

sessions every month except January. Thus the Bill proposes to bring our procedure into line with that obtaining in the majority of Australian States. I regard it as highly desirable that sessions should be held as frequently as practicable. I have discussed the matter with His Honour the Chief Justice, who considers that there will be no difficulty in arranging the additional sittings. I commend the measure to the House, and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Latham, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 7.42 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 28th August, 1934.

Question: Lotteries Commission, applications	PAGE 309
Motion: State Transport Co-ordination Act, to dis-	
allow regulation	310
Address-in-Reply, ninth day	310

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

QUESTION—LOTTERIES COMMISSION, APPLICATIONS.

Hon. H. SEDDON asked the Chief Secretary: 1, How many industrial unions or organisations have applied for permission to hold sweeps since the Lotteries Commission has been instituted? 2, What are the names of those unions or organisations—(a) which have been granted permission; (b) which have been refused permission?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1 and 2—

4,000 at 1s.—W.A. Midland Railway Employees' Industrial Union of Workers, 18th March, 1933—Granted.

10,000 at 1s.—Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union (Destitute Members), 28th April, 1933—Granted.

S/Raffles—Eight-Hour Sports Meeting, Gwalia (Public Charities), 29th April, 1933—Granted.

500 at 1s.—A.L.P., Collie (Ladies' Auxiliary) (Unemployed and Destitute Mothers), 12th June, 1933—Granted.

2,500 at 1d.—A.L.P., Bassendean, 13th July, 1933—Granted.

1,500 at 1s.—Australian Postal Electricians' Union (in aid of Perth Hospital), 14th July, 1933—Granted.

5,000 at 6d.—Kalgoorlie and Boulder Greengrocers' Association (Association Members), 6th July, 1933—Granted.

3,000 at 6d.—A.L.P., Claremont, 14th September, 1933—Granted.

20,000 at 6d.—Fremantle Lumpers' Union (Liquidate Funeral Expenses and Relieve Distress of Families), 23rd October, 1933—Refused.

10,000 at 1s.—A.L.P., Kalgoorlie (Distress Fund), 7th August, 1933—Granted.

3,000 at 1s.—Kalgoorlie and Boulder Greengrocers' Association (Distressed Member), 30th November, 1933—Granted.

3,000 at 6d.—A.L.P., Mount Hawthorn (Goose Club), 12th October, 1933—Granted.

Tickets 1s.—Wheatgrowers' Union, Nungarin (Goose Club), 29th November, 1933—Granted.

3,000 at 3d.—Albany Lumpers' Union (Children's Picnic), 4th December, 1933—Granted.

200 at 1s.—W.A. Amalgamated Society of Railway Employees, Kalgoorlie, 12th March, 1934—Refused.

2,500 at 1s.—Australian Postal Electricians' Union (in aid of Lemnos Hospital), 1st May, 1934—Granted.

Sweep—Metropolitan Council of Unemployment Relief Committees, 7th June, 1934—Refused.

10,000 at 1s.—Coolgardie Federated Miners' Union (Distressed Members), 7th June, 1934—Refused.

5,000 at 1s.—Kalgoorlie and Boulder Greengrocers' Association, 30th July, 1934—Refused.

300 at 1s.—Kurrawang Labour Day Sports, 13th April, 1934—Granted.

S/Raffles—Wheatgrowers' Union, Mil-
ing (S/Raffles, Sports Meeting, and
Dance), 2nd August, 1934—Granted.

MOTION—STATE TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION ACT.

To Disallow Regulation.

Order of the Day read for the resumption of the debate from the 21st August, on the following motion moved by Hon. A. Thomson—

That Regulation No. 48, made under the State Transport Co-ordination Act, 1933, as published in the "Government Gazette" on 16th March, 1934, and laid on the Table of the House on 7th August, 1934, be and is hereby disallowed.

On motion by Hon. C. G. Elliott, ordered: That the debate be adjourned till the 4th September.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Ninth Day.

Debate resumed from the 16th August.

HON. G. W. MILES (North) [4.40]: The Lieut.-Governor's Speech was long, but it contained little. It appeared to me that the main object of the framers of the Speech was to throw dust in the eyes of the electors with reference to the legislation the Government desire to introduce this session. During the course of his speech, Mr. T. Moore advocated putting in hand reproductive works, and mentioned water supply and sewerage undertakings. The Government are to be congratulated upon what they are doing regarding those particular activities. Although the work that is now being undertaken may not be reproductive immediately, it will be so eventually. The installation of a sewerage system will be of great benefit to the city, especially when the septic tanks are removed from Burswood, where they have polluted the river for so long. I endorse what Mr. Moore said with regard to the railway system, and particularly his references to regrading. In Canada the railways have a grade of one in 200, with the result that heavier loads can be hauled more cheaply than is possible in Western Australia, where the grade is one in

80. If the regrading of our railways were undertaken where required, the work would be reproductive. Economies that would be of benefit to those who use the service, would be effected and the revenue of the State would benefit. Another reproductive work, which I regard as a national obligation, would be the destruction of vermin. The country areas are being overrun by rabbits, foxes and dingoes, and, in some parts, by kangaroos and galahs. I have been informed by the Chief Secretary that the galahs seriously affect the wheat-growers in the Yuna-Dartmoor district in particular, and many of the unemployed could be usefully occupied in the wheat areas in destroying the pest. I congratulate the members of the Royal Commission, who investigated the affairs of the Agricultural Bank, upon their work. It was just about time the light of day was let into the doings of that concern. I do not altogether agree with them in the blame they place upon the trustees, because I consider that blame should rest on various Governments and parish-pump members of Parliament who went over the heads of departmental officials with requests for further concessions to be granted to particular clients of the Bank. We will have an opportunity to debate the Commission's report and the affairs of the Agricultural Bank at a later stage, so I shall not make further reference to that phase at the present moment. I would like to see Royal Commissions appointed to investigate every Government department. If that were done, I think the results would be somewhat similar to that of the investigations of the Agricultural Bank Commission. If we had an investigation regarding certain departments, I believe they could be placed on a better business basis, and economies would be effected. In that event, the results would be better for the taxpayers generally. I have advocated action along those lines for years past, for I believe all the Government departments require overhauling and placing on a proper business basis. I believe the State Transport Co-ordination Act will prove beneficial. We all know that one of the objects of the legislation was to secure the running of the railways on more efficient lines. If that result should follow, the work of the Transport Board will have proved worth while. I endorse the action of the Government in in-

roducing legislation of that type, although I consider previous Governments should have handled the situation with regard to motor transport at an earlier stage. It seems to me that the only means by which we can arrive at the true position is by the appointment of boards of control. Governments seem afraid to act for fear of losing votes, and, therefore, boards, if appointed, would achieve what Governments fail to accomplish.

Hon. A. Thomson: The Transport Board cannot interfere with the Commissioner of Railways.

Hon. G. W. MILES: The board will inform Parliament of what is happening, and I think Parliament can interfere with the Commissioner of Railways, even if the Government cannot. In the past the railways have not been run to give efficient service to the public. I hope the agitation that is occurring over the State Transport Co-ordination Act will compel the Commissioner of Railways to run his department on up-to-date lines. The other day we had an instance of half a dozen men being sent to the Beverley district to screw up a few bolts. On another occasion, when a key was lost, it was necessary, according to union rules, to employ three men, one to inspect the job, a carpenter to do his part of the work, and a locksmith to do his part. If that sort of thing is general in Government departments, no wonder we are experiencing difficulties. I wish to refer to the pardon granted to Mr. Gray. It was disgraceful on the part of the Government to use the King's representative to undermine the Constitution. I endorse every word uttered by Mr. Parker on this question the other evening. He quoted remarks by a bishop respecting members of Parliament. No wonder the public holds members up to ridicule when such methods are adopted. I am not speaking in a personal way; no one has a greater regard than I have for the two members whom the Government have sought to shield from the consequences of their actions. It seems to me, however, that Parliament elected Mr. Clydesdale to this House over the heads of electors, and that the Executive Council took the matter out of the hands of the electors of West Province in the case of Mr. Gray. I enter an emphatic protest against the Government using the King's representative to secure a pardon for Mr. Gray. The manner

in which the school teachers are acting merits the adoption of drastic steps by the Government. We do not know what effect the example set by the teachers will have on the rising generation. Something ought to be done. I should feel inclined to disband the whole of the teachers and let them go to private institutions. Do away with State education and give a subsidy to the parents to educate their children. It would be better than having a body of employees dictating to the Government.

Hon. R. G. Moore: The teachers are merely refusing to do that which they are not paid to do.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is the example set to the rising generation that we should consider.

Hon. R. G. Moore: That is all the teachers have refused to do.

Hon. G. W. MILES: It is a disgrace to allow unionism to run mad to such an extent.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: The teachers are only fighting for their rights.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That is not the proper way to fight for their rights. There would have been no need for the teachers to take action had the Government done the right thing when the emergency legislation was under consideration.

Hon. R. G. Moore: Is that the fault of the teachers?

Hon. G. W. MILES: The action taken by the teachers is blameworthy. They should not have adopted such methods. The Government are budgeting for another deficit. I enter my protest against continued action of this kind by the Government. Twenty years ago Mr. Scaddan was Premier. He headed the Government from 1911 to 1914. During his term there was a deficit of £414,000. I remember the occasion well. I was not a member of Parliament at the time, but I got an article inserted in a Port Hedland paper appealing to the electors that, if they favoured maladministration on the basis of a deficit of £414,000, they should vote again for the Scaddan Government. At that time the North-West elections were held a week after the elections in the rest of the State. The position of parties at that stage was 23 to 24. Mr. Male had been returned unopposed for the Kimberley electorate, and the question to be decided by the electors of Pilbara, Roebourne and Gascoyne was which party

should govern the State during the next three years. I mentioned that in my article, and added one or two other things that will bear repeating now. I said—

If you are in favour of our women and children being exposed to danger at the hands of such vile creatures as men of the Bennett type, you will again vote for the Government that endorsed the action of Attorney General Walker in releasing the criminal Bennett.

