

**ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.**

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [3.51]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

*House adjourned at 3.52 p.m.*

---

## **Legislative Assembly.**

*Wednesday, 19th July, 1933.*

	PAGE
Question: Government part-time employees ...	14
Motions: Condolence ...	14
Address-in-reply, second day ...	16

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

### **QUESTION—GOVERNMENT PART-TIME EMPLOYEES.**

*As to Election Promise.*

Mr. J. H. SMITH asked the Premier: 1, What action is being taken to give effect to the election promise and policy that immediate full-time work for three months of part-time employees would be instituted? 2, Is it a fact that hundreds of men who were part-time employees under the former Government have reverted to sustenance conditions? 3, When do the Government propose to carry their election promise into effect?

The **PREMIER** replied: 1, Effect is being given to the policy of the Government. 2, Some works were completed before the Loan funds for this year were made available by the Loan Council, and, consequently, some men went back to sustenance, but there are 4,000 fewer men on sustenance now than there were this time last year. 3, Answered by No. 1.

**MOTIONS (2)—CONDOLENCE.**

*The late Hon. T. A. L. Davy, K.C., M.L.A., and the late Mr. H. J. Brown, M.L.A.*

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.35]: Since the close of the last Parliament two of our old and esteemed members have passed from this life. The late Mr. Davy, who represented the West Perth electorate for a period of nine years, and held during the past three years the high office of Attorney General, is no longer with us. Mr. Davy was a man of fine qualities, and had a distinguished scholastic career. Coming to Western Australia as a child, he spent his early school days in Coolgardie, subsequently winning a Rhodes scholarship and concluding his education at the Oxford University. Following upon that, Mr. Davy returned to this State to take up active life, and during the too few years that were spared to him he rendered distinguished service to Western Australia. He was a man of brilliant parts in many respects; and as regards his personality I am sure I voice the feeling of every member of the last Parliament, and of all who were privileged to know the late Mr. Davy, when I say that we have lost a personal friend. To me the hours that I spent in his company will be unforgettable. I am sure also that every member of the House and all who enjoyed the privilege of personal acquaintance with Mr. Davy will agree with me that his passing represents a very great loss indeed to Western Australia. The late Mr. Brown, who represented the Pingelly electorate for a number of years, we particularly loved. I do not think any member of this Chamber for many years past spoke to fuller benches than did the late Mr. Brown. His genial personality appealed to all. He was a rugged, conscientious, capable and honest member of his party. He lived and worked during the years that he was in this House, for those whom he represented. His passing is indeed a great loss to the public life of this State, and especially to the older members of the Chamber. It is my melancholy duty to move—

That this House desires to place upon record its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Hon. Thomas Arthur Lewis Davy, a member of this House and Attorney General of the State at the time of his

death, and that an expression of the sincerest sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker.

And that this House desires to place upon record its profound sense of the loss sustained in the passing of the late Mr. Henry James Brown, a member of this House at the time of his death, and that an expression of the sincerest sympathy of members be conveyed to his widow and family by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. LATHAM** (York) [4.39]: I second the Premier's motion. Few deaths, I believe, have caused so much sorrow to the people of this State as that of the late Mr. Davy, cut off, as he was, in the flower of his youth, and, as the Premier has remarked, with a wonderful future awaiting a man of his great attainments. It is difficult to say to what Mr. Davy would have attained professionally had he remained with us. There can be no question that had he continued to follow politics, he would have been in the front rank of the public life of Australia. This State has sustained a severe loss in his passing; and there is, besides, the personal loss suffered by all who knew him. A record man in some respects, Mr. Davy had little time for party politics, and this feature probably more than any other endeared him to all members of the Chamber. He had a great ideal, a peculiarly fine ideal for a young man, of placing country before party. While many of us may desire the attainment of that ideal, I fear it is still a long way off. To the late Mr. Davy it would have been a great pleasure and satisfaction could he have seen such a position eventuate. We express our deepest sympathy with his widow and his young children. The loss of a man like Mr. Davy, who deeply loved his home and his family, must come as a tremendous shock; and the absence of a father's guiding hand is a severe deprivation to young children. The late Mr. Brown, as the Premier has mentioned, was a great character, and was loved by everyone who had the privilege of knowing him. For his electors he did the very best that was possible, serving them faithfully and well for nine years in this Chamber. His sudden demise was a severe shock to all who enjoyed the privilege of his acquaintance. It is highly tragic that two such men as Mr. Davy and Mr. Brown should have been cut off within a fortnight of each other—the one in the prime of life, the other doing his utmost in the interests of his electorate and of the State. Western Australia has suffered a severe loss by the demise of two public men who gave of their very

best. I repeat, we who had the privilege of their friendship feel that we have sustained a great loss indeed.

