clause objected to by this House when it was last before us. As Mr. Williams has said it is an inherent failing of Australians to gamble. I should like to see them given the opportunity to gamble, if we may term it so, by the issue of premium bonds. Many people will not go in for sweeps or anything of that kind, but premium bonds would meet the case for both parties. Many people who are holding on to their money now would probably respond to an issue of premium bonds. A constant stream of money is going out of Western Australia to the other States running into, I believe, thousands of pounds a week. It is quite logical to suppose that premium bonds would keep the money in the State and in circulation, and that the scheme would meet with so immediate a response as would probably help the present situation.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Would you favour a lottery?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: After the experience of the other States, Queensland in particular, I would not favour lotteries at all.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Premium bonds are much better.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I note that the Government propose to introduce a Bill seeking authority to deal with State trading concerns. I suggest they bring the measure forward as quickly as possible after the Address-in-reply debate is over. The Bill will have my cordial support. I have repeatedly expressed myself with emphasis on that point in this Chamber. An inspection of the file which has been laid on the Table leads me to think it is a pity we cannot find someone to buy our railway system, thus enabling us to get away from the whole lot of the trading concerns. As re-

gards the gathering of income tax, in these times of difficulty men are getting their accounts for income tax already, when they have no money with which to pay. Successful tributers who re-invested their money in gold-mining and lost it are now receiving accounts for income tax. If a system could be devised whereby particularly the wage-earning section could pay income tax by attaching stamps, there would be a good opportunity for them to pay once a fortnight; and the money would be coming in to the Government every day of the week. I support the suggestion to that effect put forward by, I think, Mr. Lovekin in a circular issued quite recently. If the Government are to proclaim a moratorium against rents and accounts due by farmers, I respectfully suggest to the Leader of the House that the Government should consider a moratorium for men paying union dues.

The Minister for Country Water Supplies: Do you suggest a moratorium?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: No. It has been announced in a weekly paper that the Government have been considering such a step, and accordingly I suggest to the Minister that the Government might also consider a moratorium in respect of contributions to industrial unions. Men out of work cannot get jobs unless they are members of some union. It sometimes happens that a man has to be a member of half a dozen unions in the course of a year so that he may get one job. Some years ago, when there was an unemployment difficulty, contributions were made by employers. They were particularly asked to assist the unemployed. Sir Thomas Coombe made provision for a big crowd of them at his theatre. It was then discovered from the disbursement of the moneys subscribed that a man could not get work unless he put up 25s. to become a member of an organisation, and perhaps even then he would only get a temporary job.

Hon. G. Fraser: That bunkum was exploded a long time ago.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The bunkum that a man had to belong to half a dozen unions? There is no provision for a man to change from one union to another. I should be very pleased if the opposite could be proved. Mr. Lovekin can prove what I have stated. I remember being questioned on the point—it was during the month of Septem-

ber, too—and saying to him. “You do not mean that those men have to pay 25s. to get a ticket?” His reply was, “Yes.” I then said, “Do you know that that ticket, even if the man happens to be fortunate enough to get a job, will have to be replaced by a fresh one very soon, because tickets are issued for 12 months?”

Hon. C. B. Williams: You do not understand the A.W.U. constitution.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I know the constitution sufficiently well to be aware that the fee is 25s. a year. I also know that there are some organisations which will not issue clearances to their members.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Is this one of them?

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The consequence is that before a man can get another job, he has to join another organisation. I have here a cutting which says—

A distressing feature of this work is that a man has often to belong to three Labour unions in order to get a job.

This is a cutting from the “Westralian Worker.” It is not unusual for a casual worker in the course of 12 months to be compelled to take out tickets in half a dozen unions, paying an entrance fee in each.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Is it stated in the “Worker?”

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: Yes.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Do not say the A.W.U. refuse clearances, because they do not.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The names of the unions are not mentioned.

Hon. G. Fraser: We challenge your statement that a man has to pay 25s. before getting a job.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The A.W.U. give coupons for 5s., but the man who holds them is never a member of the union if he makes ever so many payments of 5s. The constitution of the A.W.U. provides that in order to become a member he must pay 25s. He pays 5s. now, and at the end of the last term, just before the other payment is due, he pays 5s., and then for half an hour he is a full-blown member. However, I shall not pursue the matter any further than to say—

Hon. C. B. Williams: You are getting into deep water.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: The three watch-words for Western Australia are efficiency, vision, and faith in the resources of the State. They will help to pull us through the many difficulties that confront us. From the highest in the State to the humblest, all can assist the community in an effort to overcome those difficulties. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

HON. E. ROSE (South-West) [8.9]: Before addressing myself to the motion before the Chamber I desire to join with other members in extending to you, Mr. President, most hearty congratulations on the high honour which has been conferred upon you by His Majesty the King. It must be most gratifying to you, Sir, to know that the good work you have done for this State and for the Commonwealth during the time you have been in public life is appreciated not only by the people of Australia, but also by His Majesty the King. We all hope that you may live many years to enjoy the high honour conferred upon you. I also wish to congratulate the Leader of the House upon his selection for a portfolio. From past experience I know that Mr. Baxter will ably carry out the many duties which devolve upon the Leader of this Chamber. I sympathise with him as regards the problems before the Government. Undoubtedly, the Ministry have serious difficulties to overcome. I desire to extend a welcome to the new members of this House. They will find, I think, that the Legislative Council is a place in which matters can be discussed freely, and with great benefit to the people. I wish to express my sympathy with the relatives of the late Mr. J. R. Brown. As other members have said, Mr. Brown was a man whom one had to know before one admired him as he deserved. I did not really know him until he had been a year or two in the House. After I got to know him, I found him to be a man of lovable nature, a man whom one had to respect and admire. For several years before his death Mr. Brown suffered greatly, and the patience with which he bore his sufferings was exemplary. I also wish to extend my sympathy to our universally esteemed Chairman of Committees, who has been ill for some time. I hope that before long he will be back in this House, completely restored to health.

We all grieve to know that our Clerk of Parliaments is ill, and we hope that he also will be restored to health and be spared for many years to assist in the work of the Chamber as ably as he has done in the past. Turning to His Excellency's Speech one is forced to realise that the task before the new Government is stupendous. Ministers have only assumed office during the last few months, and they have tremendous difficulties confronting them. The condition of the finances must be a great worry to the Government. They have to carry out the agreement arrived at with the other State Premiers and the Prime Minister as regards balancing the Budget. Revenue has fallen fast, and there will be great difficulty in making income cover expenditure. Ministers will have to economise, and economise largely. Probably they will be compelled to devise some means of raising more revenue in the State. They have had to take over a deficit of £518,000 as at the 30th June last, and during the months of July and August the debit has increased materially. Including last year's deficit, Ministers now have an adverse balance of something over a million sterling. As a consequence of the financial situation operations have slackened and there is great difficulty in finding work for the unemployed. The decrease in revenue is traceable to the world-wide depression and falling prices. A primary producing State like Western Australia suffers heavily from those causes. In wheat, wool and dairy products we naturally have lost heavily. Two outstanding questions face the Government—finance and unemployment. I believe Ministers are making every effort to deal with both of them. The financial position in this State and also in the Commonwealth has been exhaustively dealt with by previous speakers. I do not intend to dwell on that aspect. In my opinion our Premier followed the right and only course in agreeing to the balancing of budgets when he attended the Melbourne conference. It will be highly difficult for him to balance his Budget. I think he hardly realised at the time he made the agreement the condition into which the finances were drifting. If stress of circumstances should compel him to go further afield in raising revenue, we should all show willingness to make some sacrifice. We must maintain the credit of