That man after being released went to the Eastern States, where he committed a similar crime and was hanged. I added—

If you are not in favour of the above methods, vote for the undermentioned Liberal candidates, which will mean good government for the next three years.

Unfortunately the then Government won two of the three North-West seats—Roe-bourne and Pilbara. Then Mr. Scaddan came along with his million pounds deficit during the next three years, and went strutting around the country saying the money was in the pockets of the people. At that time we considered it was little short of a calamity to have such a huge deficit.

Hon. J. Cornell: Mr. Scaddan was only a circumstance compared with Sir James Mitchell.

Hon. G. W. MILES: We thought a deficit of £414,000 would ruin the State, but the example of Mr. Scaddan has been followed by other Governments, each of which has budgeted for a deficit, and the deficits have continued for 20 years. During that period there has been only one surplus, namely, £28,000, and I believe that was a surplus of sinking fund taken into revenue on the redemption of a loan. We have already funded deficits amounting to £6,000,000, and every Government has budgeted for a deficit. That is unsound finance. Until we balance our budget, our loan expenditure each year should be reduced and not increased. The only good point about the Financial Agreement was the clause providing that any deficit, when funded, must carry a sinking fund of 4 per cent. That was inserted with the object of compelling State Treasurers to balance their budgets. We have £5,000,000 of deficit yet to fund; it is floating around in the shape of Treasury bills. That makes over £11,000,000 of deficits in the 20 years.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: And we have not paid our 4 per cent. sinking fund on them.

Hon. G. W. MILES: That is so. On top of that, the Royal Commission show a loss of £12,000,000 on the operations of the Agricultural Bank. I am endeavouring to show the disabilities under which we live in our own State, apart altogether from Federal disabilities. It is our duty to put our own house in order, apart from inducing the Federal Government to treat us better than they have done in the past. If we had Royal Commissions to inquire into every Government department and if a proper stocktaking were made, probably another £5,000,000 to £10,000,000 would have to be written off. That would bring the total to over £30,000,000 written off. Yet on that amount we have to pay interest and sinking fund for the next 58 years. Under such methods of government, the State will soon reach an impossible position, and it will then be a question of the Commonwealth taking over the State. References have been made to the State Grants Commission. Members have congratulated the Premier on his reply to the Commission's recommendations. I maintain that while Western Australia is being governed as at present, we are not playing the game by the Eastern States. The Arbitration Act should be repealed so that we could adopt the same basis for fixing the basic wage as is adopted by the Federal authorities. We pay our workers 6s. a week more than workers in the Eastern States receive. Under the Workers' Compensation Act we pay more by way of compensation for the loss of an arm, an eye or a limb than is paid in the Eastern States, and industry here is being taxed to the extent of £200,000 per annum. We do not tax our people to the same extent as the Eastern States tax their people. The figures for 1933, including unemployment relief tax, are as follows:—

Commonwealth	£8 10s. 10d.
Queensland	£5 4s. 6d.
New South Wales	£6 9s. 3d.
Victoria	£4 10s. 4d.
South Australia	£4 14s. 3d.
Western Australia	£2 19s. 6d.

Previous to the passing of the emergency legislation, our taxation was £2 19s. 6d. per head. With the emergency tax it was increased another 10s. per head to £3 9s. 6d. In spite of our low rate of taxation, we ask the Federal authorities to increase the grant. The population of South Australia is 30 per cent. greater than ours; we have 30 per

cent. more members of Parliament than has South Australia, and we pay our Parliamentarians salaries that are 30 per cent. higher than those paid in South Australia. Yet we go cap-in-hand to the taxpayers of the Eastern States asking for additional grants. There is an amount of £180,000 surplus in the sinking fund which the State Treasurer has been trying to get. That money, in my opinion, should be used to reduce our deficits. It should not be handled by the Treasurer. A message from Canberra stated that a small surplus had accumulated in connection with Western Australian Government loans, the amount being estimated at £118,000. It was originally stated to be £180,000, and I do not know which amount is correct. I have advocated the imposition of an emergency tax ever since the depression began. I am not concerned about the amount the Government will collect from the tax. I hope they collect a few hundred thousand pounds more than they anticipate, provided it is used for the reduction of the deficits, but I strongly object to the money being used to restore cuts to civil servants until we are in a better financial position. Our first duty is to economise and to balance the budget. If the budget is balanced and we are able to provide interest and sinking fund each year, there will not be much harm in increasing our loan indebtedness, provided the population is also increasing. It may be necessary for Governments to borrow money for works that are not immediately reproductive, but if we continue borrowing and budgeting for deficit after deficit, the country will soon be on the rocks, and the reply of the Commonwealth to the Case for Secession—it is called the Case for Union—will resolve itself into a case for unification. I think the Commonwealth have given us as much as we have asked for and that eventually we shall have no option to accepting unification. The Government should seriously consider the position and aim at reducing the deficit instead of budgeting for one to the extent that the Loan Council will allow. That, in my opinion, is wrong. Another matter to which I wish to refer affects the industries of the State. I allude to the Little Australia policy of high tariffs. This is not only ruining Australia, but causing us to lose friends in every other part of the world. People talk about making Australia self-contained. There is no

possible hope of doing that for the next century. Without Great Britain behind us where would we be?

Hon. J. Cornell: Great Britain is also putting up a tariff now.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Great Britain has been forced to do so to protect herself, but she has not gone mad like Australia and started an artificial glass industry as we have done. The establishment of this industry means to us the loss of a market in Belgium for our Wyndham meat, and not only the meat from Wyndham, but also that from other parts of Australia. These artificial industries—I cannot call them anything else—should be scrapped immediately. Another one of these industries is that of rice growing in New South Wales, and its establishment there means that the pearlers in the North, who are already sufficiently handicapped, have to pay a duty of £3 a ton. Then we have the cotton duties that were lately imposed, and Lancashire boycotting the primary products of Australia. If we followed the methods of reciprocity adopted by New Zealand we would be several millions of pounds better off. Further, New Zealand is able to get her wool exported for about half the price that is paid by Australia. All our troubles are caused indirectly by our high tariff and trade going one way only. In the future we shall have great difficulty in finding customers to buy any of our products. Our two main industries, wheat and wool, must be encouraged in every possible way instead of being hampered as they are being hampered to-day. I might here refer to what I consider was a joke perpetrated by my colleague, Mr. Angelo, the other evening when he spoke of growing sugar by irrigation in the North-West. At any rate, I hope he meant this jocularly. This would be one of the artificial industries, and I am definitely opposed to them all. Even the cultivation of bananas I would class as an artificial industry, though perhaps we have to grow them because of the duty that is imposed on bananas generally for the purpose of protecting those grown in Queensland. While those duties exist, we must produce as much as we can, but as far as sugar is concerned, I notice that the different parties contesting the Federal elections are silent. I wonder whether they are afraid of losing some Queensland

votes if they mention the subject of sugar at all. That industry costs Australia six million pounds per annum, and we have to tolerate that kind of thing. Instead of paying 1½d. per lb. for sugar, we are obliged to pay 4½d., and so it will continue while this artificial industry remains. As I have already said, artificial industries will get us nowhere. I was interested the other day in reading an interview published in the local Press with a resident from the Argentine. In many respects the Argentine is similar to Australia in that it is a primary producing country. They grow 25 million acres of lucerne, and their main exports are cattle and wheat, but the gentleman who was interviewed pointed out that they did not try to build up artificial secondary industries. He said: "We buy secondary products from our customers." While I know that it is impossible for Australia to be an entirely free-trade country, it would be sufficient protection if we had a moderate tariff. We notice in the Press that Germany will not buy from us now because we are not buying anything from that country. France and Italy are the same because we are not considering their products at all. The cause of our difficulties is entirely that mad-brained policy, the Australian tariff. Exactly the same thing happened in America, and Australia is trying to ape America.

Hon. J. Cornell: And what about Canada?

