

grand State which we have the honour, the privilege and responsibility of helping to govern.

MR. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [3.51]: I formally second the motion.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Latham, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. C. Willecock—Geraldton) [3.52]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next at 4.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.53 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th August, 1937.

	PAGE
Chairmen (temporary) of Committees	14
Address-in-reply, second day	14
Adjournment, special	21

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

CHAIRMEN (TEMPORARY) OF COMMITTEES.

The **PRESIDENT**: I desire to announce that for the present session I have appointed the Hon. J. Nicholson, the Hon. V. Hamersley and the Hon. G. Fraser, to act as temporary chairmen of committees.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Second Day.

Debate resumed from the 5th August.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [4.40]: I cannot see as much virtue in the Governor's Speech as does the enthusiastic Mr. Fraser,

nor can I agree with him when he refers in such extravagant terms to the administration of the present Government. With the exception of the reference to the proposed measures to be placed before Parliament, the Speech is merely the putting on record of a glowing report on the State's activities. A glance through the proposed legislation will suffice to show how faithfully the Government are obeying the dictates of the Trades Hall and allied unions. It will be remembered that last year the Trades Hall instructed the Government not to bring forward any legislation until their own pet measures were passed by the Legislative Council. A number of such Bills are included in the new programme, and others have been forecast for this session. Notwithstanding the attitude of the Trades Hall, the criticism by certain Ministers, and later the report of a speech made by the member for Roebourne (Mr. Rodoreda) who, in strong terms, urged the Government to take drastic action against the Legislative Council, this House will not be influenced in the least by those who are trying by coercion to have Bills passed which are supposed to benefit a certain section of the people, but would be very detrimental to the interests of the State generally. Last session Bills were presented which, if approved, would have had far-reaching and destructive effects on the State's industries. Three of the Bills mentioned in the Governor's speech were rejected last session; in the meantime what do the Government hope for by introducing them again this session, unless material alterations have been effected in those to be considered? Judging by references made by Mr. Rodoreda and others, it does appear that those Bills are being used for political propaganda. However, as far as this House is concerned, Bills have been, and I feel sure will continue to be, considered on their merits for the betterment of the people and the State, not for certain sections only. Apparently the Government, whose administrative acts are mainly directed to spoils for their supporters, have become politically intoxicated, and expect to supplement their extraordinary administrative acts by using Parliament for the same purpose. Almost without exception every lucrative position has been filled by the appointment of the Government's good Labour supporters. Loan funds have been turned to account by compelling every unfortunate to subscribe to the Labour newspaper and the

political funds of the party it represents. We refer to Australia as a free country, but to force unfortunate people to join associations that do not appeal to them—as is done by forcing them to join a Labour union or alternatively starve—is taking away the freedom of the subjects. Another bad feature lies in the using of Government servants to enforce these demands and become collecting agents for trade union funds. I would be lacking in my duty as a member if I did not take this opportunity of protesting vigorously against the latest attempt of the Government to foist upon the people, by an administrative act, something they had not the courage, and certainly had not the power, to impose by a Legislative Act. I refer to the inclusion in the tender forms of the preference to unionists clause, an inclusion that has already been referred to aptly, if not strongly enough, as “industrial blackmail.” The clause to which I refer is as follows:—

(9) Every tenderer, when lodging his tender, must state in writing whether or not the servants or employees whom he employs in or in connection with the conduct of his business, and who will be engaged in or in connection with the supply and delivery of the goods by the tenderer, if his tender is accepted, are financial members of a registered industrial union of workers in the industry to which the tenderer's business relates; and if such tenderer's tender be accepted the tenderer must undertake as a condition precedent and going to the root of the contract that only persons who are financial members of a registered industrial union of workers in the industry to which the tenderer's business relates, will be employed by the tenderer in or in connection with the supply (including manufacture or preparation where the goods are manufactured or prepared by the tenderer in Western Australia), and delivery of the goods to be supplied by the tenderer pursuant to the acceptance of his tender unless the Treasurer for Western Australia by writing under his hand approves of other persons being so engaged.