our State, and therefore we should set the public an example in economising. I have carefully read the report furnished by Sir Otto Niemeyer, in which he pointed out the need for economy, together with increased production and efficiency. I recognise that the desired end cannot be obtained without making sacrifices, not only by members of Parliament but by all sections of the community. Parliament should set an example, as has been done in the Eastern States already, by agreeing to a reduction in Parliamentary allowances. The reduction should be on a sliding scale, starting with those in receipt of the higher salaries and decreasing in scale down to the lower-paid officials. It must be remembered that we require money not only for the development of the State, but we have an enormous amount of interest to pay. Sacrifices are demanded in the direction I have indicated not only by the different States but by the Commonwealth as well. Sir Otto Niemeyer pointed out that the fortune of the whole was the fortune of the part, and that if the part failed, the whole failed too. That is very true. It teaches us that if one part of the Commonwealth fails, Australia itself will fail; if one section of the community fails, all will fail. Therefore it is the duty of each and all of us to put our shoulders to the wheel and do everything possible to remove the present-day depression. I can foresee that failure to emerge from our present difficulties will tend to create greater distress than we have encountered so far and hardships that will be difficult to overcome. It will also throw back the development of Western Australia considerably. On the other hand, by exercising our best energies, we should gradually get back to normal conditions. The Loan Council stressed the necessity for decreasing loan expenditure considerably. The severe financial stringency is responsible for that decision, and we cannot blame the banks nor yet individuals for the position. The various Governments of Australia must take the blame upon themselves for their reckless borrowing and expenditure. That has a great deal to do with the creation of the financial depression. In recent years loan funds have been spent in this State at the rate of £4,000,000 per annum. That expenditure might seem enormous at first glance, but when we appreciate the huge extent of the area we have to develop, it will be seen that our borrowings

do not represent so much compared with the total loans floated in the Eastern States. Both the Commonwealth and the Eastern States have borrowed more heavily than has Western Australia. If loan funds had been spent only upon reproductive work, we would be in a much better position than that which we occupy to-day. Unfortunately a lot of that money has not been used in that direction. I understand that the loan money available for Western Australia this year will amount to £1,750,000. That is very little to spend on the development of our State and on providing employment for men now out of work. At such a time as the present, we are prompted to think of the experience of the early settlers in Western Australia. In those days the pioneers did not have the money, conveniences or assistance we have to-day. In many instances they were without food, and depended on what they could shoot or catch for long periods. Most of the food supplies in those days were imported from overseas. When we compare the luxuries of to-day with the hardships of the past, it is a wonder to me that more men are not going on the land to make a living for themselves and their dependants. It is within the last few years only, comparatively speaking, that we have been able to produce sufficient wheat for our own consumption and for the export trade as well. That gives hon. members a little idea of what the pioneers had to contend with. They set a fine example of courage, one that we could well follow in these days. Those early settlers displayed dogged perseverance and energy that led finally to success. They did not work 44 hours a week; they worked long hours each day, and right through the week. The unemployment problem in Western Australia is a difficult one to tackle, but this State is not the only country where that difficulty obtains. The same conditions are reported in the Eastern States and overseas. Great Britain has over 2,000,000 unemployed. Not only in Great Britain but in Europe and even in that wealthy country, the United States of America, similar troubles are causing grave concern. In fact unemployment seems to be one of the greatest problems the world has to tackle to-day. In the "West Australian" of the 10th September there appeared an article headed "Unemployment" in which it was shown how high taxation may be a contributing cause to the creation of that evil.

The views were expressed in the following extract in the "West Australian":—

Addressing the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Bristol, Professor Henry Clay, Economic Adviser to the Bank of England, said that the total tax burden, allowing for the change in the value of money, was at present as high as in the year of heaviest taxation during the war. High taxation affected unemployment mainly by reducing the amount that could be applied from profits to the expansion of profitable businesses. The flow of new capital necessary for industrial expansion was being tapped at the source by income tax, surtax, and estate duties. Whereas before the war only 1s 2d., or at the most 1s. 8d. in the pound was directed to the Exchequer, to-day from 5s. to 9s. in the pound was thus diverted.

A paper by Professor Gregory (of the London University), who accompanied Sir Otto Niemeyer to Australia) dealing with rationalisation and unemployment, was read. It contemplated a future in which the members of unemployed would normally be greater than in the past. Labour, in the changing conditions, must be more mobile. Growing productivity gave society a margin with which to adjust conditions. This margin was the source from which unemployment must be relieved.

Authorities such as these have pointed out that it was largely owing to heavy taxation that the trouble has been caused. In Western Australia particularly, high taxation has been a contributing factor in the high cost of production. When speaking during the present debate, Mr. Lovekin alluded to difficulties that had arisen through the introduction of machinery. Think of the tractors, motor cars and machinery for use on a farm! Those conveniences have reduced the labour employed to a great extent. Think of what can be done by a reaper and binder or a harvester! One man can now do what formerly 10 or 15 men were required to accomplish. When I was a boy I remember that we had to plough the land with a single-furrow plough, reap the corn with a sickle, and after using the scythe cutting hay we had to cart the sheaves away and thrash with the flail. Dozens of men were employed on a farm in those days. The introduction of up-to-date machinery has lightened farming work so much that it is not now necessary to employ many men at all. I should imagine there are other walks in life that men so displaced could follow if inclined. In the South-West Province there is some of the finest dairying country to be found anywhere in the world. We have most favourable climatic conditions and an assured

rainfall. With these advantages I cannot understand why any man engaging in that work cannot make a success of it. Not far away from existing railways there are thousands of acres awaiting development. Certainly the greater part of the area I refer to has been taken up by different people, but the Government would be wise if they resumed some of it. I believe much of the land could be secured at a reasonable price and then the Government could put men on that area engaged on clearing work for land settlement. I am pleased that the Government are putting men on the land, although it is rather far away at Nornalup and Denmark. Still the Government are on the right track when they send men out to develop the country and endeavour to make homes for themselves. In the districts affected, settlers can produce nearly everything they require for their own consumption after the first two or three years. While group settlement has not proved the success we had hoped, largely owing to the fact that there has been too much spoon feeding, I cannot see why the settlers should not make a good living on their farms after being there for two or three years. The dairying industry is making rapid progress.

Hon. J. Nicholson: And may be the salvation of Western Australia.

Hon. E. ROSE: That is what I have been pointing out for a number of years. When we remember our wonderful climate and assured rainfall, and consider what dairy farmers have to contend with in Europe and Canada, where they have to stall feed the stock and keep them under cover for several months of the year, and yet make a good living, we must appreciate the advantages possessed by dairy farmers in Australia—God's own country. Here we have the sun that assists us in our production; where there is warmth there must be growth. So long as we do not have too much of the summer sun. But in the South we have one of the most equable climates, and so we should all be able to make good livings. Mr. Lovekin, referring to unemployment, made it very clear that some other method will have to be found to provide work for the workless. I am inclined to think with Mr. Lovekin that where one set of men are taken from one job, they certainly should be found work in some other walk of life. The fertility of the South-West is recognised by