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, Canada is just beginning to wake up, and in the State elections there we find that high tariffists are being defeated. I have no doubt it will be the same when the Federal elections take place in Canada, the high tariff party will go out. When I moved the adjournment of the debate the other evening somebody remarked, "I suppose we will have more about the North-West now." While I do not intend to go up and down the coast as my friends Mr. Holmes and Mr. Angelo did, I cannot help saying that I endorse all that was said by Mr. Holmes and most of the views expressed by Mr. Angelo excepting of course, his idea of growing sugar in the North and fat lambs in the Gascoyne for export. Along the North-West coast we have immense marine wealth and between Derby and Wyndham the coastline for beauty cannot be equalled in any part

of Australia. If my friend Mr. Mann were to see that part of the coast he would immediately advocate the conducting of excursions by the Tourist Bureau. In addition, there is the immense iron deposit at Yampi Sound, an asset of tremendous value, not only to Australia, but to the Empire, and which will be worked some day. Then the ocean teems with edible fish. I should like the Chief Secretary to make a note of what I propose to say with regard to mining in the northern part of the State. In our year book which gives the history of mining development in Western Australia, Pilbara is omitted altogether. It is generally believed that the first gold discovered in Western Australia was unearthed in the Kimberleys in 1886 and in Pilbara in 1888, but in reading the "West Australian" the other day we learned that a 14 oz. nugget was found between Cossack and Roebourne by A. McRea in 1882. I know that mining took place in Pilbara in the eighties but there is no mention of that fact in the year book. I think Yilgarn was worked at about the same time. I congratulate the Minister for Mines on the policy he has adopted generally, particularly in respect of the reservations he has granted. This is a continuation of the policy initiated by his predecessor, Mr. Scaddan. It is a splendid policy, and the only way in which mineral areas can be developed is by modern methods of boring and ascertaining the quantities of ore available and the value before sinking. That unfortunately was not the policy adopted in the early days of mining. In the Pilbara district when operations were first started, if a fault was encountered it was believed to be the end of the show. It is 40 years ago this month since I went to Coolgardie and I put in four or five years there. I returned to Coolgardie when the fortieth anniversary celebrations took place and I, with others, had the privilege of seeing the operations at the Lake View mine in Kalgoorlie and inspecting the glass model which showed the reefs going down and generally the modern methods of cheap mining. We saw how lodes were located with the aid of boring plant. I am more than ever convinced that our gold resources have only been scratched, and that there will be gold production in the future from Ravensthorpe to Kimberley. In the old days when a cross-cut was put in and a fault was found the property was abandoned. In the Pilbara district there

are a dozen centres that may yet become equal in importance to Wiluna. The late Mr. Montgomery, who was State Mining Engineer, and who was a great authority on mining, reported on the Conglomerates at Nullagine and expressed the opinion that it was one of the biggest deposits in Australia, extending over a distance of two or three miles, and going up to a height of 200 or 300 feet. Drives and cross-cuts were put in, and a thousand ounces of gold were obtained. Unfortunately no records of alluvial gold won were kept in the early days, and when miners were working what they thought to be the bottom has now turned out to be a sulphide lode. If we can only get capital to test those areas we may yet have another Golden Mile there. The chief centres of the Pilbara field, are Bamboo Creek, Boodalyerie, Lalla Rookh, Marble Bar, North Pole, North Shaw, Sharks, Shaw River, Talga Talga, Tambourah, Warrawoona, Western Shaw, Yandicoogina, Elsie, Mosquito Creek, Nullagine, and 20-Mile Sandy. Then through the West Pilbara district there are Station Peak, Bangemall, Ashburton and Hall's Creek that have never been properly tested. In all, from the Marble Bar-Nullagine districts, over 20,000 ozs. of alluvial gold have been won, while in the Marble Bar district up to 1929, 87,000 tons had been mined for 132,000 ozs., and in the Nullagine district 42,000 tons for 73,000 ozs. The possibilities of mining in those areas are enormous. If the Government agree to a reservation being granted in the Marble Bar district and someone gets an option over the leases being worked there and allows the men to crush the ore and retain the proceeds, I am sure one of those companies would agree to test the show by boring. I do not want the Government to come in with bores and send up office boys to say how the bores shall be put in. We want private enterprise to do that work, and if the Government will carry out their responsibility we can get private enterprise to bore that area. If it is proved that the lodes go down, there will be another Wiluna there. I understand that at eight miles from Marble Bar one of the companies in which Mr. de Bernales is concerned has ten feet of ore at 250 feet. If these areas are to be bored it means that capital must be induced to go in and do the work. There are possibilities of enormous developments in every centre I have mentioned, and I feel sure the Gov-

ernment will continue to do their share, as they have done in the past. I wish to congratulate the Government also on the part they are taking in the aerial geological survey now being carried out in the North, and I congratulate them also, together with the Minister for Health, on the support they are giving to the flying doctor scheme for the North. That will be of great benefit to all sections of the community up there and will make for the development of all that country. I urge members of the House that if they have any spare donations to make they could not do better than make them to the flying doctor fund. I should like to say, Mr. President, how pleased we are to see you back. I notice that you have written a book entitled "The Empty North." I have not yet had opportunity to read the book, but from a criticism I saw in the local Press I noticed an error you have made in describing Marble Bar as being five degrees hotter than it really is. However, I understand you, as the author, have been congratulated on the excellence of your work by people who count throughout the Empire. The reason why I have not been able to read it, is that I understand the Japanese have bought up all available copies. They want to see what the President of the Legislative Council thinks of the empty North. It has been said in this House that members representing the North have been here for 20 years, but have never suggested any remedy for the disabilities of the North. I have been here only 18 years, and every year I have put up a scheme for the development of the North, but no notice has been taken of it. As for the interest of the Japanese in your book and in the North, I may say they have a magazine in which in 1919 they produced a map of Australia showing all the countries of Europe, and giving area and population around our fertile fringe, to instruct their children in the possibilities of Australia, while our educational authorities were still teaching our own children that this country was a desert. I and others persistently talked in this House until we shamed the previous Government into removing the alleged deserts from the map of this State. I have walked over some of the so-called deserts and found them to be fertile regions. To-day the maps show underground water supplies, and the stock routes printed in two red lines. It is no wonder

that our State is referred to as a land of sand, sin, sorrow and sore eyes—

Hon. J. J. Holmes: And secession.

Hon. G. W. MILES: Yes, and now secession. It is no wonder our land is thus derided when members of Parliament and our educational authorities continue to write down the country as desert. However we have now had the deserts eliminated from the maps. In 1923, when Mr. Bruce was Prime Minister, I had eight trips over East and two trips Home in connection with the proposed development of the North. Mr. Bruce said he was prepared to put up to the Imperial Government a scheme under which the North would be developed, if the State Governments would first put it up to him. We wired to Mr. Theodore, of Queensland, but he turned down the scheme. We had a deputation to Sir James Mitchell, who was then Premier of Western Australia, but he said that we could not allow the Commonwealth to come in. I pointed out to him that we had already allowed the Commonwealth to build the trans-Australian railway, and that they could not take away the land, that our geographical position could not be altered, and that Western Australia would get the benefit of the development without the liability. Also we told him the Imperial Government might well be induced to come in and assist with the scheme. However, his reply was, "We ourselves will develop the North when the South is developed." I told him it would take a century to develop the South and that before then we should lose the North altogether, and if we lost the North we would lose the South as well. Mr. Theodore turned down the proposal that Mr. Bruce was prepared to put up. After all our work in London, Mr. Theodore was converted in 1924 when he returned from England, and put up a scheme for the development of the North from the 20th degree of latitude to make a new State from ocean to ocean. I wired to Mr. Theodore congratulating him on being the first State Premier to put up a practicable scheme for the development of the North, and I asked him to send us a copy of his plans. Those plans are now in our office in St. George's House, and some day they will make history. Here we have talked and talked and put up our case, but never yet have we had support from southern members. When Mr. Collier was going Home, in 1924, I showed

him my telegram to Mr. Theodore and asked him to comment on it. He made a rousing speech in support of it. The "West Australian" said it was an ill-considered statement, whereupon I went and told them they were as parochial as ever, and reminded them of other instances. Four years earlier, in a leading article, the "West Australian" had described the same proposal as a national work. I am pleased to say the "West Australian" saw their error, and altered their policy. However, that was as far as we got. I say again that we have to go on with that scheme. It is impossible for Western Australia unaided to handle the development of the North, and the sooner it is handed over to the Imperial and Commonwealth authorities, the better it will be for Western Australia. Yet when it is put up by the Federal authorities our South-West Government say, "We are not going to hand it over," and judging by the policy they are adopting they will hand it over to the blacks. I support Mr. Angelo in his references to the committee's report of 1932. They recommended a similar scheme, and I hope the Chief Secretary will take an opportunity to read the recommendations of that committee and see if something cannot be done. All the members representing the North went in a deputation to the Minister for the North-West to-day, and put our case before him. He, I hope, will deal with it in Cabinet and see if something cannot be done before it is too late.

Hon. J. Cornell: You might induce the secession delegation to state the case to the House of Commons.

Hon. G. W. MILES: We in the North want nothing to do with secession, because the North has been just as badly treated by the State Government as the State Government have been treated by the Commonwealth. Another matter I would touch upon, namely, the pilotage dues charged by the Harbour Trust to the ships trading along our North-West coast to Java and Singapore. The captains of those ships have been exempt from pilotage, and can bring their vessels into Fremantle just as well as any pilot. However, those ships have been extending their voyage to Penang, since when the Fremantle Harbour Trust have compelled them to engage pilots at Fremantle. It is simply creating a position in Fremantle for an additional pilot. These vessels are extending the trade of the State

and are being penalised because of it. It means over £1,000 a year to the companies. The Harbour Trust is being used as a taxing machine. One result is that it is keeping trade from Western Australia. It means additional taxation on the people of the State, because the shipping companies have to pass on this imposition of £1,000 per annum. I admit I do not think it is the Government's policy. Another serious anomaly is the 20 per cent. surcharge on wharfage. This was brought in as a wartime measure and is now being used as a taxing measure. As Mr. Holmes pointed out, Perth and the hinterland pay the charge once and the people of the State have to pay that charge three times. In addition, some of the wharfage fees charged in the North represent 6s. per ton plus 20 per cent., as against the 2s. plus 20 per cent. paid down here, which is a disgrace. I have been protesting against this for the past 15 years, but still it goes on. Another point I wish to refer to is the issue of income tax assessments. Some of the 1932-33 assessments have not yet come out. I do not know what the object may be, or whether it is the fault of the Federal authority, or the State authority, or both. Possibly they want to have a bit in reserve. The Government are crying out for revenue but in many instances income taxation for 1932-33 has not yet been paid.

Hon. J. Cornell: I did not get my assessment until October.