**HON. N. KEENAN** (Nedlands) [4.42]: I would not have thought it necessary to add anything to what has been so ably said by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, but for the fact that Mr. Davy was not only a member of the party with which I am particularly allied but also a member of my profession. We had bonds in common, outside this Chamber, of the closest possible character. Mr. Davy was not merely a man of promise in our common profession, but a man who had achieved success, who, although a very young man, had a standing as a lawyer which was recognised as being very high. And so the loss is also a personal one for me, not merely the loss of one with whom I was associated politically. The loss to the State is great, because naturally it is a matter of great value that there should be in our community men who are recognised as being lawyers of the highest standing. The interpretation of the law remains in our hands, whatever Parliament may do; and therefore it is a matter of great importance to the public that the legal profession should always possess men who are capable of interpreting the laws correctly. Mr. Davy would have been a leader in that regard had it pleased Providence to spare his life. As for his political worth, everyone in this House knows it better even than I do. We all regret that a young man with a strong young mind, fearless, capable of facing any position and finding a solution, should have disappeared so suddenly from our midst. I am sure we all extend to his widow and his family our condolences; and we hope that perhaps this may in some measure alleviate the pain they suffer. As regards the late Mr. Brown, I only met that gentleman in these halls; but as has been so truly said by the Premier, to meet Mr. Brown was to love him. He was a man of very open mind and manner, and invariably—although sometimes one felt inclined to laugh at what he said—uttered something that was worth listening to, uttered sound, rugged common sense; and, after all, it is common sense we must rely upon to pull this country through. So we regret his loss from our midst; and I feel sure that we all sympathise deeply with his relatives.

Question passed; members standing.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

*Second Day.*

Debate resumed from the previous day.

**MR. LATHAM** (York) [4.52]: In common with other members, I heard His Excellency the Lieut.-Governor read his Speech to members of Parliament yesterday, and I desire to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency on the appointment he has received at the hands of His Majesty the King. Perhaps it is unique in the history of Dominion Parliaments that a man should step from the Premiership into the position of Lieut.-Governor.

Mr. Raphael: It was not our fault.

Mr. LATHAM: There have been instances of Governors having subsequently become Premiers of the countries where they were formerly engaged as Vice Regal representatives. I would cite Sir George Grey, who at one time was Governor of the colony of New Zealand, as it was designated in those days, and who subsequently became Premier of that country. I am sure that His Excellency, Sir James Mitchell, will fill his present office with due dignity, with honour to himself and credit to the State. We must all acknowledge that the honour accorded His Excellency represents an appropriate closing phase to his public life. The appointment of Sir James Mitchell certainly gave effect to the policy enunciated by representatives of the Labour Party from time to time that if we are to have Governors, they shall be Australian-born—

Mr. Raphael: But of our way of thinking.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know about that, but I extend my congratulations to the Government on the appointment that has been made.

Mr. Raphael: It was not ours; do not blame us. It was a pure accident.

Mr. LATHAM: Then I will say that the choice was that of His Majesty the King, if that will be more acceptable to the non-member. I congratulate the Premier on the number of members elected to this Chamber to support him. In the circumstances, of course, he will not look to members sitting on the Opposition side of the House to render him assistance.

Mr. Ferguson: You cannot blame His Majesty for that.

Mr. LATHAM: Hardly.

The Minister for Works: I think you should congratulate His Majesty, rather than blame him.

Mr. LATHAM: The result achieved was at the hands of the public in consequence of the policy upon which the Premier and his supporters went to the country. I feel sure some promises were made during the course of the election that will be hard to fulfil.

Mr. Raphael: Not with the brains that we have on the Government side of the House.

Mr. LATHAM: If the advent of the new regime means the restoration of a period of prosperity such as the State enjoyed when Labour was last in power, I can assure the House that I shall be delighted at the changed conditions, because it will be admitted that the last three years have been extremely strenuous, probably more strenuous than any formerly experienced by a Government in this State. I repeat that the Premier will not require the assistance of Opposition members in his task of giving effect to his policy and to the promises he made. Incidentally, I hope we shall not engage in a contest to see who can out-do the other at election time with regard to the making of promises. During the last campaign some extravagant promises were made, some of which we know it will be impossible to live up to. We shall endeavour to see that effect is given to those that were made, where possible.

Mr. Raphael: Evidently your mind does not revert to those made three years ago.

Mr. LATHAM: I tender my congratulations to the new members who have been elected to this Chamber. My association with the Legislative Assembly extends over a period of 12 years, and never before have I seen such a great change-over. It may be a good thing, for new members will bring new ideas, but the task of giving effect to those new ideas will be found difficult. I hope those who are fresh to parliamentary work will not be disappointed if they cannot give effect to the great ideals they indicated before they were elected to this Chamber. I regret the loss of some of my colleagues in the Mitchell Government, as well as other private members who fell by the wayside at the last election. It can be said of every one of them that they rendered loyal and

splendid services to the State. It is difficult to persuade electors that what has been done has been for their own good. As a result of the recent election, the services of some of the most able men Western Australia has experienced were lost to the State, at any rate for the time being. Then, again, I congratulate the Lieut-Governor on the splendid testimonial he gave to the Mitchell Government. I have never read a better testimonial than that embodied in the Speech. It was a splendid one. There may be some reason for it, but I will not advance it in this Chamber.