I object in the first place to this arrogant misuse of administrative power. By what right has anyone, the Premier included, sitting as a Treasurer, to take to himself the power to include in a tender form submitted to the Tender Board some far-reaching regulation that neither the people nor Parliament has approved? I am ready to believe that the Government that could impose upon sustenance workers a condition that makes it necessary for them to pay 25s. for the right to work, could be capable of other

administrative acts of equal immoral force; but this inherent capacity to ride roughshod over the urgent needs of the indigent does not endow such a Government with the privilege of adopting the same methods by wholesale application. This latest administrative action is a threat aimed at achieving by overt means an end that this House had denied the Government in their cunningly-conceived proposed legislation. In effect the Government are trying to use their administrative powers to ensure that every worker, whether he wishes to or not, shall be a member of the industrial section to which Labour owes such slavish obedience, and upon which Labour members rely for support in selection ballots. A dictator could do little more than that which this dictating Government are doing. They are attempting not only to control the type of employee an employer shall have, but are going much further and saying that the employee shall belong to some industrial union. Even more than that, they are laying the obligation upon an employer to see that his employees are financial members of a union. Do the Government anticipate by this action that they will make all employers who tender for Government jobs a species of union recruiter? Is it not to be the responsibility of a tenderer for Government supplies, depending for some of his supplies upon a source outside his immediate control, to demand of that source that all his employees shall be members of a union, and not only demanding such a thing, but that they shall be financial members? What is the position of a tenderer who, having undertaken this degrading interrogation of all his employees, and found that they are members of a union and financial members too, buys a small part of his material from a concern, one of whose employees is a unionist but is not financial? If the Government are honest in their intentions it will require an army of inspectors to carry out this job of inquiry. If that is their aim they will be creating another large and expensive department for the sole purpose of bolstering up their own industrial strength which, we all know, is gradually dwindling, for the reason that they are out of step, not only with the unions but with the people they pretend to represent. Members know that I am not opposed to unionism as such. I doubt whether many members of this Chamber are antagonistic towards union

ideals. To compulsory unionism, however, I am bitterly opposed, as should be every intelligent member of the House. I cannot conceive of a more deliberately mischievous action than the inclusion of this clause in the tender forms just as I cannot conceive of a more inhuman action than the insistence by men in receipt of over £1,000 a year that the man without any means at all shall pay 25s. for the right to work. From one end of our social structure to the other the Government are devoting their few remaining energies not to the improvement of the lot of the people as a whole, but to an attempt to protect themselves in office and to divert public and private moneys into channels from which their industrial section can profit. Earlier in my remarks I said I felt I would be lacking in my duty if I did not refer to this process of industrial blackmail. I am now going further, and say I feel that members of this House would be lacking in their duty if they did not use all the power they possess to interpose this House between the Government and the people they are attempting to oppress.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is that the intelligence of members to which you refer?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If in the past we have, in the process of reviewing proposed legislation, detected niggers in the woodpile, we must redouble our surveillance, for the Government have made it patent that they will stop at nothing to push forward a despicable programme of industrial dictation which is as dangerous to the liberty of the employee as it is to the rights of the employer. The drift of the State's finances is becoming more serious every year. A reckless state of affairs exists. The wild orgy of borrowing all the money possible, the yearly increases in taxation, and the extravagant expenditure, can only end in a more serious and far-reaching period of straitened circumstances than the financial crisis of 1930-33. Government expenditure during the past few years has been directed mainly towards influencing political popularity. The main channels of expenditure have been those which are non-productive of revenue. The State's public debt is being increased annually by close on 2½ millions, and naturally the State's interest liability is increasing accordingly. At June 30th last the public debt stood at 89 millions, in round figures, carrying over £4,000,000 to meet interest, sinking fund and exchange per an-