Hon. G. W. MILES: There has been this delay on the part of someone. When a man pays his income tax, he is allowed a deduction on account of the taxation paid for the previous year. If he does not get that deduction in time he pays his tax on a higher rate. If that is so, it is due to the neglect of the department in this case. He does not know what he has to pay for the previous year. In all fairness to the taxpayer, and in justice to the revenue of the country, this matter should be looked into. The petrol tax was one of the fairest from the point of view of distribution ever made by the Federal Government. It was made upon an area as well as a population basis. The greater area of the State was at our end of the country, but we have not yet received our share of the grant. The Grants Commission recommended a grant of £600,000 for Western Australia, but stipulated that £200,000 should be used for the development of the northern portion. That is another reason why more considera-

tion should be given to that end of the country. There should also be an amendment of the Taxation Act dealing with cattle increase. Under the State legislation a rate of 30s. per calf is imposed, but under the Federal law the amount is 10s. The calves are regarded by the State as revenue, but many of them may never be sold. In any case, the grower must keep the beasts for four years before he can realise on them. The Chief Secretary should see that something is done to relieve the cattle grower of this charge of 30s. The Government's revenue would eventually come when the grower made a profit on the sale of his cattle.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Cattle growers will soon be leaving the country.

Hon. G. W. MILES: I would again emphasise the need for balancing the Budget, and the exercise of continued economies. The Government should consider the advisability of handing over to the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments all that portion of the State north of the 22nd parallel. It is impossible for that part of the State to obtain any Customs concessions unless it is handed over either to the Commonwealth or to the Imperial Government. I support the motion.

HON. C. G. ELLIOTT (North-East) [5.33]: I congratulate the Government on the attention they have paid to and the work they have done for the gold-mining industry. I also congratulate them on their decision to participate with the Federal and Queensland Governments in the aerial, geophysical and geological survey of the territory north of the 22nd parallel. A large proportion of the State exists north of that parallel, and in view of its known auriferous possibilities the action of the State Government in participating in this modern and up-to-date investigation of the possibilities of the North is most commendable. I hope the investigations will prove fruitful. The problems of the tropical portions of the State, from the point of view of settlement, will quickly be solved, if it turns out that rich gold discoveries are made as a result of the aerial survey. The gold mining industry has always been one of the State's most valuable assets, and for many years is likely to continue to play an important part in its prosperity. Up to the 31st July last this State produced 40,430,597 fine ounces of gold valued in sterling at £171,738,242, while

over £30,000,000 has been paid in dividends to shareholders. The wonderful value to the State of the Golden Mile alone is shown by the fact that its production to date is over 22,000,000 fine ounces, or approximately 670 tons of gold. The value of our present production may be gauged by the mine profit for the seven months of this year, which amounted to £967,376. The enhanced price of gold and the exchange premium have brought the value of gold to over £8 10s. an ounce. This high price has resulted in a return to Western Australian producers for the last seven months of £3,119,593. The premium alone has accounted for no less than £1,545,042 of that amount. The high price of gold has given the mining companies the opportunity to put into operation vigorous schemes of development, and to erect new and up-to-date treatment plants, two of which have cost in the vicinity of £340,000 each. This, with the introduction of sound mining practice, has now made it possible to treat 4-dwt. ore at a profit, and has brought into production millions of tons of ore that formerly was unprofitable. In this State exists one of the largest auriferous areas in the world, extending, as it does, from Ravensthorpe in the south to Pilbara in the north. Millions of pounds of new capital are now flowing into the State for the purpose of prospecting new country, and opening up and reconditioning old mines that formerly were unprofitable to work. Old mining centres are being resuscitated. Norseman, Coolgardie, Southern Cross, Ora Banda, Menzies, Leonora, and Laverton are all now centres of mining activity. Wiluna contains one of the great mines of the world. It is making a mine profit of over £50,000 a month, and supporting a thriving town of some 5,000 people. The great factor in this wonderful revival is the high price of gold. How long this will obtain is problematical, but the general opinion expressed by leading financial experts, whose opinions must be respected, is that there is no reason why the present price should not continue. Some authorities even consider it will rise much higher. Whether that is so or not, it seems to be universally accepted that when the world's finances stabilise, the standard price of gold will be not less than £6 per fine ounce. If we take everything into consideration, we can safely say we have a long and prosperous future before the gold mining industry of Western Australia. This is the

bright side of the picture. Unfortunately, another side remains to be presented. In the production of this wealth men must work underground under conditions that are dangerous and far from healthy. In addition to many mining accidents that happen every day, there have been, since 1900, 850 fatal accidents, an average of 25 a year. The industry takes toll in another direction. I was disappointed to find reference to this omitted from the portion of the Speech dealing with the mining industry. I refer to the occupational diseases that arise from work in the industry and the necessity for more reasonable and adequate provision for those who suffer and represent the saddest product of our great industry. Since 1925, when compulsory examination of mine workers by the Commonwealth Health Laboratory, was enforced, 586 men have been prohibited from working in the mines because they had contracted silicosis plus T.B. Of these 296 have died. The figures do not take into consideration the men who have been notified as suffering from silicosis advanced, numbering 308, making the total number 914 in less than nine years. From time to time various Governments have brought in legislation dealing with compensation for these occupational diseases, but the position at present is far from satisfactory. On first entering a mine a man becomes a potential subject for silicotic diseases, and a possible beneficiary under the Workers' Compensation Act and the Mine Workers' Relief Act, 1932. He is compelled to insure himself against such a possibility by the payment of 9d. per week premium. His employer is also compelled to contribute towards his possible incapacity by occupational disease, at the rate of 9d. per week, plus 4½ per cent. of his wage rate, and the Treasury contributes another 9d. per week. These contributions provide the capital from which compensation payments are made. After a time the annual compulsory examination at the Commonwealth Health Laboratory may reveal that the man has contracted early silicosis, and become dusted. He is notified by the Mines Department of this fact, and is advised to leave the industry and take up work in a healthier occupation. How is he to obtain this new employment? It is almost impossible for him to obtain other work. If he follows this advice, he is faced with starvation for himself and his dependants.

His alternative is to remain in the mines until he qualifies for compensation by the development of his dusted condition to advanced silicosis or silicosis plus T.B. When the annual laboratory examination discloses that he has reached the compensation stage of the disease, he is prohibited from working in the mines further, and comes under the provisions of the compensating Acts.

Hon. J. Cornell: And then he has about three years to live.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Yes, from three to five years to live. Such compensation now means the payment to the beneficiary of £750, payable at the rate of from £2 10s. to not exceeding £3 10s. per week. Thus it takes about five years to exhaust the amount. If he is still alive at the end of that time, he then comes under the provisions of the Mine Workers' Relief Act, and receives the princely allowance of 25s. per week to maintain himself and his wife. This, be it noted, at a time when, in the normal course of his complaint, he is in the greatest need of extras in the way of foods and medicines to nourish him and to relieve his sufferings during the advanced stages of silicosis and T.B. Twenty-five shillings a week for himself and his wife! I want hon. members to realise that the mining industry pays 4½ per cent. on wages to the State Insurance Office under the Employers' Liability Act as insurance against occupational diseases alone. These payments from July of 1930 to May of 1934 amounted to £194,547 0s. 11d., while claims under the Third Schedule to the Workers' Compensation Act amounted to £17,097 17s. 9d. From the 1st January, 1932 to the 30th June, 1934, the amount paid to the Mine Workers' Relief Act funds by employees, employers and the State in equal proportions was £54,610 8s., and claims for the same period amounted to £29,216 12s. 1d. The multiplicity of Acts dealing with the matter of compensation for occupational disease is unsatisfactory. At present there are men who have been discharged from the industry being dealt with under the Miners' Phthisis Act, the Workers' Compensation Act, and the Mine Workers' Relief Act. The compensation paid under the latest scheme, which I have already dealt with, is not satisfactory. At the most critical time it leaves the beneficiary with totally inadequate relief; and I am sure that in view of the large sums accruing from the payments towards this end by employees,

employers, and the State Treasury there should be ample funds to meet what is only decent provision for these men. If a man is killed outright in the industry, £750 is paid to his dependants; and £750 is the amount paid to keep him and his dependants if the industry kills him by inches, and when that sum has been exhausted he is paid 25s. per week to keep himself and his wife, at a time, as I said before, during which he needs every care. Even then he is denied this payment until he has signed Form 6 of the Mine Workers' Relief Board, a form which would hardly be exacted of a seeker for charity, and which is an insult to a man whose health has been broken in the great industry we boast of and who has regularly contributed from his earnings a weekly premium to insure him against such a position. I wish to make it clear that the Mines Department are not responsible for this objectionable form, which should be withdrawn at once.

Hon. A. Thomson: What amendment would you suggest?

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: I am suggesting legislation to give these men adequate compensation.

Hon. J. Cornell: The new system is a retrograde step, instead of an advance on the old scheme.