Mr. Patrick: It is worth framing.

Mr. LATHAM: That is so. Members on the Opposition side are somewhat disappointed that no idea has been furnished as to what alterations the Government propose to make. The Speech represents a review of the work of the past three years and indicates the advances made under most difficult circumstances. It largely amounts to congratulations to the Mitchell Government for the wonderful work achieved by that Administration, for which I am very grateful. I notice that the first matter dealt with in the Lieut-Governor's Speech relates to the secession referendum and conveys the intimation that the Government intend to give careful consideration to the best methods to be adopted in order to give effect to the decision of the people. I am pleased to know that. I realise it would be unwise to indulge in undue haste, for the problem is one that demands careful consideration. I hope the Government will give early consideration to it, because I believe some solution of our difficulties will be provided from that source. How far it may be possible to go, and the manner in which the Government propose to deal with it, we shall have submitted to us, I understand, at an early date. My sympathy goes out to the Treasurer for, like the late Treasurer during the last three years, the present Treasurer for the next three years will have to bear the heat and burden of the day. Ordinary Ministers are the members of the Government who do the spending whenever they can get the money, and it is the Treasurer's difficulty to provide that money. While I congratulate the Treasurer on his having got a greater amount of loan funds than the late Treasurer was able to secure, at the same time I do hope the

additional money will be spent exclusively on reproductive works. It is not easy to find work on which the money can be wisely spent, and there have been mentioned in the Press some works about which I have serious doubts as to their capacity to return interest on the proposed expenditure. And, further, I have doubts as to the wisdom of carrying out some of those works. It is of no use pretending that borrowing money and spending it will bring us prosperity. The only way to get back to prosperity is to secure better prices for the goods we are producing. Until that can be brought about, Western Australia and other countries will continue to experience great difficulties. Of course, we can have a system of bonusing wheat-growers and wool-growers, but that is only taking money out of one pocket to put it into another. The only thing we can do at present is to try to keep down costs. In His Excellency's Speech, reference is made to the high interest rates. I agree that we must endeavour to get the interest rates down, and so induce the people to invest their money. It is of no use having money locked up in the bank, and if we can get our bank interest rates reduced, we shall be compelling the investor to look for more profitable avenues of investment. The primary industries are crippled because of the very high rate of interest many of them are paying. Even though the Associated Banks have brought down their interest to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., we require still cheaper money. There is no harm in borrowing money if we invest the sum where it will earn interest and a margin towards the redemption of the loan. In Australia during the last two years we have had inflation, and that has assisted to tide us over our financial crisis during the period of depression; but unfortunately the Governments of Australia have had to pay their debts overseas by a deflated currency instead of an inflated one. Many think—the member for North-East Fremantle mentioned it yesterday—that we can live within ourselves, that we should be able to get enough money by taking in each other's washing. However, it is utterly impossible to provide any remedy by that means. We have to remember that our troubles are the result of a tremendous fall in the national income, which is principally derived from the primary producers. There has been an immense falling-off in the rev-

enue earned; the primary producers have increased production, only to find a great reduction in their incomes. In 1927-28 the national income was £45,743,000, and for 1931-32 it was only £34,000,000, or £11,000,000 less, which means, of course, £11,000,000 less in circulation, and in consequence men were thrown out of employment. Until we can get our people to produce their goods at a payable price, our difficulties will remain. During the last three years we have increased the output of our wheat by one-third, yet there has been a falling-off of £10,000,000 in the income of the wheat-growers during that period. A lot of people entertain the idea that Western Australia is a very wealthy country. It is wealthy through its national resources, but its people are not by any means wealthy. It is quite a new country and the amount that has been obtained from our primary industries has all gone back into development work. So there is very little accumulated wealth in the State, and therefore we are not able to stand up to adversity as well as the Eastern States can. I have taken out some figures from the report of the Commissioner of Taxation for last year. It is surprising to note the falling-off in taxable incomes of the people of Western Australia. In 1929-30, with incomes between £301 and £500 there were 14,832 taxpayers, but in 1931-32 that number had fallen to 9,565. In 1929-30, with incomes from £501 to £700 there were 3,880 taxpayers, but in 1931-32 the number had dropped to 2,369. In 1929-30, with incomes from £701 to £1,000 there were 2,008 taxpayers, whereas in 1931-32 the number was only 1,045. In 1929-30, with incomes from £1,001 to £1,500 there were 1,162 taxpayers, but in 1931-32 the number had dropped to 517. In 1929-30, with incomes from £1,501 to £5,000 there were 1,003 taxpayers, but their number fell to 430 in 1931-32. In 1929-30, with incomes of £5,000 and over there were 95 taxpayers, but in 1931-32 the number was down to 13. After all, the people with big incomes are employers of labour, and consequently the falling-off in their returns aggravates the position. Those figures are worth studying, for they show how poor in actual cash the people really are. Their properties will be worth a great deal when things become normal again, but it is the ready cash that is required to-day. It is of no use borrowing money with the idea of creating prosperity, for we cannot