all who have travelled Australia. We have there a most adequate rainfall, and the dairying industry is making rapid strides, as will be seen by these figures: During the four months ended August—April is the close of the financial year for the butter factories of the South-West—1,083,465 lbs. of butter were produced, whereas in 1929 the figures were 743,268 lbs. So it will be seen that there is an increase of 337,187 lbs. It gives some idea of the rapid progress being made. Again, in 1920, only 134 tons were produced, whereas in 1930 the figure rose to 1,483 tons. And, thus far, the country is only being scratched, for one can travel through miles and miles of undeveloped areas. In 1920 the amount paid to our farmers for their cream was £22,624, whereas in 1930 the amount reached £224,261. That money circulating in the South-West must go a long way towards assisting development and finding work for people who otherwise would be unemployed. There are many other industries that might be tackled in the South-West, for the dairy farmer goes in for mixed farming, including pig-raising, fruit-growing and potato-growing. In the past far too much money has been sent out of Western Australia every year for dairy produce, so we can get some idea of the opening there is for farmers to make a start and get ready sales for their produce at their doors. A good many of our railways run through undeveloped country. The Government have the power of resuming the adjacent land if necessary. Some hundreds of thousands of acres within reasonable distance of existing lines should be developed. I hope the Government will take that into consideration and devise means of acquiring that land. Now that they have power to resume it under the Closer Settlement Act, it would be wise to put that Act into operation. The only means to be adopted to preserve the manhood of the unemployed is to settle them on the land. Nothing can be more depressing than to see the number of young men, strong, healthy men, seeking employment but unable to secure it. I do not agree with some that are downhearted. They drop their bundle, as the saying is. I think that by careful administration and economy Western Australia will not be long before she is on her feet again. I know that the present Government intend to use their best

endeavours to straighten up the finances and to find work for the unemployed. A number of members have spoken on the position of the finances. Several of us saw this depression coming some years ago. I myself on the 17th August, 1927, brought up the subject in the House. My remarks are reported in "Hansard" as follows:—

In June, 1923, the public indebtedness throughout Australia was £905,484,946, involving the payment of an annual interest bill of approximately £46,500,000. That is an enormous figure. Three years later the national debt was increased by £108,272,115, making a total indebtedness of £1,013,757,061, with a consequent interest bill of over £51,500,000 per annum. When we come to consider that the population of Australia is under seven millions we commence to realise what a wonderful people we are, seeing that we can shoulder such a heavy financial burden. Truly it is time that the Prime Minister looked into the financial position and put a stop to the rash borrowing that has been going on. If we were to continue at the rate experienced in recent years, it would not be long before the chickens came home to roost. As it is, unless great care is exercised we shall have a financial crash as sure as we are discussing this problem to-night. That crash will be inevitable if reckless borrowing is to continue. It is high time something was done.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That was your forecast.

Hon. E. ROSE: Yes, and it has come true. A number of members have spoken in the same strain this year. In 1927 Mr. Lovekin and Sir William Lathlain both spoke strongly on the financial position, and I followed. So a number of members of this House could see it coming, and if the Prime Minister and the State Premiers had only taken warning in those days, we should not be in the unhappy position we find ourselves in to-day. Unfortunately, Australia has borrowed a great deal of money, and not all of it has been turned to good account. A lot of it has been spent recklessly. In the province I represent developments are taking place and our exports are increasing considerably. Mr. Kempton the other night quoted Geraldton as an instance of increased wheat production. Not only have we in the South-West increased production of wheat, but in nearly all other lines of production we are making rapid strides. We have had little or no money spent on our harbour accommodation of late years. Mr. Kempton remarked the other night that in Ger-

aldton harbour there is not sufficient water to permit of the loading and unloading of the vessels coming to the wharf. I sympathise with him, because we all know that unless there is sufficient water the boats are put to great expense in going to Fremantle or some other port to top up. Geraldton certainly is worthy of a good harbour, for the hinterland warrants the expenditure. So, too, with Bunbury. The Bunbury harbour is silting up. We have not sufficient water to load and unload big boats. We expect in the near future—I think next week—our first ship of phosphatic rock to arrive. Unless we have something done to our harbour we shall shortly be in trouble. Certainly we have a long jetty and it is well protected by the breakwater, but something will have to be done there before long. Last year 123 vessels entered the port, their gross tonnage being 489,922, while the cargo handled aggregated 275,412 tons. It gives some idea of the shipping being done at that port. Our imports are not so great as are those of Geraldton, but our exports are very satisfactory. In hardwood timber last year we sent away 110,591 loads, of Collie coal 14,926 tons, and of wheat 68,728 tons. Since the 30th June this has been increased up to nearly 100,000 tons. Of general cargo we exported only 533 tons. Our imports for 1930 aggregated 5,101 tons. That low figure is easily accounted for, because imports for the town and district are usually landed at Fremantle and railed to Bunbury, and so we do not get credit for them in the harbour returns. We imported 1,588 head of cattle and 1,911 sheep. I think those figures warrant a little more being done to the harbour than has been done in recent years. Such splendid protection does the breakwater afford that there is very little range in the harbour, and vessels may safely lie at the jetty. The breakwater has a length of 5,000 feet. When we have the fertiliser works in full operation at Picton Junction we shall be receiving through the port immense quantities of phosphatic rock. That will necessitate a tremendous lot of work being done in the harbour and on the railways. We shall require to have improvements effected to our railways in order to carry all that material to its destination. A great many country centres will have to be served, and unless we have our railways in order we shall be in some trouble.

I suggest, as previous members have done, that we should dispose of all our State trading concerns including saw mills, brick works, implement works, ferries, tramways, electricity supply, water supply, sewerage undertaking, quarries and hotels. It is wrong that the Government should be running beer shops.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They have paid well.

Hon. E. ROSE: So have the brickworks and some of the other concerns. When we consider the value of the land on which the hotels are located, the rentals that the Government should be receiving, the rates and taxes which should be produced, the wages that are paid to employees by cheques not bearing stamps and all other outlays to which private enterprise is subject, they must be incurring a heavy loss. It is not the duty of the Government to engage in trading in opposition to private enterprise. Schemes such as the tramways, ferries, electricity supply, water supply and sewerage should be, as Mr. Franklin pointed out, under a metropolitan board of works. I believe the Government could save considerable expense if they handed over those utilities to a trust or to the council and devoted their time to administering the affairs of the State. It is quite right that railways, posts and telegraphs should be controlled by the Government. In the olden days when travelling stock by road, it was necessary to have reserves on which to camp. To-day there is little necessity for travelling stock. Yet these reserves are still retained. The Government would be wise to dispose of many of them, because they are not used and are only breeding grounds for vermin. I am pleased that the Government are undertaking a comprehensive scheme of irrigation and draining at Harvey. It shows their confidence in the South-West that they are prepared to assist development in that way. It shows that they recognise the value of the land. Irrigation makes possible mixed farming the whole year round. We have a long dry season in the summer, and irrigation is necessary that the work of production may be carried on without interruption. I hope the work at Harvey will be the forerunner of several other schemes. Under the existing scheme 4,000 or 5,000 acres have been irrigated, and the number of families making a living on those areas may

be judged from the fact that 250 children are attending the local school. There are dozens of areas like that between Perth and Bridgetown and Busselton, where the water could be conserved and used for irrigation. I hope the Government will continue this work and that settlers will appreciate what is being done for them and put their shoulders to the wheel. I am sorry I did not hear Mr. Miles's speech, but I was glad to learn that he had spoken about Collic coal. There is no doubt it is a matter that should be investigated. I hope a Royal Commission will be appointed to inquire into the whole of the contracts and the suitability of the various coals for railway purposes. Being an interested party, I do not wish to say much more on the subject. I have read the file carefully, and I agree with Mr. Miles that the matter should be investigated by a Royal Commission. Whatever assistance I can give will be given in order that the question may be settled once for all.

Hon. C. B. Williams: You are satisfied there is nothing to hide.