Hon. C. G. ELLIOTT: Yes; the position is worse under the new scheme. In conclusion, I hope the Government will see their way clear to introduce during the present session legislation granting reasonable and adequate compensation to men who, after all, have been so great a factor in our wonderful gold production and in the payment of millions of pounds by way of dividends. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.53]: May I at the opening of my remarks extend to you, Mr. President, congratulations on the good work you have done for the State during your absence in England. I am sure the effect of that work will be to extend the oversea trade of Western Australia and to promote the development of its resources. Since last session this House has been reconstituted, by reason of the biennial elections associated with the Council. As the result of those elections and of other happenings, a number of gentlemen who were not pre-

viously members of this House have joined our ranks. To those gentlemen we extend a hearty welcome, and we feel sure that they will take their part in the good work the Chamber has been elected to carry out. In that connection may I point out what has not previously been pointed out by any member who has spoken in this debate, that as the result of the last election the House can fairly claim to have a mandate. One hears a good deal about mandates as the result of elections, and it is only right that we should assert our position with regard to mandates because, after all, we have a considerable and important function to discharge in connection with the affairs of the State. In criticism of my statement it might be argued that some of us did not have much of a margin so far as mandates are concerned; but I want hon. members to appreciate the conditions under which our mandate was obtained. For example, the last election for this Chamber was characterised by a determined attempt on the part of the Labour Party to change the complexion of the House. Throughout the State they spared no effort to point out the necessity for gaining increased representation here, so that the party's programme might be carried into effect. This fact makes the result of the elections a matter of great importance. In spite of the most strenuous efforts of the Labour Party, this House, in the result, has been returned to carry out the policy to which the majority of members have devoted themselves. That circumstance should be taken into account when we deal with such legislation as may be placed before us. As I said, some of us may have been returned by a narrow margin. On the one hand, Mr. Hall was returned by a majority of something like 1,000; on the other hand, my majority was in the neighbourhood of eight. Mr. Hall had a great advantage over me, in that almost every member of the Government went into his electorate to fight in order that Mr. Hall might be replaced by another representative. Naturally, the electors, appreciating the concentrated effort which was being made, rose in their numbers to assist Mr. Hall, and returned him by a tremendous majority. I myself obtained but a narrow majority. Nevertheless, I claim, that narrow majority justi-

fies me in declaring that the electors are fully satisfied with the policy put forward on behalf of this Chamber—to move in the direction of sound finance and responsible government. While on this last point may I refer to an attitude which unfortunately is spreading through the community with regard to responsible government, as the result of the way in which our laws are being administered. It cannot be denied that in many respects those laws have not been enforced as they should be. In numerous instances the law has been left more or less in the background and more or less ignored in its administration, with the result that the law is being largely regarded with contempt. A generation has arisen which has seen laws flouted though it knew they should be administered. The result is a contempt for the law on the part of that generation, and an impression that the administration of the law may be seriously hampered by political action. Every hon. member will realise how serious it is that such an impression should gain ground, especially among our younger people. The result is that when public feeling is aroused, attempts are made by some of the people to take the law into their own hands. Thus a highly serious position is created, one which requires firm rather than delicate handling. I think I am justified in saying that the regrettable occurrences early in the year on the goldfields were due to the fact that the law has been more or less regarded with contempt there, simply because it has not been enforced. On the occasion of those disturbances an opportunity was afforded the Government to ensure that the law was firmly administered and to impress upon the general public the need for obeying the law. If the public consider a law too hard, they have a recognised remedy by which the law may be amended or repealed. At this point I wish to refer to what has taken place since the disturbances to which I have alluded. Another member has referred to the fact that attempts have been made to enforce the Sunday trading laws on the goldfields. Those of us who have lived on the goldfields know that those laws have been left more or less in abeyance. Since the riots, however, there have been endeavours to put into force the law with regard to Sunday closing. Cer-

tain licensees were found to have broken the law, and prosecutions were launched against them. Those prosecutions have not yet been proceeded with and, in fact, I understand the complaints have been withdrawn.

Hon. J. Cornell: Were they pardoned, too?

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is what we want to find out.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is there one law for the goldfields and another law for the rest of the State?

Hon. H. SEDDON: In the interests of the administration of the law, and to clear up any question of unfair interference, an authoritative statement should be made exactly as to why those prosecutions have been withdrawn or the proceedings postponed. If the law is not to be enforced, let us be told plainly and bluntly that the Government are not in favour of upholding the law. On the other hand, if the law is to be set up as worthy of administration and of being put into force, we should see to it that these breaches of the law are dealt with without any question of partiality arising. The law should be administered firmly and strictly. One would be justified in asking who is responsible for the delay in launching the proceedings or in securing their withdrawal. Dealing briefly with the financial position generally, I will refer to what I may describe as the position disclosed by collections that have been made. We have a rather good indicator now of the national income of Western Australia. By the imposition of a hospital tax of 1½d. in the pound, which practically affects every income-earner throughout the State, we can get a good idea of just how the national income is progressing. On the figures furnished by the Chief Secretary a week or two ago in answer to a question in this Chamber, it appears that the collections from the hospital tax for the financial year just closed were considerably higher than those collected for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1933. Taking the collections and working them out on the basis of 1½d. to the pound, we find that the national income for the financial year ended the 30th June, 1933, was in the vicinity of £23⅓ millions, whereas, on the same basis, the national income for the financial year ended the 30th June last amounted to £24½ millions, showing an increase of £1⅓ millions compared with

the preceding year. That is very interesting and encourages our hopes that we are gradually winning our way out of the period of depression. As against that, we have to take into consideration just how much this national income has been affected by the increase in borrowing, whether in the form of direct loan expenditure or of deficits. We are justified in assuming that the loan expenditure for the year is represented by the actual expenditure on works plus the amount that is involved in the form of the deficit. Again comparing the last two financial years, we find, taking both the items I have mentioned into consideration, that for 1932-1933 the loan expenditure was £3,082,000 and for 1933-34 it was £3,452,000, roughly a difference of £333,000. Although the national income increased by £1⅓ millions, there was an increase of loan expenditure of £333,000. I will deal briefly with the question of State and Federal relationships. I have always contended that Premiers' Conferences provided opportunities for discussion between Federal and State Governments with a view to eliminating overlapping that frequently takes place and to remove duplication, such as with regard to taxation. An attempt was made at the conference last February to deal with State and Federal relationships and a long and interesting statement was made by the Prime Minister at the Premiers' Conference. Unfortunately, few concrete or satisfactory results followed and the impression I formed was that the main consideration influencing the State Premiers was how much money they could get to spend, and to what extent they could still further indulge in the extraction of money from the general public. A distinctly unsatisfactory development that took place was the evident continued tendency on the part of State Premiers to break away from the Premiers' Plan. I regard that as an extremely disquieting development. The more attempts are made to effect alterations to the Premiers' Plan, the more one realises the Plan was intended to help the States to gain a sounder financial basis. That result can be achieved only by balancing budgets. Nevertheless we find that so far from attempting to achieve that objective, the tendency has been to mark time in certain States and, in fact, to allow deficits to increase. That is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs that will not

redound to the credit of any Government acting along those lines. Particularly is it disquietening when we find that there is an impression in certain directions that advantage can be taken of the increased revenue obtainable nowadays, and to allow expenditure to swell once more. One would not be justified in participating in the present debate without referring to unemployment. It may be contended that so many members have dealt with the question that it is worn threadbare. Nevertheless, some members have drawn attention to what is undoubtedly the most tragic aspect, that relating to youth. I wish to add my quota to those directing attention to that phase because it is one that demands attention by the whole community. It certainly demands the attention of the Government as a matter for special consideration, for it must be handled in dealing with the general question of unemployment. An examination of the available statistics forces upon us the realisation that a certain number only of the young people can be placed in regular avenues of employment. A certain number only of apprentices can be employed and the number of young men and women who can be employed in commercial houses must necessarily be comparatively small. Thus there will always be a surplus of those who are turned out of the schools, year by year, for whom no avenue of employment is available. They can only obtain casual work as it offers. Many of the positions that they take are dead-end jobs, with the result that, after a year or two, their employment ceases and they are thrown on the industrial scrap heap. It is a striking reflection upon our industrial system that so many young people start out in life and after a year or two, spent mostly on casual work, they are regarded as a public liability and are scrapped.

Hon. A. Thomson: Really, they are too old to work at 18 years of age.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is one of the results of the severity of the restrictions placed upon juvenile employment. These young people represent an increasingly large proportion of the army of permanently unemployed persons that is such a serious menace to-day. Reference has been made to what I regard as rather a serious fault in our system of education. I do not desire to criticise the system as a whole, because

I consider the training afforded our boys and girls in the ordinary elementary schools is one that is comparable with that available under any other system in Australia and possibly in many parts of the world. There appears to be a fault that the Chief Secretary may give consideration to. The fault lies in just exactly what importance is attached to technical school training. Whereas a youth may go to a high school and pass the Junior examination, another lad may go to a technical school where the range of subjects he takes is not such as will qualify him to pass the Junior public examination. The result is that in these days when so many employers insist upon applicants for positions having passed the Junior standard, the young people who go to the technical schools are placed at a disadvantage, although they receive a training that will help to make them useful in the commercial or industrial world. The latter section of our youth are handicapped in consequence when vacancies have to be filled. I look upon the training available at high schools as more or less frill compared with that obtainable at the technical schools. While the higher education may be quite all right to enable youths and girls to matriculate and proceed with a University training, from the standpoint of practical use the high school education is not to be compared with the training available in technical schools.

Hon. J. Cornell: It does not qualify a man to take a job.

Hon. H. SEDDON: No, but the training at a technical school provides a good grounding that should be useful when the youth applies for a job.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Dealing with the question of unemployed youths, our system of education involves a large expenditure every year, and I think it can be said that every young person turned out from our ordinary schools would cost the State £80 to £100 before he had been educated. Quite apart from the tragedy of unemployed youth, there is a very serious economic loss. A good deal has been said about giving the young people guidance as to the vocations for which they are fitted. I understand that quite a lot of investigation work has already been undertaken along those lines, but the unfortunate fact is that

the average boy or girl not only has not the job for which he or she is fitted, but has no job at all, and frequently we have the serious tragedy of the square peg in the round hole. It appears to me that we shall have to plan a scheme to deal with the young people right from the school and place them in some class of work. There is nothing more demoralising for young persons than to be turned out of school with the training received there—and the system does train them to make the best use of their faculties—only to find that there is no room for them. As a preliminary we might approach the question from the same angle as we did the matter of training men for the war. At that time we took men from all sorts of occupations, so long as they were physically fit, put them into camps, subjected them to a severe course of training, and made them efficient soldiers. Surely something along the same lines could be adopted to deal with our young people. We could take them from the time they left school, put them into some sort of training camp and there develop such abilities as they possessed. It should be the duty of the community to clothe those young people and to ensure that they receive good food—there is no assurance that they get adequate food at present—and employ them as far as possible in some sort of useful work.