num. This is a very heavy burden to meet, with the State's population standing at only 460,000 people. A further loan of £2,350,000 is to be raised for this State for 1937-38, and this will increase the public debt to £92,000,000. Such borrowings, if used to increase revenue production, would be warranted; but the Government are quite content to borrow and tax to the limit, and expend the major portion of the money in the metropolitan area, where admittedly a portion earns interest and sinking fund, namely the extension of the water supply and sewerage. These payments, however, are recovered from internal moneys and reduce the financial activities of the people. Western Australia cannot be self contained. If we are continually borrowing and adding to our debt and interest payments, this can only have the effect of impoverishing the State and the people in their private capacity through the heavy burden of taxation. If each year's loan expenditure resulted in increasing per ratio our excess of exports over imports, there would be some justification for it, but a glance at the position will show a serious decline in this respect. I am now dealing with the commercial side of Government finance. A most pleasing feature is an increase in the State's commercial trading, which resulted in our attaining over £40,000,000 in Australian currency, this being £3,000,000 above the previous peak period. But the real earnings of the State, namely the excess of exports over imports, have shown a serious decline. A study of the results of the past four years gives rise to very serious thought. The excess of exports over imports for 1933-34 amounted to £3,571,000; in 1934-35 the figures did not reach half that amount, being only £1,632,000; 1935-36 saw a further serious decline, the figure being only £1,175,000; whereas 1936-37 brought a slight increase, the figure being £1,425,000, but this was still very much below the figure for 1933-34. It must be remembered that the increased prices for practically all products exported were substantial. More alarming still is the fact that Government expenditure has shown a very heavy increase each succeeding year. A comparison of the State's revenue, loan expenditure, interest, sinking fund and exchange, and the resultant State's earnings as represented by the excess of exports over imports, is very interesting. Unfortunately I can give only the total fig-

ures for the three years, but these will suffice to warn us of the unhappy position, which is not improving. For the year 1933-34 the revenue amounted to £8482,000, the loan expenditure to £2,644,000, the deficit for the year to £789,000; the interest, sinking fund and exchange to approximately £4,000,000; and the excess of exports over imports to £3,571,000. For 1934-35 the revenue was £9,331,000, the loan expenditure £2,784,000, the deficit £167,000; interest, sinking fund and exchange to £4,000,000, and the excess of exports over imports £1,632,000. For 1935-36 the revenue was £10,034,000, the loan expenditure £2,464,000, the surplus £88,000, the interest, sinking fund and exchange £4,000,000 and the excess of exports over imports £1,175,000. In connection with the excess of exports over imports, the figures represent Australian currency values. For the two following years estimates of loan expenditure show no lessening of borrowing. For the year just ended, 1936-37, the estimate is £2,412,000, and for the present year, 1937-38, the estimate, which depends on the ability of the Loan Council to raise the amount, is £2,350,000. The estimate of the costs of interest, sinking fund and exchange is stated as £4,039,000 and the deficit for 1936-37 £371,000. This represents a very serious burden for 460,000 persons to carry, and each year results in a further £2,000,000 odd being added to the State's public debt which, without providing for the deficit being added for the present financial year, but adding the estimated loan for the year, will exceed £92,000,000. Thus we—the State—have now a public debt which exceeds £200 per head of the population. Those people, and unfortunately there are many, who rejoice when it is agreed by the Loan Council to raise substantial loan moneys for this State, should consider that the increasing indebtedness carries additional costs, which naturally result in increased taxation; and they should realise that the trend of government is on the same basis as their own borrowings, for luxurious adjuncts in their own particular calling, which, while adding to their indebtedness and yearly expenses, produce no additional profits, and ultimately end in financial chaos. Mr. Fraser was very eulogistic and extremely extravagant in his references to the present Government, more especially as regards their assistance to

producers. As a matter of fact, very little consideration has been given to the producing industry over the past four years. Each year has seen a very heavy decline in the amounts provided for producing interests. Unfortunately, I am unable to supply the figures for the past year but will supply those of the preceding three years. Those three years show conclusively that the Government are giving preference to those parts of the State which export very little, and had it not been for the moneys provided by the Federal Government, our primary industries would have suffered to such an extent that there would have been very little to export, with a consequent death blow to the State's finances. The assistance given to primary industries by the State is as follows:—Agricultural water supplies—

1933-34	£244,000
1934-35	£142,000
1935-36	£93,000

Development of agriculture, land clearing, drainage, etc., experimental work, assistance to wheatgrowers, carting subsidy and reconditioning holdings—

1933-34	£186,000
1934-35	£145,000
1935-36	£99,000

Agricultural Bank capital—

1933-34	£325,000
1934-35	£50,000
1935-36	Nil

Assistance to settlers on the Industries Assistance Board, assistance to industries, primary and secondary—

1933-34	£114,000
1934-35	£7,000
1935-36	£9,000

Soldier settler advances—

1933-34	£1,200
1934-35	£331
1935-36	£426

Group settlement—

1932-34	£115,000
1934-35	£26,000
1935-36	£10,000

The total amounts for assistance to primary industries are as follows:—

1933-34	£985,000
1934-35	£370,000
1935-36	£211,000

The expenditure in the metropolitan area for the same years on water supply, sewerage and drainage is as follows:—