Hon. E. ROSE: As far as I am concerned, there is nothing to hide. I am prepared to give a Royal Commission all the assistance I possibly can. The cost of production should be investigated and the question of which coal is most suitable for railway purposes should be decided. Many statements have been made and some of those in the reports of Mr. Howe have been disputed, but until a Royal Commission does investigate the matter, the question will not be settled. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

HON. E. H. GRAY (West) [8.51]: I wish to endorse the remarks of the previous speakers in welcoming new members and with regard to the death of Mr. Brown, who was a great friend of mine. When my time comes, I hope I shall face the end with the same fortitude and courage as he displayed. It is pleasing to hear that the Clerk of Parliaments has taken a turn for the better, and we all hope he will soon be in his place again. I hope also that Mr. Cornell will speedily be restored to health. During the debate not one speaker has referred to the effect of the depression on the children of the community. In my opinion the depression will have its greatest effect

on the children who are now at school-leaving age. What must be the thoughts of the teachers at the boys' schools regarding the boys who are leaving this year? The teachers, the Government and the public must know that it is utterly impossible to place them in trades. The majority of them are bound to become labourers, possibly casual labourers. Whether it is the fault of Governments or of the people, one thing is certain that the children in the long run will be the greatest sufferers. In the metropolitan area we see large numbers of boys loafing about the streets, and this impels me to say that the Government should introduce legislation to raise the school-leaving age to 15 or 16. The boys and girls, but especially the boys, if idle after leaving school, soon deteriorate, and the enforced idleness must have a bad and lasting effect on them.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Remember the reply Mr. Drew made to you on the same subject.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Two years or more ago I made a candid criticism of the cost to the Education Department of driving children to school. Mr. Drew made some drastic alterations, and reduced the amount considerably. According to the departmental report the increase last year was £991. Having regard to the state of the finances and the general condition of the schools in the State, the Minister should make a drastic cut of the £12,000 which was the cost of driving children to school last year.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Would you have no children in the country going to school?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Many of the schools are deficient in things that should be provided by the Government. Last year only £2,646 was spent on furniture, apparatus, etc., for primary schools. It is a very small amount considering that the primary schools have an average attendance of 47,000 children. A reduction of the amount for driving is overdue.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Surely you are not in favour of denying privileges to country children as against the town children!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The basis on which the driving allowance is paid should be altered. I have discussed the matter before in this House. The basis of payment is wrong. Wherever there is organisation in the shape of a motor bus or motor car that could pick up a big load of children, the expenditure is well merited.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It saves building another school.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I have no objection to the system so long as it is well organised. The trouble is that in many instances it does not help the poor farmer, but it does help the man in moderately good circumstances, and it is time the system was altered. I knew a farmer who had to travel 15 miles to and 15 miles from the school daily.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That is not fair.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: He was receiving 1s. per day, and had to feed two horses. A well-to-do-farmer was living just outside the prescribed walking distance from the school. He had an old horse and buggy and eight children, and was receiving 4s. per day for travelling less than six miles. The expenditure on driving allowances will increase unless it is carefully watched. I am strongly against the system, and I am certain the expenditure could be reduced by at least £6,000. Seeing that hundreds of boys in the metropolitan area, through no fault of their own, have to walk bare-footed to school, and are often very hungry, I suggest that £6,000 be taken from the driving allowances and devoted to the purchase of milk for the children of unemployed in the metropolitan schools. It would be money well spent.

Hon. V. Hamersley: And drive the people out of the country into the town.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The ex-Minister made a stipulation that assistance was not to be given to any farmer who was in receipt of a gross income exceeding £400. That limit could be reduced considerably. No matter how bad the times may be, he is a poor old farmer that cannot provide a better bill of fare for himself and his family than any average well-to-do middle-class family of the metropolitan areas enjoys.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: You had better go to some of the farms in the backblocks.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I have been through the mill, and I always had a good table. If a farmer cannot provide a decent standard of living, he is not worth the name of a farmer. Even on poor land he could grow enough to provide a decent table.

Hon. V. Hamersley: Why did you leave the land.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Because there was better tucker to be had in the town.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes. We know the present low price of wheat. Experts say that it will continue low for many years to come, that Russia and other countries will be able to keep the price down. Farmers and their representatives should therefore suggest some other way whereby people on the land can augment their means of livelihood. I suggest that attention should be turned to the flax-growing industry. In 1917 there was a very serious shortage of flax in the world, and the commodity stood at a tremendous price.

Hon. H. Seddon: What rainfall do you require?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I will come to that later. The Commonwealth Government endeavoured to encourage farmers to take on the planting of linseed. A commencement was made in Tasmania and also in Victoria, but very little headway resulted, chiefly because of the high price at which wheat then stood. It was natural that farmers should seek the best means to make money, and that was the reason why the flax-growing industry made but little progress. I find in the year books that a paragraph appears with monotonous regularity showing that the flax industry has made the same amount of progress each year for the last eight years. They state that the Commonwealth Government endeavoured to encourage the establishment of the industry, but that practically no headway was made.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought something was being done in New Guinea.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Linseed can be grown in any part where wheat can be grown. It was tried out in 1928 on the Merredin State Farm, where a good crop was obtained with a 7-inch rainfall. I have here a cutting dealing with the linseed grown on that State farm. It is as follows:—

The reference to the plot of flax in the report of the Merredin State Farm last week should be carefully noted by farmers. It will be recalled that in this column at seeding time the point was stressed that while flax growing for fibre cannot yet be advocated as an industry, every farmer keeping stock should grow an acre or so of flax to produce linseed. It was stated with emphasis that linseed can be grown throughout the agricultural areas wherever wheat thrives, and its value as a supplementary food for cattle, horses, pigs, calves and stud sheep was pointed out. The success in growing the crop in Merredin should induce farmers to arrange in time for a plot next season.

I have a report about the flax industry from an expert named Mr. Moore Robinson, managing director of the Flax Corporation of Australia, Ltd., and it is as follows:—

He visited Victoria, and indicated that the flax industry after many years of experiment and trial was now firmly established in Tasmania. Three years ago Tasmanian farmers had grown seven acres. In the next year the area was increased to 89 acres. Last year the product of 125 acres was harvested, and so satisfied were farmers with flax that this year they had entered into contracts with the flax corporations to grow over 1,600 acres. Even this area, Mr. Moore Robinson stated, could have been largely increased had sufficient supplies of suitable flax seed been available. The corporation would permit the use of only the highest quality pedigree flax seed by farmers contracting to grow for it. Arrangements were being completed for financing the corporation on a large scale. The flax corporation intended not merely to produce flax fibre within the Commonwealth, but to manufacture the fibre into fabrics for which there was a large demand within the Commonwealth.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What variety of flax is suggested?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is not stated. Fully a million and a half pounds worth of flax products are imported into the Commonwealth each year. After the war, the British Government sent soldiers to East Africa to grow flax for fibre. While the price was high, farmers in Great Britain and Ireland made a lot of money out of the business. The proposition is a feasible one, and the Government should make a full inquiry with a view to starting the industry here. I believe the Commonwealth Government have offered a bounty of £20,000 under certain conditions. This amount could be increased as the occasion demanded, seeing that the plant can be grown for seed in any part of the State where wheat can be grown. It can also be grown for fibre on the group settlements in the wetter districts. One could foresee the time when many plants would be erected for treatment of the fibre in the main centres of our agricultural districts, and to foresee the time when central plants would be erected in Fremantle for the manufacture of by-products, such as oil-cake for stock. The question is well worthy of consideration at the hands of the Government. The average farmer one meets has a very doleful tale to tell about the price of wheat. With flax, which can be grown anywhere that wheat can be grown, in the dry areas for seed, and in the wetter areas for fibre, nothing whatever is wasted. Every