Hon. L. CRAIG: You would have to compel them to go into those camps. If there is a job offering in the country to-day, they will not go to it.

Hon. H. SEDDON: If it were known that they would have to engage in employment, they would probably consider the advisability of taking what work was offering, even of accepting jobs in the country.

Hon. A. M. CLYDESDALE: What employment would you have for them?

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is the next question to consider. What jobs could we offer them? By taking boys who were maturing, we could train them in useful work such as construction work. Much of the construction work is really machine work. In the building of a dam, for instance, the greater part of the work is machine work. Road construction under modern methods is largely a matter of handling machines. There is no reason why the machines should not be built in our workshops. If we approached the question from that standpoint and laid down a scheme of development work with the idea of doing it by means of machines—some of our biggest engineering

works are being carried on by means of machinery—the young people might be utilised under supervision. The minding of a machine could be as well undertaken by a bright boy as by the class of man ordinarily regarded as an unskilled labourer. To-day the tendency is more and more in the direction of mechanisation of production. By gathering boys into camps where, under skilled supervisors, they could engage in various kinds of development work, we should not only be offering them an avenue of employment until such time as openings occurred for them, but we would be spending our money to the best advantage and gradually building up an army of trained workers. We cannot escape the fact that most of our Government relief work has been loan work, and it has been undertaken not with a view to securing the highest efficiency but with a view to utilising the lowest grade of labour. Our present system of financing works is open to question. I have always contended that to borrow money was a most expensive way to carry out development work, but it seems to be generally held that we cannot undertake development work without borrowing. If we adopt that standpoint, let us look at the question of raising capital. One of the best definitions of capital is conserved labour. Say a man saves out of his earnings a sum of £100. He lends that £100 through the Savings Bank or by taking a loan from the Government. He has lent £100 worth of his labour which, applied to loan works, is reconverted into labour, and is supposed to play its part in the development of the country. If we approach the question of unemployment works from the standpoint of fixing the value of the labour put into them, we might say to the young people, "It costs a certain amount to feed and clothe you and provide for your ordinary requirements. We will employ you for the whole period of 12 months and give you a credit for the amount your work is worth over and above the amount of your sustenance." With properly organised labour operating machines, the value of the work done could become a very substantial amount, and if the young men had a credit with the State and the loan were floated on the labour of the men, they would be able to build up a substantial reserve. Each young man would be building up an income that would be very valuable to him in later life, and above all he would be retaining his self-respect. Mention has been made of the need for under-

taking development works in the North. It seems to me that a tremendous amount of work could be undertaken that would reduce considerably the costs those people have to bear. The suggestion might be considered to ascertain whether it could not be adapted, and instead of incurring debts in the shape of loans let us float the loans with the people doing the work, thus conserving our own resources and increasing the credit of the State. This would be better than paying men the minimum amount required to keep them alive, as we do now, and then discontinuing their employment until they are again forced by destitution to seek relief. It would entail on the Arbitration Court a function it so far has not undertaken. There is no doubt that we have not established a standard of value for work done. The Arbitration Court fixes a basic wage, and above the basic wage fixes certain margins for skill or for unpleasant conditions, and also determines the number of hours to be worked. The functions of the Court might be extended and, by means of a system of fixing the value of work, determine exactly the amount of work being done by the young people trained on sustenance undertakings. We could then estimate exactly what a young man could do, and how much he could save in the shape of credit by the end of 12 months. Let me give an illustration. Some years ago a number of young men in Victoria, who were unemployed, were taken in hand by a country carpenter. He trained them until they became sufficiently skilled in ordinary carpentry work for him to undertake contracts. He took the contracts with the assistance of the boys, and the boys, under his supervision, were sufficiently skilled to carry out the work successfully. They were competing on fair lines with skilled tradesmen in that class of work, and it was not long before the party got all the work they could cope with. The boys were making good money.

Hon. A. Thomson: They were contractors.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes. The basis of wages was such that there could be no accusation of unfair competition with other tradesmen. The scheme was so successful that the party were never short of work.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: That would be all right where plenty of work was available.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think that could be done here under existing conditions.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not know whether it could. Our difficulty is to make the best use of all the work that is available. Instead of having to borrow £3,500,000 of actual money, we could effect the same result by borrowing on the men's labour. Capital is really conserved labour, and it would be possible to use the men's labour to create credit instead of borrowing from other people.

Hon. R. G. Moore: How would you pay him the credit?

Hon. H. SEDDON: By a credit note.

Hon. L. Craig: How would he negotiate the credit note?

Hon. H. SEDDON: He would not negotiate it.

Hon. L. Craig: He could not discount it?

Hon. H. SEDDON: No. It would remain with the Government and pay interest until redeemed in the ordinary way through the sinking fund. With our system of mechanisation to-day, and it is mostly machine minding, the work can be carried out just as well by bright youths as the average class of labour. Under that system it will be possible to make more effective use of loan money than is being done at the present time. I wish to deal briefly with our system of economy as it exists to-day. Most of the disturbance is due to the fact that our economic system is changing over. The conflict of interests between State and Federal is largely due to the national policy adopted by the Federal Government as compared with the policy of the State. The State has proceeded along the usual lines of a policy of agricultural development while, as far as the Commonwealth Government are concerned, they have proceeded along a plan for national self-dependence, embodying industrial development. The conflict of these interests has been apparent for many years and the depression has brought it home to us so that we are gradually changing over to what I might describe as a better balanced system. I contend that one of the most potent factors in assisting the State to effect that changeover is gold mining. Whereas the policy of the State has been to develop the agricultural industry—secondary industries have been a long way in the background—in the changeover which is taking place in the direction of national self-sufficiency, there is one factor that is helping us considerably during that changeover, and

that is gold mining. Time and again references have been made to gold mining but I desire to stress certain aspects in connection with it because it is operating to-day to a large extent in keeping up the income of this State. The least costly, though most valuable factor in the changeover, as I have already said, has been gold mining. My colleague has pointed out that the improvement in the price of gold has had a material effect in attracting capital to the State, and there have been considerable sums of money invested by companies in an effort to develop old mines which, a few years ago, were thought to have been comparatively worked out. The advance in geological practice has been very considerable, and the result has been that, where modern geology has been employed in examining many of the old ore bodies, they have been found as the result of the application of science to be due to ordinary geological features. The new capital that is being brought into the State is not costing the State anything. We do not have to pay interest or sinking fund on that capital for 58 years, as we do under the Financial Agreement. The people who are subscribing it are taking the chance of loss, but they are also hopeful that they will make a gain. Still, they are taking a risk, and if they lose the whole of their money there will not be any charge on this country. Again, the money is providing considerable employment for people who otherwise would be unable to obtain sustenance. I do not think it is realised that 95 per cent. of the gold won in Australia is spent in Australia, so that of every £100 brought here and sunk into mining, £95 is spent in Australia. When a mine has reached the producing stage, the same thing applies. This money is not only providing employment, but is providing a local market for the farmer, who is thus enabled to get the best prices for his commodities. It is also bringing in additional taxpayers. Instead of the burden of taxation being limited to the ordinary population, it is being spread over a greater number, on account of the people employed in the mining industry, people who otherwise would not be able to get work. So that, as a means of bringing capital into the State and providing work in the development of the ore bodies, and the production of

gold, here is a factor which should be recognised and given its full value in the scheme of re-arranging our national economy. I am stressing these points because one would think they would be recognised by every responsible person in the community, by the farming community as well as by the general public. When we realise that this capital, which has such an important bearing on the future of the State, is being eagerly sought after by every gold-producing country in the world, one would think that public opinion in this State would be exercised in a way that would encourage that capital to come here. We should remember that every £100 raised for gold mining has fields for employment in Western Africa, South Africa, New Guinea, South America, Canada, and even the Western States of America, and that each of those countries is most anxious to induce capitalists to invest in their parts of the world. Those are countries against which Western Australia must compete. A note has already been sounded in this Chamber that we might impose extra taxation upon the gold mining industry. It must be recognised that such a suggestion is entirely detrimental towards the incoming of capital. Reference has been made by certain members on different occasions to the fact that we should tax the production of gold, because of the high price of that commodity.

Hon. A. Thomson: The industry should pay more than it is paying.

Hon. H. SEDDON: As I said by way of interjection when the hon. member was speaking, during the many years that the wheat industry was receiving high prices, there was no suggestion of a tax on wheat.

Hon. A. Thomson: There was a suggestion that a bonus should be paid on gold produced.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Because, at that time, the gold mining industry was having a rotten spin. Many of the disabilities under which the gold mining industry was suffering were disabilities from which the agricultural industry was also suffering, and yet we now find that when gold mining is attracting capital to the State, suggestions of taxation are made which will be telegraphed to all parts of the world. Such proposals cannot but have a restraining effect on the raising of capital, that capital which, as I say, is fertilising the avenues of

production in this State and will continue to do so for many years to come, and which will also provide markets for those farmers who to-day are deploring the low prices they are getting for their products.

Hon. V. Hamersley interjected.

Hon. H. SEDDON: The amount of private money introduced in connection with agriculture is comparatively small in proportion to the enormous amount of capital sunk in that industry, directly and indirectly by the State. Coming again to the question of gold mining industry bearing taxation, I would point out that by arrangement with the present Government the mining companies are now carrying the whole of the load relating to the men unfortunate enough to be suffering from miners' diseases. Not only are the companies carrying the current load, but the accumulated load.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The whole amount?