1933-34	£343,000
1934-35	£578,000
1935-36	£774,000

No doubt there will be a variation of the amounts under the heading of Agricultural Bank Advances, but even with a reasonable allowance in this direction the plain position is that the Government expend moneys in non-productive works, in preference to rendering assistance to producers to increase the State's exports, and thereby increase the State's income from abroad. Should any calamity occur in connection with our primary industries, the immediate cry of the present Government will be, "What are the Federal Government going to do?" But the present Government never consider their own responsibility. Whilst the producers have at times been given substantial assistance by the Federal Government, no appreciation has been shown towards that Government. A comparison of the assistance given by the two Governments is very interesting. The figures are as follows:—

	State	Federal
	Government.	Government.
1933-34	.. £985,000	.. £639,000
1934-35	.. £370,000	.. £368,000
1935-36	.. £211,000	.. £644,000

It is quite apparent that the Government are prepared to allow the primary industries to depend on the Federal Government. The Commonwealth payment to Western Australia in excess of constitutional obligations from 1931 to 1937 aggregate over £11,000,000. This comprises the following:—

Special grants, roads grants, grants to local bodies ..	£6,900,000
Relief and assistance to primary producers ..	£3,956,000
Contribution to employment relief, forestry, etc. ..	£591,000
Health, maternal and infant welfare	£11,500

In addition, the Commonwealth provided £346,000 for long-distance aerial services. The Federal Government recognise that the most important matter for all Governments is to increase exports; otherwise financial chaos must result. But the State Government's only aim is to use all funds in congested areas where the political power exists, especially amongst the industrialists, on whom they rely for their political existence. Neither the State nor the Federal Government has made any attempt to assist producers in the replacement of plant and power and consequently the large majority have worn-out plants and insufficient power. Last session I put forward a scheme which may not have

been acceptable in its entirety, but if this Government had desired to help to increase production in the State, the adoption of the scheme would have done some good. I think that money could have been raised for it; in fact we have been spending in other less-important directions as much money as would have been required. The position of a very large number of the producers is that their plant is worn out and they have insufficient power. The expense of keeping that plant going is a very heavy burden. The delay in carrying out seasonal operations is the main drawback. If producers want to replenish either plant or power they must be in a very sound position because they are allowed only two years' credit. It is impossible for these people to recover their position without assistance, and the Government have been lacking in their duty in not having found money for such a scheme as I suggested (especially with the increasing revenue that is derived from emergency taxation), money which would be returned in a period of years—I suggest ten—bearing the full amount of interest to cover borrowing. Whilst the producers are doing all that is possible under such straitened circumstances, their production is badly affected, and this is responsible for their failure to assist in maintaining a substantial export quantity of wheat. The Government should have made provision to assist them and, by so doing, increase the State's earning capacity through increased export. The Federal Government have provided £464,000 to date for rural relief under the farmers' debt adjustment scheme, and a further amount of £330,000 will be forthcoming for this year, provided the money is raised. Good service has been carried out by the director and the board, but they have been hampered in their operations owing to not having enough funds. The State Government's action has been to allow this far-reaching relief to depend on Federal moneys, whereas if they had considered the progress of the State they would have supplemented the funds and re-established many more producers than has been the case. There is no doubt that good work has been done; 1,700 farmers have been re-established here but the board have been held up owing to shortage of funds. It is of some importance to the State Government that these people should be re-established early. Surely the Government could have spared some money. This State has not seen fit to advance funds on the same basis as that