create prosperity artificially, or, at all events, not for any length of time, for eventually it renders the position worse. The borrowing of money assists us for the time being, but in the end it is only loading industry with interest that has to be met by the primary producers. Again, it is of no use thinking we can recover prosperity in Western Australia without prosperity for the whole of Australia and indeed for the rest of the world. Admittedly we may do something to improve the position here, but unfortunately the tremendous liability Australia has overseas constitutes a very serious difficulty. After all, a State Treasurer has very little say in the finances of his State, for we handed over financial control to the Loan Council when we entered the Financial Agreement. Much has been said against that agreement, but probably had we not entered into it the position would have been still worse. However, the sovereignty of this State has been whittled away. Our Premier goes over to the Loan Council, where he has but one voice in seven and so he cannot get much new money. And to-day we are even frittering away the powers vested in this House by the Constitution. The Federal Government are doing exactly the same, for they appoint all sorts of irresponsible boards and shoulder them with a responsibility for which they answer to nobody. The Tariff Board is a striking instance. That board imposes Customs duties which are allowed to operate for years before the people's representatives confirm or reject them. The same thing is happening in all the States; that is to say, the appointing of boards to do the work of Ministers. It is taking away the powers of the people's representatives and flouting the old axiom, "Government of the people by the people," for it has now become in many respects the government of the people by boards. The Minister for Employment and Industry is very unwise in throwing on to others a responsibility for which they will be answerable to nobody. The Minister himself was appointed to do the work, and I was hopeful he would try to carry into effect what he so frequently advocated when on this side of the House.

The Minister for Justice: Where has he departed from that?

Mr. LATHAM: He has appointed boards.

The Minister for Justice: He has appointed an advisory council.

Mr. LATHAM: It is the same thing.

The Minister for Justice: No, you were talking about self-governing boards.

Mr. LATHAM: This is practically a self-governing board to find employment for the unemployed.

The Minister for Justice: You spoke of the Tariff Board, which is very different.

Mr. LATHAM: The Tariff Board is the worst instance of all, making laws to compel the people to pay taxation through the Customs for years without any due authority. We ought to do our best to discourage the appointment of boards and councils.

The Minister for Justice: Advisory councils have always been in existence.

Mr. LATHAM: Every Minister has the right to call in anyone whom he thinks can advise him; but to have these big cumbersome, useless boards who are half the time quarrelling amongst themselves is of no use at all. So I do not look for any great relief in that direction. As I said before, it is throwing on to other people the responsibility that should devolve upon the Minister for Employment. The most heartening news we have heard for some time is the advance in the prices of primary commodities. That will have the effect of bringing more money into the State and relieving the unemployment problem. If we can only get the money, that problem will soon disappear. I have a chart which I intend to lay upon the table showing the relation between the primary producing and the industrial sections of the community. Only an improvement in the prices of primary commodities will enable us to overcome the existing difficulty. In the last three years very poor prices have been realised for our timber, but during the last few months the market has improved. It is sad to traverse the South-West and there find people who had had employment in the timber industry thrown out of work, with nothing to do and with no money to keep themselves. I am pleased that an improvement has been recorded in the timber industry. I cannot agree with the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Tonkin) in the opinion that we can solve our problems here.

Mr. Withers: I would not expect you to agree with him.

Mr. LATHAM: I would not agree with the member for Bunbury; I know him too well. We have to depend upon the prices obtainable in overseas markets. It is a tragedy that while wheat was selling here for 2s. to 3s. per bushel it was bringing as high as 10s. on the continent. If we did not have any overseas debts on which to pay interest, and if we did not have to buy any of our requirements outside the State, we might be able to give effect to the suggestion made by the member for North-East Fremantle yesterday. But when we have to pay interest on overseas debts and when we have to purchase requirements abroad, there is only one way to meet our obligations and that is by the export of primary commodities. We have not sufficient gold to pay all our commitments. Although Western Australia produces 83 or 85 per cent. of the gold yield of the Commonwealth, we have not sufficient gold with which to meet our commitments abroad, and so we have to export primary products. Interchange of trade is essential. No country can pay its commitments in gold. The demanding of payment in gold has brought about many of the difficulties confronting the world; prohibiting the importation of goods has added to the difficulties. Many things we need and cannot produce are available on the Continent, but the people on the Continent are required to pay so much for wheat and other commodities we can supply that they cannot afford to buy. I hope that secession will have the effect of re-opening that trade channel between us and Europe.

The Minister for Works: How will secession help it?

Mr. LATHAM: We should be able to deal with the countries of Europe individually. The present trouble is the demanding of payment in gold. The paper lira of Italy, for instance, would be useless here. So, too, would be the metal currency of that country. The countries of Europe cannot pay in gold. If we could take their goods in exchange for our primary products, it would be possible to trade with them. To that is attributable the failure of the Economic Council. Every country desires to preserve the same policy; no one wants to get out of step. If trade were untrammelled we

could take from Europe the goods we need at a price we could afford to pay and they could receive from us the wheat necessary to maintain their national life. I believe it is possible for that to be done. If we get secession I hope the Minister will endeavour to make available to the producers of Western Australia the markets that need our commodities. Nations the world over have been busy erecting tariff barriers.