Hon. H. SEDDON: Yes. I take it the Chief Secretary will be able to support me in this. Arrangements have been made between the Government and the mining companies whereby they have agreed to take over the responsibility of the whole of the payments. I mention that because it appears to me that in fairness to the industry, and particularly with regard to the encouragement of investment of capital in Western Australia, there should not be a discordant note sounded, and that the fact that the industry is bearing its fair share should be stressed. There is another aspect of mining finance that I desire to deal with, and it is more urgent to-day than it was in the past. A little while ago I had occasion to refer to the methods adopted by certain companies operating in the gold-mining industry. There are three classes of companies—no liability, limited liability, and companies having fully paid-up capital. Unfortunately there has been a good deal of exploiting by means of the no liability companies, and in my opinion the exploitation has been most detrimental to the welfare of gold-mining. I refer chiefly to Adelaide companies. Again and again representatives of those companies come to the State when public attention is turned to the advance being made in gold-mining. The companies take up leases in proximity to new discoveries, secure options on the payment of a very small deposit and raise a good deal of money from the public on the possibilities of the holdings taken up. The public are induced to subscribe

for the shares by the reports that are published. Many people put their money into gold mining as a gamble. At the same time there is no reason why the cards should be so marked against them that they will not get an ordinary run for their money. What happens is that the company pays a deposit on the lease, and flambuoyant reports are made by so-called mining experts as to the prospects of the lease, and the public are induced to come in and buy the shares and run them up in the market. Then we find that the company, having had only a small amount of capital in hand, starts to make calls. If the calls were all paid by the shareholders with the idea of giving the company a run and allowing the money to be spent in legitimate mining development, well and good, but what happens is that a load of shares is thrown on the market, down comes the price, and many people have to carry on the shares at a loss. The result is that while a few legitimately try to give the company a run by paying the calls, the majority of the shareholders do not pay up, and so the shares are forfeited and the option is thrown up. I have wondered whether we could not suggest to the Minister for Mines that he might explore the Mining Act with a view to providing that a lease shall not be held by a company unless it has sufficient capital in hand legitimately to work the mine and develop it. I think, too, that if we insisted that no company should hold a lease unless it was a fully paid up company, we could not then have the legitimate investor slugged at the expense of the sly, clever chap who is trying to evade responsibility by selling his shares or by defaulting. There is considerable room for investigation into mining finance to see that every company should get a run for its money. Then, in this question of mining experts, there is a good deal of room for investigation. Men come to this State and call themselves mining experts, and when a lease is taken under option one of these experts comes in and gives his opinion upon it. Frequently he is a man without any experience at all. The suggestion was made to me a little while ago that if we insisted upon every person who reported on a lease in Western Australia being a duly qualified mining engineer, we should at any rate fix the responsibility on him. To that extent we would get over a great deal of the abuse which exists to-day from these so-

called mining experts. This is a field the Government might well investigate because, with the prospects ahead of gold mining there is every possibility of a repetition of what occurred in the development of the Kalgoorlie field and other fields at that time. For many years the results were such that people outside the State would not invest money in Western Australian mining. I have heard Mr. Holmes refer to an unfortunate experience he had in mining. If that mine had been honestly handled, the hon. member would not have occasion to complain so bitterly as he has done. And what must have happened to thousands in the Old Country and other parts of the world who invested in Western Australian mines at that time? On the other hand, we have companies which are raising money for legitimate development schemes. They know they must have so many thousands of pounds if they are going to develop those properties and equip the leases with the right plant. These companies have to compete against all the mushroom and illegitimate enterprises, and suffer in the opinion that is created by the fraudulent enterprises that Western Australian mining is simply a glorified form of robbery. Unless we are careful, we shall undo all the good work that has been done by men who have endeavoured to raise money for legitimate mining development. We do not want any more of that; we do not want the people to be misled as they have been in the past. Quite apart from mining, I wish to refer to one or two developments that have taken place in finance, public and private. All sorts of theories have been voiced and all sorts of wonderful rainbows erected to attract the uninitiated to the wonderful possibilities of the so-called modern ideas of finance. Unfortunately, those theorists deal only with one side of the question and will not seriously study what finance and banking really mean and how many different aspects there are to be considered. Consequently, many of the public are induced by those theorists to believe many things; to believe that the ordinary banking world to-day can be extended, inflated, to the end that the whole of the community shall be benefited. One question which has been thrashed out and argued all over the country is the relation between deposits and advances. It appears to me that many of the theorists start from the wrong point. If one wishes to establish a bank,

he must raise a certain amount of money as capital. With that money he sets out his banking machinery and induces people to invest their funds with him. Having got a certain amount of deposits, he proceeds to the other side of the banking business, to find a use for this money. He arranges first of all to invest portion of it, after which he must reserve a considerable portion to meet his ordinary requirements. He can then make a certain proportion available for ordinary advances. This is where our friends the theorists come in. They tell us that, having arrived at that point, the bank advances create deposits, and that it is only necessary to make sufficient advances to create sufficient deposits. On that theory the establishment is built up higher and higher until, as an American once said, somebody asks for a dollar—when the crash comes. These theorists argue that advances create deposits. I make the statement here that from what I have been able to read about banking, it is essential to obtain deposits before you can make your advances: otherwise you come to grief. That is only an elementary fact within the understanding of any schoolboy, but unfortunately many of these theorists ignore that very necessary principle. I should like to refer to certain statements made on this question in the "Commonwealth Year Book" for 1933, where there is to be found a number of interesting comments on the banking situation. One reference, to the New South Wales savings bank, reads as follows:—

Owing to the depletion of liquid assets of the New South Wales savings bank consequent upon continuous withdrawals by depositors, the commissioner decided to suspend payment.

If there be anything in this theory of social credit, that all one has to do is to make advances to create deposits, there was an opportunity to demonstrate it! The fact that the New South Wales savings bank closed its doors means that quite a number of depositors have committed suicide because they could not get their savings to live upon. For people were going about Sydney offering to make over half their life savings if somebody would provide them with something to carry on with. This position should be studied by our theorists before they make any further attempts upon the banking system of Australia. At that time, the Primary Producers' Bank went down. Many people

hold that the big factor in bringing that bank to its knees was that people were taking out the money they had in that bank on account of the distress created by the failure of the New South Wales savings bank. We had a State savings bank of our own at the beginning of the depression, and that is exactly what happened to that bank. Members will remember what the Premier had to do in order to save the interests of depositors. He, too, was in the position of belying this wonderful scheme of creating deposits out of advances. He could not do it, and the result was that to salvage the hard-earned savings of the people he had to make arrangements with the Commonwealth Bank to take over the State savings bank. Those people who wish to tinker with our banking system have first to demonstrate that their theory will have some beneficial influence on that banking system. From all that I have been able to read of the world's banking system, one thing outstanding is that our Australian banking system is the strongest in the world. That is a very big thing to say. I contend it is the strongest in the world because, after all, we have to view the position in English banking. May I point out that in Great Britain the raising of loans is effected through the special banks—merchant bankers. In Australia, the raising of loans is effected through the Commonwealth Bank. All the expenses incurred in loan flotation are, by means of that bank, reduced to a minimum, and we are able to raise loans in Australia far cheaper than we could do through the banks of the Old Country. We have to remember that there are certain banking houses in the Old Country whose business is concerned entirely with the floating of loans. This does not come within the function of the ordinary trading banks. Seeing that the question of banking has been brought so prominently before the public, we should realise that right through the whole of the banking history of Australia in the present century one principle has been laid down as fundamental, and that is the principle of safety first. Examine the position of our banks at the beginning of the crisis when the position was so critical, and we realise how much the application of that principle had to do with the action of the banks at the time. From the "Commonwealth Year Book" I

have obtained figures that are interesting. In 1930, the year in which our banking system was exposed to the greatest danger advances represented 95 per cent. of the total deposits, but advances plus Government securities constituted 109 per cent. In 1934 advances to total deposits had dropped to 81 per cent., and—a point that should give cause for considerable thought—deposits to advances plus Government securities represented 112 per cent. That is why some of us are so persistent in urging upon the Government the adoption of a sound method of financing. In conclusion, I consider that the outlook for Western Australia is considerably brighter than it was 12 months ago. I believe, as the Premier said, that there is still a call for very careful financing. We must not allow ourselves to run away with the idea that we can relax. In my opinion there has been too much relaxing already. I have pleasure in supporting the motion, and trust that the Chief Secretary will be able to answer some of the queries I have raised.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [8.18]: I congratulate Mr. Elliott on the excellence of his speech, particularly his references to miners' occupational diseases and compensation. I am pleased to welcome Mr. Elliott to this Chamber. I have held right through that Mr. Scaddan, as Minister for Mines, and those who followed him, tackled the question of miners' industrial diseases from the wrong angle. Having started off wrongly, no degree of satisfaction can be attained until the problem is tackled from the right angle. The right angle is from the standpoint of silicosis, not tuberculosis. We went astray by departing from the South African method, for the South African people were the pioneers in dealing with this subject. There tuberculosis is a secondary consideration; the primal consideration is silicosis. Silicosis is not an accident; it is a condition. We have so far involved ourselves that we have thrown the whole of the financial burden on the Workers' Compensation Act. The compensation payable at the most critical stage in a victim's illness is a dole of 25s. a week under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. I think it would be better termed the mine workers' destitution fund. In season and out of