bit of the plant can be made use of. The Government should appoint an expert and the necessary encouragement should be given to our agriculturists to lay out plots during the ensuing season.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: How is it harvested?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: With the ordinary harvester. In the wetter areas, where the plant could be grown for fibre, the principal product would be the fibre itself. This could be exported to compete in the markets of the world, so the experts say.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do you think it could compete with Russian flax?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I understand it could compete with flax from any part of the world. This industry, so the experts say, provides a good opening for small farmers to engage in, instead of wheat growing. Seeing that a million and a half pounds' worth of flax products are brought into the Commonwealth each year, the proposition should be a good one to investigate on behalf of our farmers.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I believe that about 20 years ago a man came out here and went into the matter himself.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: We did not grow wheat then to any extent.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He was advocating the growth of flax here.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: At the time when flax was being advocated as a profitable plant to grow, the price of wheat was about 8s. a bushel. We can understand why more attention was not paid to the production of linseed. Now that the price of wheat is so low, we must look around to see what other things can be grown to take its place. I wish now to say something about the prison administration. After being for six years a member of the Indeterminate Sentences Board, for some reason that I have not been given, the present Government thought fit to dispense with my services. They gave me no opportunity to say goodbye to my colleagues with whom I had been working for six years. I claim that the members of the board have done a certain amount of good. I was the only member of the board who was not paid. Common courtesy and decency should recognise the principle of giving a man a reasonable opportunity, in work of this nature, to finish up his activities and retire as gracefully as possible, which I would have done.

Hon. W. H. Kitson: For whom did they sack you?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: For Brigadier Dale of the Salvation Army, a very fine fellow. I was rather hurt over the matter. It seemed extraordinary that I, as a member of Parliament, should be retired on the excuse that the Government had decided that a member of Parliament should not be a member of the board.

Hon. E. H. Harris: You should have joined the Army.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I certainly received a nice letter from the Chief Secretary. He stated that owing to the partial judicial nature of the duties of the board, the Government had decided that it was in the best interests of its members and the country that Parliamentarians should not be appointed to that board.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Were you not thanked for your services?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The Chief Secretary said it had been decided not again to appoint a member of Parliament to duties of that character. It was a very nice letter, and I was thanked for my services, and so on.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Was that not a courteous way to deal with the matter?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It was all done so suddenly. I would not do things in that way were I in that position. If that was the reason for the action taken, it appears from recent events that the Government are not very consistent. During the last four years the board was subjected to vigorous criticism in the columns of the Press. One organisation charged the members of the board with the murder of a police sergeant. It was said the board was responsible, and we had to put up a vigorous defence in the Press. Although the board was not responsible in any way for the unfortunate happening, it had the effect of crippling its activities to such an extent that it has hardly yet recovered from the effects. The board is given very wide powers under the control of the Controller and not of the Minister. The incident I refer to practically crippled the board.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: That was not during the life of the present Government.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The National Government brought down the Bill which became the Act.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: I refer to the occurrence at Narrogin.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I was referring to the sergeant who was murdered by Kelly. It had an effect upon the activities of the Board, because it showed that the public were not prepared for the advanced legislation provided in the Act. The Government were not prepared to allow the board to function in accordance with the Act governing it. As mentioned in the Press, it showed the necessity for amending the Act. In my opinion, the Indeterminate Sentences Act should be amended by abolishing that part dealing with habitual criminals, and placing them under the control of a judge. The act provides that the board should deal with two classes of prisoners, the reformatory prisoners who are mostly young men, and the habitual criminals whom no reformatory legislation could possibly help. A heavy responsibility was placed upon members of the board to determine whether or not the time had arrived to recommend the release of an habitual criminal. I am satisfied after my long association with the board that is an unfair burden to place upon members, and that the fate of those men who have lived more years in gaol than out of it should be within the control of a judge of the Supreme Court who should be asked to shoulder the responsibility of releasing prisoners. As to reformatory prisoners, in my opinion the Act should be amended so as to place the control of the board in the hands of the Minister. The Act provides that the board shall recommend the release of prisoners to the controller, who has the right to say whether a man shall be released or not. In ordinary procedure, no doubt the controller would report to the Minister; but the Act gives the controller absolute control of the reformatory prisoners. He can either agree or disagree with the board's recommendation. In practice it works out that an unfortunate occurrence like that which happened to a police sergeant makes the controller conservative and even frightened. The effect of that occurrence was to put the controller in sole charge. In fact, the members of the board themselves got a little scare. As they were not in close contact with the Minister, the good effects of the Act upon young offenders were nullified. I have to make a complaint about the manner in which the present Government have treated the Inde-

terminate Sentences Board. During the six years of the previous Government, the Minister did not interfere with any prisoner placed under the board's control. No instance can be found where the previous Government took the work out of the hands of the board and released a prisoner. During the short space of time the present Government have been in power, they have absolutely overruled the board by releasing two men convicted of serious offences. I want to ventilate the matter, because if the Minister or the Government are going to take over prison administration and release prisoners at will, it is as well to repeal the Act under which the Indeterminate Sentences Board function. As a matter of fairness I shall refrain from mentioning the names of the two prisoners concerned. Though the previous Government, during their six years of office, never once attempted to interfere with the board, the present Government promptly released one man whose application had been absolutely turned down by the board. His sentence was five years. He was sentenced on the 2nd August, 1927, and released on the 2nd August, 1930, having served three years of his sentence of five years. Now, here is the point: such a case absolutely upsets the prison, undermines the authority of the superintendent, ridicules the work of the board, and holds up the whole system to contempt. I can quote instances where young men have been penalised for being good men. One young man was sentenced to five years for embezzlement. He became a good tradesman in the gaol. He should have been released at least 18 months before he was in fact liberated. He rendered good service. He was well educated. Both in the prison and on the farm he did everything possible to assist the administration. Yet he had to serve practically every minute of his sentence, with the exception of the remission allowed by the regulations. There were other young men who were entitled to be released; but they were given to understand that the prison farm was started with the object of letting men work out their destiny in good surroundings, with good food, and with plenty of work to keep them in good condition. It was an unwritten law that the farm should be given a good trial, and it was considered that the men on it, being well looked after, should work out their release. The farm

was a place set aside for good prisoners. During the year seven prisoners have been released—four first offenders and one second offender.

Hon. G. Fraser: How many got away from the farm?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Only one, I think. Two escaped, but one was recaptured. When the Government step in to release men because they happen to have powerful friends who approach Minister, the work of the board is undermined, and so is that of the superintendent. In the first case there was no reason why the man should not serve his sentence alongside the younger prisoners. He was of fair age, and considering the position of trust he had held he was only undergoing fair punishment for the serious offence he had committed. It is a scandal that a man with powerful friends can get released in defiance of the board. I hope that no such unfortunate happening will occur again during the existence of the present Government.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Can you say that the board did not recommend his release?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The board absolutely turned down his application twice, on the ground that no reasonable case had been put up by him. His age and his profession were not such as to enable him to render services on the prison farm or in gaol as younger men do. The board have been made a laughing stock, and so have the Government. Justice has been made a laughing stock. That is the effect when men without friends have to stop in gaol, while men with powerful friends are released. Thank God a Labour Government would never do a thing like that! The second case is that of a young man who was sentenced to three years in March of 1929 and released in July of this year. That case is in a different category from the others.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That man served 16 months.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: He had been sentenced to three years, and he was not released by the board. The point is that under the Act every prisoner has a right to apply to be placed in a reformatory prison, where he receives special treatment and special food, living and sleeping apart from habitual criminals. He also gets increased pay. Any man receiving such treatment should respond in such a way as to be able, upon

leaving prison, to fight his way up again into public trust and confidence. I can state definitely that the Labour Government never interfered with the operations of the board.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Did you say the Labour Government had never let prisoners out before their time?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No. I said the Labour Government never released any prisoners without the concurrence of the board. Although the ex-Minister for Justice (Mr. Willcock) was repeatedly approached by powerful deputations, he absolutely refused to interfere with the operations of the board; and in that he showed good judgment. The present Government have not followed his example, and the results have been disastrous to the younger prisoners, who became callous when they saw one-eyed justice meted out.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Are you sure the board did not make some recommendation?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am certain they did not. They were not even consulted.