The Minister for Justice: Through feelings of intense nationalism.

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, and no doubt the demand for war indemnities has been greatly responsible. America and France, by their hoarding of gold, have impoverished other countries, and many people have been thrown out of employment because the mills have ceased to operate, due to there being no markets for goods when manufactured. Every country apparently desires to be a seller and no one desires to be a buyer. Western Australia can afford to be a buyer provided she can dispose of her wheat, wool, timber and other commodities at a reasonable price.

The Minister for Justice: Every country desires a favourable trade balance, and how is that possible?

Mr. LATHAM: The problem is causing great concern the world over. Meetings of councils are being held in the hope of finding some solution, but we do not seem to get any nearer to a solution. I believe that my suggestion would provide a solution. It is idle to contend that we could live as a self-contained community, because we would be faced with the difficulty of paying the interest on our overseas debt. There are times when I wonder whether we shall be able to pay our overseas interest bill. It is not dishonest if a man cannot pay, but it is dishonest if he does not pay when he can. Sometimes I wonder whether Western Australia and Australia will be able to continue to carry the present load. The Commonwealth has a tremendous national debt, over £1,200,000,000, for a population of 6½ million people. On top of that are the private debts. Unless a reduction of the interest rate can be secured, I am afraid we shall have to do as the individual has to do, namely, ask to be relieved of our interest payments. I do not think it would be dishonest to ask for such relief. I hope that the people who have invested their money

in Government stock will realise that they ought to make a sacrifice similar to that being made by the people who are paying the interest. It is impossible for the people engaged in industry to continue to carry the present tremendous load. During the last few years the primary producer has been intensely loyal to the State by continuing to produce, notwithstanding the knowledge that, by so doing, he was bound to incur a debit balance. Probably some wheat growers and pastoralists are making a little out of industry, but collectively the primary producers are making a loss, and yet they continue to render a great national service to the State. Of this service there should be some acknowledgment by lessening costs to them. The Government have promised to relieve the unemployment situation, but so far they have not made very much progress. I admit that the Treasurer has only just succeeded in making arrangements for the current year's finance.

Mr. Wilson: The Treasury was empty.

Mr. LATHAM: The previous Government were only allowed to draw requirements monthly. We could not do, as the present Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, suggested we should do, namely, write out a cheque for £100,000 and present it to the bank to be honoured. The bank would not have honoured such a cheque for us, and I do not think it would do so for him. We received the money month by month, and at the end of the month we had to balance and show that we had not overdrawn accounts.

The Minister for Employment interjected.

Mr. LATHAM: We had only sufficient money to carry on with. We might have had another £100,000 had the hon. member not prevented our getting it by indulging in long and tedious debates last session. The Minister for Employment has a full-time job. I wish to quote from some of the dodgers circulated during the recent election campaign.

Mr. Wilson: They are old.

Mr. LATHAM: One of the dodgers is headed "Change the Government before it is too late!"

Mr. Wilson: Hear, hear!

Mr. LATHAM: This dodger alleged that the workers would be menaced by three

things if Labour did not win the election, one of those things being "the creation of a non-democratic Legislative Assembly dominated by Tories and reactionaries." I hope there are not many reactionaries in the new Government, because the Premier will be confronted with sufficient trouble without having too many reactionaries in his party. One of the dodgers contained a portrait of the Minister for Agriculture.

Mr. Wilson: He takes a poor photograph.

Mr. LATHAM: In this one he looked cross, as if in doubt as to how the election was likely to result. Another dodger addressed to all sustenance workers and bearing the signature of the present Premier, contained the following:—

In the event of a Labour Government being returned to power you are given the following assurance:—(1) A measure will be introduced to provide for general insurance against sickness, accident and unemployment. (2) The first big effort will be to get all men back to work.

We tried to do that for three years, so I can assure the Minister for Employment that he has a full-time job. The dodger continued—

(3) Until No. 2 is achieved, progressive improvement will be made in sustenance conditions by (a) employing men in batches and by rotation on full time for a period of three months, and then reverting to sustenance rates until their turn again comes for full time.

The Minister for Mines: Read it correctly. You have omitted a word.

Mr. LATHAM: All I omitted was the word "say," immediately before "three months."

The Minister for Mines: You are a beauty at misrepresentation.

Mr. LATHAM: I would not suggest that the Minister for Mines was the author of the dodger.

The Minister for Mines: But I knew at once that you had omitted a word.

Mr. LATHAM: Anyhow the inclusion of the word "say" makes no difference. I heard a man remark, "The new Government have not provided us with the three months' work on full time," and the man addressed replied, "No, you are on three months' sustenance for a while."

Mr. Raphael: They would have been on 5s. a week if you had had the handling of the matter much longer.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member should speak for himself. The dodger continued:—

(b) Repeal the existing condition that no one is entitled to obtain work unless receiving sustenance.

That assurance is likely to require the attention of the Minister for Employment for a long time.