season I have urged that this question should be tackled logically and reasonably. We have nine or ten years' experience and data to guide us, and we have also the experience of other countries. Despite the rigid medical examination, there is a type of man who gets into the industry more susceptible to silicosis than are other men. We know that once a miner has developed silicosis, or has shown any sign of it, if he is allowed to continue working in that atmosphere, it is the beginning of the end. Our legislation and compensation scheme should aim at the removal of men from the industry immediately they show signs of their health being impaired through silicosis. Remove them and let them continue as useful members of society, probably to live the allotted span of life. Let us give them some degree of compensation then, but make it perfectly clear that that is all the compensation they will receive even if they remain in the mines and become worse. The position to-day is that we encourage the men to commit suicide. We give them nothing, but we tell them they had better get out because they are showing signs of silicosis. What are such men to do if they leave the mines? Many of them remain. That illustrates the difference between legislation as it exists and legislation as it should be. I reiterate what I said last session, in support of Mr. Williams, that in order to give the public—who are contributing to the Mine Workers' Relief Fund—the mining companies and the miners the justice due to them, the whole scheme should be thoroughly overhauled. The Royal Commission that inquired into the administration of the Agricultural Bank discovered many things. With many of their findings we may not agree, but with many of them we can agree. I suggest that a body composed of the Assistant Crown Solicitor, the Government Actuary, a representative of the miners, a representative of the mine owners and a representative of the Mines Department be appointed to ascertain just where we are heading. Mr. Elliott quoted illuminating figures of the number of men who have left the industry. It is necessary to bear in mind also that most of our mines are now working at greater depth, and that we are opening up new mines. The important phase of dust prevention should receive adequate consideration. We are told by the

Mines Department that as regards dust prevention, all is well. We were told that all was well with the Agricultural Bank. I venture to say that an inquiry such as I suggest would soon reveal many things that were not right. It is remarkable what apathy prevails in the community, and even amongst the miners themselves, towards this question. I have yet to learn that any actuarial calculation has been made of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund, and I am satisfied that the fund will not be able to fulfil many of the requirements expected. This session and next session we shall have a sheaf of amendments as long as a wet Saturday afternoon to deal with this question. In supplementing Mr. Elliott's remarks, I ask the Minister to make representations to the Government along the lines suggested. I have asked the member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe, who represents practically all the miners, also to use his influence, in the hope that the Government will simplify the law and accord greater security to those who are paying the compensation. I repeat that an important point for consideration is whether it would not be wise to get men out of the mines as soon as they showed signs of silicosis. The experience in other parts of the world, where the problem has been tackled along those lines, has proved successful. In South Africa a man who shows signs of silicosis is told that it is the beginning of the end if he continues in the mine, and that the wisest course would be for him to leave the industry. He receives a certain amount of compensation by leaving the industry at once, and if he waits until he reaches the third stage, when it would be compulsory for him to leave, he gets no more compensation. Consequently, there is no incentive for a man to continue in the industry for the sake of the compensation, and usually he leaves at once. Ninety men left the industry and joined the miners' settlement in order to prolong their lives. They went on the land under better conditions than those granted to ordinary settlers, but only six of the men who did not return to the mines have received no consideration. All the rest received consideration under the Mine Workers' Relief Fund. Reference has been made in this House to the question of taxing the gold mining industry. The manner in which it has been suggested, directly and by interjection, may,

as has been pointed out, have a harmful influence. It has been said that a royalty should be charged on gold. By interjection I said there was only one logical way to tax the industry, and that was to tax it as it is taxed already. Members must not run away with the idea that the industry is not taxed. It has been taxed for a quarter of a century. It is taxed on profits, the only basis of taxation. It is ridiculous to argue that the industry should pay on the royalty basis. Mr. Hamersley interjected that he had to pay land tax and a tax on any profits he made. It is on profits that the gold-mining industry is paying tax to-day. It also pays so much an acre to the Crown for the land that is mined.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Do not say too much about mining rentals.

Hon. J. CORNELL: How could the rental be arrived at? Take the original capital that was put into the Great Boulder mine, and compare that with the Crescent South leases, also on the Golden Mile. The latter company was charged as much per acre as the Great Boulder mine was charged, but the difference was that nothing came out of the Crescent South, but a good deal came out of the Great Boulder. It cannot be argued that there should be any other than a flat rate for gold-mining leases. The only alternative would be to tax on the amount of gold won, which would not be fair. Let the tax be on profits or dividends. A company pays a tax if it pays a dividend. The individual is taxed on his income if he is working his own mine. If the position of the industry to-day is such as to warrant an increase in the ordinary basis of taxation as applied to other companies and individuals, let us say so, but do not let us say that the industry should be taxed on the royalty basis, at so much per ounce of gold. That would not work, and would be liable to prevent the introduction of capital into the State. I wish to say a little about the agricultural industry. Mr. T. Moore said that interest should come down. I think it is coming down. If I visualise the agricultural industry and the pastoral industry correctly, both are over-capitalised. If we are to have some writing down of capital the interest will automatically right itself. If I owed £2,000 and had this written down to £500 I would be just as pleased to pay five per cent. interest on the £500 as $4\frac{1}{2}$ on the £2,000.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Everything must be over-capitalised if it takes two notes to buy a sovereign.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Some mines are over-capitalised.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Unfortunately, the illustration drawn by Mr. Holmes does not apply to 90 per cent. of those engaged in the farming industry. The greater proportion of the capital on which the farming community of this State was raised was raised when our pound was at par, and equal to a sovereign. To-day that is not the position. It is on that capital that the farmer is expected to pay interest. Then the farmer has to face the necessity for replacing and renewing existing machinery and power. It has been said that wheat can profitably be grown at 10s. per bag. Most men who use that argument are fairly reliable and active farmers. They have done their farming and made their experiments during the depression years with fairly reliable machinery. Whilst a man with machinery in good condition, and power up to the standard, may be able to make ends meet at 10s. a bag, I suggest that 70 per cent. of the farming community could best serve their own interests in the event of a satisfactory rise in the price of wheat by scrapping their existing machinery and replacing it with new. That phase of the matter must be taken into consideration side by side with a reasonable price for wheat. The Federal Government has given assistance to the farming community in more tangible form than has been evident for a long time. We must do something to ease the capitalisation of the farmer, and to enable him to replace his existing plant.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: If you double the price of a sovereign you halve the value of the product.

Hon. J. CORNELL: A few years ago I travelled over one of the finest railroad systems in the United States. That company owned 600 miles of railway. At that time it was in the hands of the Official Receiver, because the undertaking was over-capitalised. It had paid very little, if anything, in dividends, and the directors came to the conclusion that it was better to put the company into liquidation, reconstruct it, write down the capital, and put it on a basis where it would pay reasonable dividends in accordance with

the capital invested. That is the position of a large percentage of our farmers. Whether this is attended to by the Federal authorities or by the State I venture to say it must be done. Other concerns during the depression years have had to reconstruct and start on a new basis. Something of a similar nature must be done in the case of the farming community. No business man would hesitate, if he could recover 70 per cent. of the debts due to him, to take that percentage and cry quits. I understand on good authority that, if the present Prime Minister is returned to office, an influential section of people in Australia is prepared to stand behind him, and subscribe sufficient money to enable this all-important question to be tackled as it should be tackled. We are told that the report of the Agricultural Bank Royal Commission will be the subject of debate later. We as Parliamentarians, and Ministers as members of Cabinet, have to share in the responsibility for the position as it exists to-day. It is more their responsibility than it is that of the trustees of the Bank. Every year the report of the institution is laid upon the Table of both Houses, and very little notice has ever been taken of it. We, therefore, are more remiss than the trustees have been. I join with others in welcoming you, Mr. President, back to your honoured position. I am sure you have had an enjoyable time, and I know you have done a lot of good for Western Australia. Although the time spent in taking your place was a strenuous one, I can only say that I enjoyed it. It can be said that new ground was broken while you were away, but although most of us were wiser as the result of it, none of us were the worse friends for it.

On motion by the Chief Secretary, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.41 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 28th August, 1931.

	PAGE
Questions: Wheat, bulk handling, extra cost and savings	331
Statutes, consolidation	332
Toxic paralysis	332
Bills: Sandalwood Act Amendment, 1R.	332
Soldier Land Settlement 1R.	332
Roman Catholic Church Property Act Amendment, 1R.	332
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment, 2R.	332
Electoral Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	333
Constitution Acts Amendment, 2R., Com. report	335
Forests Act Amendment, 2R., Com. report	335
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report	336
Reduction of Rents Act Continuance, 2R., Com. report	338
Supreme Court Criminal Sittings Amendment, 2R., Com. report	339
Administration Act (Estate and Succession Duties) Amendment, 2R.	339

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

QUESTION—WHEAT, BULK RAILING.

Extra Cost and Savings.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, In view of the Premier's statement that the extra cost to the Railway Department of carrying 12,000,000 bushels of bulk wheat is approximately £13,000, how much is attributable to—(a) an extra tare of approximately 5 cwt. on vehicles altered to carry bulk wheat, which tare is equivalent to 200 four wheeled steel trucks; (b) the empty baulage of converted trucks which are unsuitable for hauling any other lines of goods; (c) the extra shunting necessary to sort out trucks suitable for bulk wheat; (d) the extra maintenance necessary on improvised trucks? 2, What was the saving in shunting at bulk sidings? 3, What was the saving in shunting on the wharf at North Fremantle? 4, What was the amount paid on bulk wheat for shunting at North Wharf? 5, What was the amount paid on bagged wheat for shunting at North Wharf? 6, What was the cost of the shunting at North Wharf of—(a) bulk wheat; (b) bagged wheat; (c) bulk and bagged wheat?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, On the wheat already carried this season to Fremantle, viz., 9,000,000 bushels—(a) approximately £1,000; (b) approximately £7,000; (c) approximately £1,600;