Hon. E. H. H. Hall: Were you a member of the board at the time?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No. A prisoner was released without the board knowing anything about it. That is the point. The board, in fact, were greatly surprised.

Hon. C. B. Williams: Does that explain why you got the sack?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am absolutely against the proposed sale of State utilities, especially the implement works and the timber mills.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Those are not utilities.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Well, State undertakings, State businesses, such as hotels, mills, and shipping.

Hon. J. Nicholson: State trading concerns.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Why did you not reinstate the butchers' shops?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It would have been a good thing. I would like to be the manager of one. Having regard to the condition of Western Australia, the Government should bend every effort to make the implement works a flourishing concern. I am not going to admit that the undertaking has failed in the past, but I say that now of

all times it should be able to produce machinery and prove of great use to Western Australia while returning a profit to the Government. There has never been such an opportunity as the present for the development of the State implement works. The farmers, if they know their business and are alive to the necessities of the State, will stand behind the Government and the unions in making the works a big concern turning out Western Australian machinery for Western Australian farmers. The drills and ploughs which the works produced could not be bettered inside or outside Australia. In harvesters, unfortunately, the works have not been able to compete successfully. However, when this opportunity is offering, when the Commonwealth Government have taken drastic action to prevent the importation of American machinery, when they have given a little protection, surely it would pay the State Government to bring an expert from Victoria or South Australia in order to have the harvester section of the business put on a profitable basis, turning out a machine which would be able to do the work required by the farmers.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do not you think a loss of £20,000 in one year is quite sufficient to condemn the works?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No. The present position is so favourable—

Hon. G. W. Miles: You mean that the Government in power will not send their supporters there to get jobs?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: If I were in the Government, no client of the Agricultural Bank would obtain any implements except from the State works.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: That is the only way the works ever got any trade.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The State Implement Works have suffered just in the same way as the Albany Woollen Mills and other Western Australian concerns. People will not use Western Australian manufactured articles; they want the imported article. That is why Albany cloth has to be sent to the Eastern States, while people in the trade here ridicule the cloth and do their best to prevent men from purchasing suits of Albany products. The farmers will not use implements manufactured at the State works because they do not think a good article can be produced there. The farmer is prepared to take every penny he can get from the Agricultural Bank, but he is not loyal

enough to support his own State. We talk about our troubles! Our position has been created largely because of the disloyalty of Western Australians themselves. They prefer to buy American motor cars, American harvesters and ploughs, and everything possible that can be imported from abroad.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do you not think that if McKay established works here, it would be better for the State?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: He had an opportunity to do so, but did not.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Because the unions would not agree to the conditions.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: McKay had 20 years of golden opportunity, during which the development of Western Australia was taking place, to establish harvester works in Western Australia, but failed to do so.

Hon. W. T. Glasheen: You know why!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not; I suppose it pays him better to make the harvesters in Victoria and dump them in Western Australia, just as Jones' jams and other articles of Eastern manufacture are dumped here. And Western Australians are fools enough to support those people! There is one pleasing feature of the present depression. It has awakened the business people to the necessity for an endeavour to make our people support local products. Surely to goodness, when we have the nucleus of a good concern, and a protective tariff that practically shuts out American machinery, it is reasonable to expect a Government, claiming to be business men, to put their ability to the test and make those works a success.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: You bought an insolvent plant to start with, and the concern has been insolvent ever since.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We cannot help the past.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Would it not be better if private enterprise had it?

Hon. C. B. Williams: It is because private enterprise has mucked things up, that we are in our present position.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Every hon. member who spoke about the depression preached a doleful tale.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I thought they held out great hopes.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Several of those who have spoken gave indications of having read up the question. When we do read books dealing with economic problems, it must force us to the conclusion that there is no ground for the pannicky behaviour displayed by many public men at present. We are going through a period of depression caused, chiefly, by the Great War; there can be no doubt on the point.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: We did not face our job.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Seddon made a very valuable contribution to the debate. I agreed with much of his speech but disagreed with some of it. His was a splendid contribution spoilt, I thought, by his ill-timed references to the attitude of the Labour Party during the war. It is greatly to the credit of any hon. member, especially in these days, who undertakes research work, as Mr. Seddon did, and I think it most unfortunate that he should have spoilt it by his allusions to the Labour Party.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You did not like the truth; is that the trouble?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Seddon made one statement, at any rate, that was absolutely untrue.

Hon. H. Seddon: What was that?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It was embodied in the references to the attitude of the Labour Party during the war. Any reference to the war along lines that indicate the Allies as absolutely spotless, and our late enemies all to blame, is merely calculated to sow the seed for future wars.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who did that?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Two or three speakers.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You are reflecting upon your Deputy Leader in the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He was the one that did the damage.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Seddon even discussed the attitude of the Labour Party on the conscription issue.

Hon. G. W. Miles: He was right there.

Hon. C. B. Williams: He was wrong.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Nicholson paid a glowing tribute to the Allies. If we con-

sider matters properly, we must recognise that Germany and Austria were not responsible for the war. The circumstances that led to hostilities were to be found in a combination of events that made war inevitable. If we could but spread the propaganda as preached by the Australian, British and Continental Labour Parties with reference to war, the Great War would never have taken place, nor would there be wars in the future. We squabble about £12,000 being spent on driving our youngsters to school! I would be prepared to spend £12,000 a year in sending our children as they leave school on a tour of Continental countries, so that they might understand the viewpoint of other people as well as our own. Surely we do not want our youngsters to go through the horrible experience of war every decade or so. Surely we will not delude ourselves regarding the causes of the trouble. Are we to preach about the glories of the British Empire and the Allied cause, well knowing that it was nothing of the sort? The Germans, Austrians and others took part in the war against us because they were dragged into it. We must do our utmost to make war impossible in the future by getting the people of the world to come together.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Hear, hear! We all agree with that sentiment.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We must pay greater attention to our younger people. We should send them abroad to Germany, Austria, Russia, and other countries, and by securing an international point of view, make war impossible. I deprecate any attempt by any public man to glorify the Allied cause. When we read history, and learn how millions of men suffered horrible consequences arising out of the clash of nations, we should not act in any way likely to make war possible in the future.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who glorified war?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Several members spoke about it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Your Deputy Leader spoke about it.

Hon. C. B. Williams: That Deputy Leader speaks for himself.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Certainly I did not glorify war.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Well, that was my impression.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I am sorry you should have gained such an idea.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Every effort should be made to get the peoples of the world to come together so as to understand each other, and one way of doing that is by travel. We should develop the work of the League of Nations, and if we can create that sort of spirit, we will not have another war. When Mr. Lovekin can suggest to us that war is nearer than most people think, it is simply horribly to contemplate. We as public men should do everything possible to prevent war.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Well, set an example in your own State with your unions and get the men back to work.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is declared by many writers that prosperity and depression go in cycles. In proof of that it is pointed out that such crises occurred in 1753, 1763, 1772-73, 1783, 1815, 1825, 1836-39, 1847, 1857, 1866, 1878, 1890. There have been crises since then, too. As far back as December, 1867, Mr. John Mills, of Manchester, in a paper on "Credit Cycles and the Origin of Commercial Panics" said—

It is an unquestionable fact that about every ten years there occurs a vast and sudden increase in demands on the loan market followed by a great revulsion and a temporary destruction of credit.