The Minister for Employment: It has already received attention.

Mr. LATHAM: Many men now engaged in industry will require relief and the Minister will have them on his hands. That will not help him.

Mr. Hawke: Is that another testimonial to your Government?

Mr. LATHAM: No, that arises from the impossibility of finding markets for our commodities.

Mr. Hawke: The present Government will find the money.

Mr. LATHAM: The dodger continued:—

(c) Repeal the existing condition that all men must accept work away from home irrespective of whether they are physically fit and without regard to their domestic obligations. (4) Provide that all men employed on country jobs away from home shall be paid at least the basic wage while so employed.

They were paid the basic wage while so employed during the previous administration.

Mr. Sleeman: Were they?

Mr. LATHAM: Yes, I know of no instance in which a man did not receive the basic wage while so employed. Consequently that will be no innovation.

Miss Holman: What about "kitty"?

Mr. LATHAM: I have not met her. I know they were paid the basic wage during the time they were employed.

Miss Holman: Plenty of sustenance men were sorry they ever did meet her.

The Premier: She was not a nice girl.

Mr. LATHAM: Evidently not. I am glad I did not meet her. It is clear that the Minister for Employment will have to devote most of his time to solving the various problems that will confront him. I am sure his will be a full time job. These documents will be well worth preserving, and should certainly be useful in three years' time.

The Minister for Mines: You will not find anything in them as bad as "work for all."

Mr. LATHAM: We did not publish that in pamphlet form.

The Minister for Mines: Yes, you did. I can produce a copy for you.



Mr. LATHAM: It will be handy to keep these documents. Last year they were all on the one side, and now there are some on the other side.

The Minister for Works: "Work and prosperity for all." It was your Leader who had one of those things printed.

The Minister for Agriculture: We have preserved your policy speech too.

Mr. LATHAM: I will tell the Government a little about that. I hardly think the candidates who went on the public platform believed they could gull the people in the way some of them intended to do. Of course I do not think that had anything to do with the result of the election.

The Minister for Agriculture: They were not gulls.

Mr. LATHAM: They were gulls if they took any notice of what the Minister said.

The Minister for Mines: They took so much notice that they turned you down.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not believe that was the cause of our losing one seat.

The Premier: Look at the other party.

Mr. LATHAM: A similar thing happened in South Australia when the Government were defeated on the same day as the defeat of the Government in Western Australia. In a time of trouble and stress people think that a change cannot make things any worse, and they certainly made a change. Everything in the garden, however, is not as beautiful as people would lead us to assume.

Mr. Hegney: We hope at all events it will not be any worse.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope not too. If members opposite are going to endeavour to live up to those pamphlets they will have something to do. I do not like post-mortems, and do not intend to have any, but I think it is worth while telling the House exactly what I said and how I was misreported. The heading in this particular case was "Arbitration and Workers' Compensation." What I said was—

The operations of the State and Federal Arbitration Courts and the incidence of workers' compensation affect industry considerably, and because of this we contend that there should be a review of our arbitration laws.

Not their abolition.

We believe that the Court should consist of a President only, with representatives of the employers and employees acting as advocates for their respective interests. The duplication of machinery and the system at present in operation are unnecessarily costly. Then, in

making an award we believe that the President should take into consideration not only the wages to which an employee might be entitled, or what an employer can pay, but also the ability of the industry to carry the financial burden.

Members opposite will realise that they cannot impose burdens on industry without meeting with the trouble that we encounter to-day, and without creating unemployment. The extract continues—

It is useless to pursue a policy of wage fixation if the amount so paid is to be added to the cost of commodities and eventually passed on, leaving a pyramiding of costs which become greater than industry can bear and finally bring about a cessation of activities.

There is nothing unreasonable in that, or anything to which exception can be taken. Members will agree that it is stupid to have two men who are biassed, sitting on either side of the table. After all, the President has to decide. I have never known the subsidiary members on the Bench, representing opposite interests as they do, to agree.

The Minister for Mines: Then you have not read many of the Arbitration awards.

Mr. LATHAM: They have not agreed on any important matter, but they sometimes have done so in small matters. A judge frequently has the liberty of the people in his hands. The President of the Arbitration Court merely decides these issues. The evidence is all placed before him, and the cases are argued by the advocates. It is unnecessary to have the cumbersome court that exists to-day.

The Minister for Works: This court does its work more expeditiously than the Federal Court does.

Mr. LATHAM: That court has to travel far and wide.

The Minister for Works: It only deals with a limited number of industries.

Mr. LATHAM: Many more awards are dealt with here than is the case with the Federal Court. The extract continues—

We desire the adoption of a more scientific method of determining what is a fair thing to all concerned. The Federal Basic Wage as it applies to the State would, if adopted, obviate the duplication now taking place, and would bring Western Australia into line with Victoria and Tasmania where the Federal wage is accepted as a basis for wage adjustment. It is unsatisfactory to find two men side by side working under different arbitration laws, one receiving more than the other because of the difference in the basic wage, yet both having to pay exactly the same price for commodities.