on which funds have been granted by the Federal Government, but is treating advances as repayable over a period of 20 years. By supplementing the wheat and superphosphate bounties paid by the Federal Government, the State Government would be carrying out one of the duties of a Government, as both these projects play a most important part amongst exports. The cheaper super is supplied to producers, the more liberal will be the use made of it, thus returning increased yields of wheat, wool, and lambs, etc., of a better quality, and thereby increasing the export surplus on which the State depends to recover prosperity. Moneys provided for replacement of machinery and power, a bonus on wheat, and a bounty on superphosphate would all benefit the State by increasing the revenue, and would supplement the earnings of different public utilities. But the present Government prefer to use governmental funds in either non-producing revenue concerns, or those which may produce interest from internal moneys but produce no revenue whatever. After all, such interest is a tax, and with the State's rapid advancement towards another poverty period, it is imperative that every avenue should be exploited to increase the State's exports. When dealing with loan expenditure, the figures used will show that annually State revenue has been increasing, but there has been no appreciable improvement in the State's position, as expenditure has been beyond reason. In addition to revenue increase, with nearly £1,000,000 from the emergency tax, there is the benefit of the hospital tax, and the large amount of money made available by the Lotteries Commission to assist charities, which relieve the Government of a responsibility. The position should have shown marked improvement. Instead, it is aggravated by the continual extension of Government activities which must of necessity be the most expensive method of control. In this respect there is unnecessary expenditure, such as the large amount of money which has to be found for the unwarranted encroachment by the Government into the avenues of private transport services by the purchase and installation of a trolley bus system in the Claremont area where, if it were untrammelled, the existing service would be adequate. The time is overdue for the transfer of a number of Government-controlled services to boards with statutory powers,

which boards could render those services in a more satisfactory and more economical manner. The growth of activities is deplorable from many angles. Unfortunately, time will not permit me to deal with all, but I might make reference to motor service costs. No matter what portion of the State is visited, an extraordinarily large number of Government vehicles is met with at every hour of the day and an unreasonable number at night. Those vehicles comprise cars, runabouts, trucks, etc. It would cause alarm to the ratepayers of the State if information were made available showing the number and cost of all Government motor vehicles, as well as the maintenance cost, the expense for fuel and oil, and also spare parts. Costs such as these could be reduced considerably by the establishment of boards to control many Government activities. I venture to say that present costs could be cut down by half. A board to control harbours, rivers, and the State Shipping Service would be more economical, and would provide better services at less cost than at present, in addition to which there would be established uniform control of the ports.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you going to say anything about the producers experiencing difficulty in getting their super delivered by the railways?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Not at this stage. Metropolitan activities, such as sewerage, drainage and water supply, should also be controlled by a body possessing statutory powers. Transport is even more urgent, and cannot be satisfactory until a better form of control is established. In the metropolitan area at the present time there are many justifiable complaints with regard to the running of tramways and buses. The tramways are entitled to have their routes protected, just as the routes of the bus companies are protected. It is apparent to all that the problem of metropolitan passenger transport service must be placed on a better footing without delay. I am convinced that this difficulty can be overcome and a more satisfactory position created by the appointment of a metropolitan transport board. This would necessitate arrangements being made to finance, control and provide for the purchase of existing services, such as buildings, vehicles, plant and equipment, with an allowance for goodwill. This would be merely following the lines of the arrangements entered into when the

London Transport Act was passed in 1933. By this means only can we hope to solve our metropolitan transport problem. Following the creation of such a board there would be an improvement in transport and a big reduction in costs. Some time back we passed an Act to control transport. Unfortunately, those who were entrusted with the administration of the Act and were given the title of Transport Board, made extraordinary use of the provisions of the Act, and, at the sacrifice of the primary industries, directed their efforts towards driving transport to the railways. This hampered production to such an extent that our exports suffered considerably. Producers were caused unnecessary expense and vexatious delays in the transport of their commodities, particularly in the marketing of fat stock and lambs. Since the appointment of the present chairman, Mr. Milne, however, the board's operations are being carried out in such a way that both the people and the State are benefiting, and moreover, what is now being done is what Parliament intended. Lambs must receive expeditious transport and careful handling. In some cases the growers had to travel their lambs a distance of up to 20 miles to rail transport and then have them hauled in trucks. That would occupy perhaps double the time that would have been taken by motor vehicles. Fortunately, this has all been ended, and arrangements can now be made to load the lambs on the grower's property, and in a short time they are slaughtered without any loss of condition, and very little bruising. More important still, they will carry the bloom which is so necessary to high-grade lambs, more particularly those for export. In other ways as well the board are now assisting producers. In the "West Australian" of the 12th April last there appeared a statement showing the manner in which the traffic fees for the period ended the 31st March, 1937, had been distributed. The statement disclosed that out of a total distribution amounting to £124,604, a sum of £48,000, or 38.8 per cent. of the total, was paid to the Main Roads Board to be expended in the metropolitan area. If the Main Roads Board received a similar amount each year over a period of five years, it would represent the huge total of £240,000, approximately a quarter of a million. It appears to me that the Main Roads Board would be har-