For example, in 1876 it is recorded that there were 3,000,000 persons out of work in the United States of America. That was caused by a financial crisis at that juncture. The national debt of Great Britain at the time of the accession of Queen Victoria in 1837 was £761,000,000, and the interest and sinking fund charges amounted to £28,000,000 per annum. The national debt of Great Britain at the conclusion of the American War was £249,000,000 and the interest and sinking fund charges represented £9,000,000. In 1890 the national debt of the whole world was £5,479,000,000. When we consider the enormous debt that the nations of the world have to shoulder now, and especially when we view the position of the Commonwealth, we must be struck by the lamentable increase. The producing power of the various nations is reduced correspondingly. References have been made to the statements freely circulated about repudiation. It must be remembered that the first nation to repudiate her debts

was France, and that was done long ago. That country does not seem to have suffered from her action.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Do you advocate repudiation?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, but France repudiated her debts and did so during the last war, but she has not been ostracised. Spain, Portugal and the South American Republicans have also repudiated debts.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You surely would not suggest emulating the South American Republics?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not suggest that. In the course of his speech, Mr. Seddon endeavoured to make out a case in support of his statement that the best people of the world, and particularly the best people in Great Britain and Australia, were the thrifty who invested in war bonds and loans. I do not agree with that statement.

Hon. H. Seddon: You think the thriftless people are the better.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Not at all. The fact that a person is thrifty does not necessarily indicate that he possesses the best attribute of human nature.

Hon. G. W. Miles: But it is a jolly good one.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I believe that some of the finest families we could possibly discover may be those who have not enough money to pay a week's rent.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Yes, they spend it on beer and picture shows.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, they may be decent citizens. The parents may spend the whole of their savings in providing their children with a good education. People who are thrifty may be mean, sordid, selfish and miserable; they may be people who will do anything to forward their own interests and remain absolutely callous to the welfare of other individuals. Although thriftiness is a very useful quality, there are other qualities far finer in the make-up of human beings. It is as well to point out that the argument heard when repudiation is suggested, namely that it would hurt thousands of people, does not necessarily prove that the money-power is not the cause of all our troubles at the present time.

Hon. H. Seddon: Thriftlessness has landed us where we are to-day.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: No, the world-war had a great deal to do with that. Years

ago a comprehensive inquiry was made. It is quite a long story, and many public speakers have lived and died who have given expression to the opinions held by Mr. Seddon. In regard to thriftiness and people investing in Government bonds and that sort of thing, it was proved in 1885, after a very exhaustive investigation, that three-fourths of the people of Great Britain and Ireland did not own anything at all with the exception of their furniture.

Hon. G. W. Miles: These days many people do not own even that.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It is practically the same to-day, when we know that one per cent. of the people receive over 30 per cent. of the national income. Where does Mr. Seddon's argument come in if one per cent. of the people own 30 per cent. of the national income? Therefore we are confronted with the money-power which cannot control its own affairs. Why is it that a few short months ago, during the Centenary year, every public speaker was booming up Western Australia. We issued a book—I was reading it last night—which was a paean of praise from the first leaf to the last, extolling the glorious history of Western Australia. Then, almost in a day, we were confronted with this depression.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The true state of affairs was not revealed.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Not even after all the big speeches were published in the daily Press and experts from Great Britain came here to give us advice. But all that information was to be found in the Year Book. It is wonderful how prosperity will increase and depression too will increase. It seems to me the general policy being carried out at present serves to make the whole of the machinery stop. Confidence is the basis of business. Yet the general attitude of business men and of the banks and of all connected with commerce during a depression, seems to have the effect of stopping the whole of the machinery. We ought to be able to put our heads together and keep the business going for the short time that Australia is likely to be brought to a standstill.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Because she cannot borrow a few bob.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That is only one of the causes. Surely the leaders of public

life will be able to get together and keep the machine going, rather than be pitching a doleful tale of economy and low wages and of putting men off in every phase of business life, with the result that the whole of the machinery is coming to a stop.

Hon. J. Nicholson: It would be a very good thing if it could be accomplished.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I want to say a word or two regarding unemployment. In my opinion we cannot expect to proceed as we are proceeding at the present time. I have a lot of admiration for the way in which Mr. Scaddan has tackled this unemployment problem, but the Government must be prepared to go still further with their assistance to the unemployed. Things cannot go on as they are going. I think I can claim to be in a position to speak with authority on the present situation. Only to-day I saw a sight I have never seen in Australia before. I saw a woman with a family of six children, the baby being three weeks old, in a house the roof of which the landlord was just removing. The woman's husband was away on sustenance work.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Where did this occur?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: In Fremantle. I have never seen that done before.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Whatever were your people doing to let the landlord do it?

Hon. G. Fraser: Surely you would not advocate the use of force, Mr. Lovekin?

Hon. A. Lovekin: I would have made one to stop him had I been there.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: Why did he take the roof off?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: So that the poor woman could not sleep there to-night. Only three weeks ago she had given birth to a child. She and her husband owed to the landlord the enormous sum of £3 15s. in rent.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And the people of Fremantle let him take the roof off!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It all came so suddenly. Nobody expected it.

Hon. C. H. Wittenoom: It would cost him more than that to take the roof off.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Well, that is all that is owed. Last week there came to me a young couple who had been paying rent for a house for the past three years. The husband is a motor mechanic. This couple have two young children. The father got

out of work five weeks ago, and evidently he and his wife were not amongst the thrifty people that Mr. Seddon speaks about.

Hon. G. Fraser: They had nothing to be thrifty on.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: They are very decent people, but unfortunately they owned £4 5s. Then suddenly, without any notice the landlord distrained on their goods because they happened to have some very decent furniture in the house. As I say, they had been paying their rent for three years and they owed only £4 5s. Now what is the effect of this sort of thing? In good times if such a situation arose, no doubt the husband would take some of his furniture and sell it, but to-day if it were put up for sale under the bailiff, the landlord would not get the cost of the action. The Government will have to extend their activities in this regard, for the local authorities have not the money with which to supplement relief work. I have been castigated by the relief committee for telling people not to pay rent when they are on sustenance. What has happened is this: people in receipt of Government work are what we might call the hard working community, and the result of the action taken by landlords is having a bad effect on the decent section of the unemployed. Imagine the plight of a married couple with a family but never out of work before; people who did not know what it was to be out of work. We have had applications from people who did not know the way to the Charities Department. What is the effect of the bailiff distraining on such people? It is to frighten those people and undermine their character. It is a terrible shock to a decent couple to be confronted with the bailiff clamouring for what, after all, is only a small sum of money. I want to know what we are going to do about it.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do you know the landlords who do this sort of thing?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes, I have a pretty good idea. I have here an astounding document, that of course must have been fixed up to bluff a couple out of their house. They were decent people, but they owed between £6 and £7 in rent. The landlord instructed a solicitor to take them to court. They were taken to court, and the magistrate of course had no option but to make an order for the tenant to vacate the house within 14 days.