I have here the quarterly summary of Australian Statistics, Bulletin No. 131, dated March, 1933. I wish to show what the relationship of the basic wage was in the different States at that time. The basic wage for Victoria was fixed by the Commonwealth award. In New South Wales the basic wage was £3 8s. 6d. a week, plus child allowance; in Queensland it was £3 14s. 0d.; in South Australia £3 3s. 0d.; and in Western Australia £3 9s. 0d. In Tasmania the Federal award, as well as in Victoria, was followed as nearly as possible.

The Minister for Works: To which industry do you refer?

Mr. LATHAM: I am referring to the basic wage fixed by the State Arbitration Courts. This applies to all industries, with the usual allowance for skill.

The Minister for Works: You have quoted the basic wage for each State.

Mr. LATHAM: The Federal basic wage in Sydney, under the Harvester equivalent (plus adjusted "Powers" 3s.) was 75s. 4d., in Melbourne it was 70s. 4d., in Brisbane 65s. 11d., in Adelaide 65s. 9d., and in Perth 66s. 5d. against 69s. for the State basic wage. It was submitted to the electors that I had the wonderful idea of reducing the basic wage by 10s. a week. Our opponents made use of the fact that there was a weekly rate reduction of 10 per cent. provided by the Federal Arbitration Court, bringing the wages down to 55s. 9d. Victoria has a lower basic wage than we have, and yet it is one of those States where the Savings Bank figures have increased during the last few months. I notice that the people seem to be more prosperous in that and some of the other States than they are here, where the basic wage is at a higher rate.

Mr. Hawke: There is a big proportion of Scottish people in Victoria.

Mr. LATHAM: We can take the Savings Bank accounts of the people as a fairly good barometer of the prosperity of the State. It is usually the savings of the wage earners that are deposited in the Savings Bank. In New South Wales during the last twelve months there has been an increase in deposits of £579,000, in Victoria an increase of £2,491,000, in Queensland an increase of £537,000, in South Australia an increase of £958,000 (the wage is lower there than it is here), in Tasmania an increase of £383,000, and in Western Australia a decrease of £190,000. A different basic wage throughout

Australia must of necessity bring about the position that the people who are engaged in industry in the Eastern States are able to place their goods on the market here at a lower price than that at which we can produce them ourselves. That seems to be the trouble. To-day our people buy Eastern States goods, and a lesser wage is paid to keep people employed in other places whilst our own people are out of work. What I wanted to do was to bring about a better distribution of the work. I am also concerned about the young people. What opportunities for work have they?

The Minister for Works: You wanted a levelling down of prices.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not say so.

The Minister for Works: You do. You wanted the Federal basic wage to apply in Western Australia, and that would have been approximately 10s. a week less.

Mr. LATHAM: I have just read to the House the extract from the speech I delivered.

The Minister for Works: No other interpretation can be put upon your remarks.

Mr. LATHAM: If the Federal basic wage had gone up what excuse would the Minister have advanced then?

The Minister for Works: You did not contradict the statement.

Mr. LATHAM: I did contradict it at every opportunity.

The Minister for Works: You left that for someone else to do.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister only reads into my speech what suits him, and leaves out those things which do not suit him.

The Minister for Agriculture: You have quoted your own words.

Mr. LATHAM: I have read an extract from my speech.

The Minister for Works: We quoted from the "Primary Producer," your own paper.

Mr. LATHAM: This speech is copied from the "Primary Producer" and quoted by the "West Australian." If I had quoted from the "West Australian" some of the remarks made by the Premier I am sure I should have been misrepresenting him. I know he did not say what the "West Australian" claimed that he said.

The Minister for Mines: In regard to that speech the "Primary Producer" and the "West Australian" are identical.

Mr. LATHAM: The Minister might check that.

The Minister for Mines: I have checked it. I go further and say that you supplied the "Primary Producer" with a copy of your speech before it was delivered, and they published it accordingly. It was the same as that which appeared in the "West Australian"

Mr. LATHAM: I cannot help what the Minister for Mines says. His intentions are all right, but sometimes he goes astray, as he has done on this occasion.

The Minister for Mines: I am sure I have not strayed.

Mr. LATHAM: I say definitely this is what was said, and what was published in the "Primary Producer."

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you say the "West Australian" report was untrue?

Mr. LATHAM: I say that that paper did not quote my remarks as I delivered them.

The Minister for Agriculture: You have waited several months to say so.

Mr. LATHAM: I have said it repeatedly. There are many occasions when it is inadvisable to see a thing. There are none so blind as those who will not see.

The Minister for Mines: Copies from both papers were cut out and pasted alongside each other, and they were the same.

The Minister for Justice: We will move a vote of thanks to you for saying it.

The Minister for Agriculture: There is the result of your speech on the National benches.

Mr. LATHAM: Does the Minister think the people were so easily gulled as to believe something that was never stated?

The Minister for Works: Did you not want them to believe it?