assed by receiving so much in the shape of fees, because practically all the roads under its jurisdiction in the metropolitan area are already constructed, and money is needed in the country for roadmaking. These funds should be diverted to the agricultural districts, the roads through which are extensively used by people who pay their licenses in the metropolitan area. Many of the latter are dealers, salesmen and travellers. I have made an examination of the latest Statistical Register in connection with local government, and I find that there are 87 road board districts in the agricultural areas, and that in those districts there are 100,630 square miles. In this territory the provision of roads is just as important as the provision of water supplies and other conveniences, and the total rate collections amount to only £104,614. Yet we have £48,000 being paid annually to the Main Roads Board to be spent on a few main roads in the metropolitan area, which embraces a little over a hundred square miles. Most of the important roads in the metropolitan area have already been constructed, and there can surely be no need to hand over to the Main Roads Board any further money to be spent in that direction. I contend that there is no longer any need for that sum to be handed over to the Main Roads Board.

Hon. L. Craig: You are suggesting that the metropolitan traffic fees should be diverted to the country?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The fees should be diverted to the local bodies so that they might be enabled to put their roads in order. The Main Roads Board has ample funds as it is. Many fees are paid in the metropolitan area by motor vehicle owners whose business takes them over country roads, and so it is only right that a portion of the license fees, at any rate, should be expended in the country.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: Does not some of that £48,000 come from the petrol tax?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No, it has nothing to do with petrol. I desire it to be understood that my criticism is directed towards the financial policy which does not assist the agricultural districts. At the same time I do not deny that the Main Roads Board is doing excellent work, and is one of the State's most successful activities, which is fortunately favoured by being under the control of a competent and far-

seeing director. But in plain words, my grievance is that 87 road boards collect only £104,614 to construct roads, and for other purposes, over an area of over 100,000 square miles, whilst the Main Roads Board receives £48,000 from traffic fees for the purpose of constructing roads designated as main roads in an area of 100 square miles. Provision should be made to transfer this money to bodies controlling roads in outside districts. I do not know whether members appreciate the good work of the Main Roads Board. I have no desire to indulge in criticism of the board; what I am advocating is an alteration of policy. Such an alteration as I propose would permit of roads being constructed in other parts of the State, roads that are used by the people of the metropolitan area.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You mean a re-allocation of the funds?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, a re-allocation of funds now no longer needed by the Main Roads Board for expenditure in the metropolitan area. After all, only a small proportion of the roads in the metropolitan area are main roads. Those roads are practically all made; I do not know of any that is not made.

Hon. J. Nicholson: You could not ask me to admit that.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I am not asking Mr. Nicholson to admit anything.

Hon. L. Craig: I think the Transport Board make an allocation now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: Yes, but that is a different matter.

Hon. G. B. Wood: What is done with that money now?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I wish members to understand that the position of which I speak is only arising now. The Main Roads Board have been expending their money very usefully, but, in my opinion, they have reached the limit. The roads required have already been made, and the board do not know where to spend the money allotted to them.

Hon. J. Cornell: They might build a new road from Midland Junction to Perth.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: They might. I have every faith in the Director of Main Roads, though he has a tendency to look for opportunities to construct new roads.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is a main road from Southern Cross to Coolgardie that ought to be made.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: If the policy were altered as I have suggested, roads like that would participate in the division of the £48,000. I trust that before long this State will be benefited by a copious fall of rain. The crops are not beyond recovery, and good results might yet be obtained. If, within the next few days, we receive an appreciable fall of rain, we shall have a happy and contented farming population. I hope that the results of the season will be excellent and will benefit not only the people engaged in our primary industries, but the State as a whole. I support the motion.

On motion by the Honorary Minister, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. W. H. Kitson—West) [5.33]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till to-morrow at 7.30 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.34 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 10th August, 1937.

	PAGE
Questions: Mining reservations	21
Superannuation Act, pensions to railway employees	22
Malnutrition, adequacy of sustenance rate	22
Sitting days and hours	22
Government business, precedence	23
Bill: Supply (No. 1), £2,500,000, all stages	23
Address-in-reply, second day	33
Adjournment, special	46

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

QUESTION—MINING RESERVATIONS.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Minister for Mines: 1, What was the total number of reservations in existence at the 30th June, 1937, granted under the Mining Act for the