Now let me read this bill of costs which was served upon the unfortunate man after the proceedings were over—

	£		£
1. Letter before action	...	0	3 4
2. Instructions to sue for possession and rent	...	0	6 8
3. Preparing summons, particulars, etc.	...	0	12 0
4. Attending at local Court issuing and paying	...	0	8 6
5. Instructions for evidence of two witnesses	...	0	6 8
6. Attending at court conducting cases without counsel	...	2	2 0
7. Attending at local court paying hearing fee	...	0	11 0
8. Preparing bill of costs	...	0	2 0
9. Engrossing and copies	...	0	2 8
10. Attending at court lodging	...	0	6 8
11. Appointment to tax paid	...	0	2 0
12. Attending taxation	...	0	6 8
13. Witnesses: A. Hamilton (Commission Agent)...	1	1	0
	£2	2	6
		£4	15 4
		2	2 6
		£6	17 10

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Did the lawyer not charge for the ink?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: A document like this served on a "down-and-outer" who for years had paid nobody would not have had the slightest effect, but I say it is a cruel document for a solicitor to issue against decent people who, through unfortunate circumstances are out of work.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Some of these solicitors are nothing but profiteers.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am certain that Mr. Nicholson would never have sent in a bill like that, for it is about equal to taking one of Mr. Williams's crushing plants at Kalgoorlie for the smashing of a mosquito. The time is opportune for an amendment of the Act.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You mean the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Yes. Only unscrupulous, greedy landlords would take the full extent of what the law gives them power to do. I must confess I did not think it possible for a bailiff to come in and seize goods without an order of the court. It is only during recent weeks that it has been done in Fremantle. I have never known of it before.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The times were too prosperous for that sort of thing before.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We cannot allow it to continue. I urge the Government to bring down an amendment of the Landlord and Tenant Act, making it compulsory to bring all cases of this sort before a magistrate. Why should a landlord have these special powers, which are merely a relic of

the bad old days? When we are faced with an emergency such as the present, surely this House would sanction an amendment making it mandatory that all landlords' cases of this character should be brought before a magistrate, to whose discretion the question would be left. That would have the effect of restoring confidence and abolishing much of the harshness and cruelty now being exercised.

Hon. J. Nicholson: People cannot be ejected until an order is obtained from the court, but the process of a bailiff distraining is a different matter.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The case I have in mind does not come on until the 20th September.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He is applying for an ejectment order, and must go to the court for it.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am absolutely opposed to any reduction of members' salaries on the ground that such action is liable to be misunderstood.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It was not misunderstood when we increased our salaries by 50 per cent.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It has been preached through the Press and from public platforms that we should set the example and join in the common sacrifice.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Do not you think the people made the suggestion first of all?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: It has been said that we ought to set the example. There are a few wealthy members in this Chamber, and where is their consistency when they advocate a reduction of salaries, and let it go at that? Some members of this House—

Hon. C. B. Williams: Could forego their £600 a year and it would not affect them.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: That is so. It would not have any effect on their standard of living. If wealthy members would stand in their places and advocate, as Mr. Lovekin did, an increase of real wages by reducing rents 25 per cent., it would have a beneficial effect.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There should be some sacrifice.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Such advocacy would be well received throughout the State if property owners were prepared to accept 20 per cent. or 25 per cent. reduction of rents. In Fremantle, business men for months have been trying to get the big land-

lords to reduce the rents of their buildings. After many meetings, much propaganda and several leading articles in the local paper, as well as representations to the landlords, they have conceded a 5 per cent. reduction.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You must not forget that taxation is very heavy on them.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: When we remember that 25 per cent. of a man's wages goes in rent, it is easy to understand how those controlling the fixation of rents could create a good impression amongst the community by making a reduction. For comparatively wealthy men to suggest a reduction of salaries is ridiculous. I am prepared to strive for any scheme under which everybody is compelled to pay in proportion to his ability. I am prepared to bear my share of the burden. But we must have sincerity of purpose and be prepared to put a reasonable proposition before the public. I trust that, in spite of the bad times, we shall, as a result of united effort as advocated by Mr. Miles, succeed in emerging from our troubles, and that the standard of living gained by the Australian people over a long series of years will not be interfered with. It does not matter what money a man receives so long as he has real wages.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: Hear, hear!

Hon. E. H. GRAY: This evening Mr. Harris asked what the standard was. In my youth I travelled extensively, and in my opinion the Australian worker, through his organisations and propaganda, has been able to establish a standard of comfort, culture and enjoyment not equalled in any part of the world. It would be deplorable if advantage were taken of the present crisis to reduce that standard. Advantage is being taken of the crisis, amongst others by the London Press.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I think that is wrong.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The London Press undoubtedly wishes to reduce the Australian standard.

Hon. J. Nicholson: That is quite a wrong impression.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I am opposed to any attempt to reduce the standard. The action of the Government in precipitating proceedings in the Arbitration Court is wrong.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Is not that the proper tribunal?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Long service leave and district allowances have been enjoyed by the workers for many years, and it is

a mistake to try to reduce their standard of living.

Hon. G. W. Miles: How are we going to pay them?

Hon. A. Lovekin: Should they have those privileges when other people are unemployed?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: We have had bad times before. When I came to Australia 33 years ago, things were bad. People in South Australia were leaving their farms by the hundred and going to Broken Hill and elsewhere. But Australia has wonderful powers of recuperation. Drought, debt, the war, and Federal Governments have reduced the country to its present state. Sir Edward Wittenoom endeavoured to ascribe the whole of the trouble to lack of business experience in Federal Governments. Surely that cannot be borne out by facts! If members of the Bruce Government were not business men, who were? Mr. Bruce was trained in business and was the idol of his Nationalist supporters, and yet he ran the Commonwealth into a deficit of £16,000,000. Now we are told that our present difficulties are due to lack of business experience in various administrators.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The trouble is world-wide.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: Mr. Watson and Mr. Fisher did show surpluses and put the Government of the Commonwealth on a sound footing. Why blame Labour administrations?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Who is trying to do that?

Hon. E. H. GRAY: The present depression is world-wide. I am satisfied that Australia will recover as quickly as any other nation, perhaps more quickly. It has made a wonderful recovery after droughts in years gone by, and though perhaps times were not as bad as at present, I feel sure everything will come right again. Experts are generally wrong. May they prove to be wrong on this occasion when they predict for Australia severe suffering and unemployment for three or four years. I believe they will be wrong, and I trust they will be. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. M. Drew, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.9 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th September, 1930.

	PAGE
Standing Orders, report of Committee	519
Bills: Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, 1R. ...	520
Plant Diseases Act Amendment, 1R.	520
Egg Marketing, 1R.	520
Traffic Act Amendment, 2R.	520
Anatomy, 2R.	525
Main Roads, 2R.	527
Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report	531
Inspection of Scaffolding Act Amendment, 2R. ...	532

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

STANDING ORDERS.

Report of Committee.

The SPEAKER: I have received the following report from the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Assembly:—

Your Committee, in conference with the Standing Orders Committee of the Legislative Council have taken into consideration certain difficulties which have arisen in the interpretation of the Standing Orders governing the admissibility of amendments to Bills in Committee. The difficulty was confined to Bills for the purpose of amending existing Acts, and consisted in the doubts sometimes held as to the interpretation of Standing Order 277. The resolution adopted by both Committees was as follows:—

It was agreed that Standing Orders of both Chambers should include the following interpretation:—

“Subject matter of a Bill” means the provisions of the Bill as printed, read a second time, and referred to the Committee.”

It was further agreed that Standing Order 309 of the Legislative Council be struck out, and the following substituted:—

“It is an instruction to all Committees of the whole House to whom Bills may be committed that they have power to make such amendments therein as they shall think fit; provided they be relevant to the subject matter of the Bill, but if any such amendments shall not be within the title of the Bill, they shall amend the title accordingly, and report the same specially to the House.”

Your Committee, therefore, recommend the adoption of the following Standing Order, to stand as No. 422.