Mr. LATHAM: I say I never said it. I can assure hon. members that if they think they won the election on those lines, they have not the same ideas as I have. Just as the people sometimes think at the end of three years that they desire a change, so they thought when the last general elections took place that they required another Government after having passed through the three worst years in the State's history. I do not say that what was experienced during those three years was the fault of the Government that was in power. I would not blame the Leader of the present Government, if he had been in power instead of the Government that recently went out of office, and had been unable to satisfy the people. The Government now in power went out of office a little

over three years ago at a time which was fortunate for them, because the prices of wheat and wool immediately afterwards started to go down.

The Premier: That was because we were defeated.

The Minister for Justice: And now the prices are going up again.

Mr. LATHAM: I notice that. I will not regret the change of Government if that change brings with it prosperity for the people. If the people want us at a future date to assume control of the affairs of the State, we shall be ready to take over the reins. I have here a chart prepared by Professor Shann and I daresay some hon. members have seen it. It shows the prices that were obtained for our farm products and industrial costs from 1927 to 1932. The red line on the chart denotes the industrial prices, while the black line represents the value of farm products. During the period between 1927 and 1929 the red and the black lines were running closely together, but after that, when the lines started to fall back, trouble set in. I should like to point out that anything that is done in the way of increasing taxation, and increasing the cost of commodities, is reflected in the red line. In 1928, when Mr. Scullin imposed the sales tax, the red line immediately shot forward until it reached its present level. The real work of the Government is to bring these lines together, and when that comes about we shall have prosperity again. We must be careful that we do not do anything that will advance the red line. If the red line goes on increasing in length the result will be the collapse of our industries. There must be a margin for the producer to work on otherwise it is impossible for him to carry on.

The Minister for Works: There has been a considerable advance in the price of wheat since this Government took over.

Mr. LATHAM: If there is anything for which I can blame the hon. member, it will not be that.

The Minister for Works: I do not want any blame.

Mr. LATHAM: As I said before, so long as the Government bring prosperity to the State, we shall not regret the change. I propose to lay the chart on the Table of the House, so that members may give it some

study. If we are able to raise prices in some way, so much the better, but I do not know of any way by which we can advance the prices for farm produce, though we can bring down industrial costs. If we do not bring down those costs, we are bound to have our industries collapsing. That is what I am concerned about. The Minister for Employment has told us about the wonderful advantage that will be gained by finding full-time work for people whether they are on sustenance or not. This will mean encouraging people to leave their farms.

The Minister for Lands: There are many now who want to get back to their farms.

Mr. LATHAM: Things are beginning to settle down to-day in comparison with what was the position a year or two ago. The great trouble we experienced was to show how much better off were those on the land than the people who were in the city. It will not be possible to carry out the suggestion made by the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Tonkin) yesterday, that every man should be his own employer. Immediately we start that policy, we throw others out of employment. To-day we have complaints from furniture makers. So many people are making furniture in their backyards. Immediately a man starts to work for himself he throws someone else out of employment, and so I cannot see that the hon. member's suggestion will prove a solution of our troubles. Then the hon. member stated that if the people who have money will not invest it in industry, the Government ought to do it.

The Minister for Agriculture: Other countries are becoming self-sustained.

Mr. LATHAM: That is the real international trouble.

The Minister for Agriculture: What are the French farmers doing? They are great protectionists.

Mr. LATHAM: Until Australia prohibited the entry of goods from France and Italy into the Commonwealth, we were supplying those countries with a certain amount of our wheat. When we told them that we were no longer taking their goods, they naturally replied that they did not want our wheat, and they put up their tariff on wheat.

Mr. Withers: They only bought our wheat because they wanted it.

Mr. LATHAM: The people in Europe to-day must be suffering on account of the high price they have to pay for bread, and yet we have been selling wheat at under 3s. a bushel.

The Minister for Justice: The people you are talking about have got over their difficulties by not paying their debts.

Mr. LATHAM: No territory can become great unless it can expand its industry.

Mr. Nulsen: That would not be done on low prices.

Mr. LATHAM: We must borrow money or it must come out of industry. There comes a time when it is not possible to borrow money, and we must always bear that in mind. Immediately the prices of wheat and wool fell, thousands of people were thrown out of employment. There never was such prosperity as when the prices of those commodities were high. If the farmers can supply wheat that will bring 5s. or 6s. a bushel, or wool that will bring 2s. a lb., it will be easy to borrow money, because the earning capacity of the people has improved. It is no use our paying high wages if industry will not provide the money to enable those high wages to be paid. Of what use is it to pay high wages if that is going to kill industry?

Mr. Nulsen: What is America doing?

Mr. LATHAM: America was supposed to be one of the most wonderful countries in the world. Yet we find now that it is experiencing the greatest difficulties. No fewer than 2,000 banks collapsed there.

Miss Holman: That is all being altered now.

Mr. LATHAM: We made it impossible for our banks to close their doors.

The Minister for Agriculture: You cannot blame the toilers for what happened there.

Mr. LATHAM: I am not blaming the toilers; why should I? We are the toilers.

The Minister for Lands: America is correcting all that now.

Mr. LATHAM: Roosevelt is experimenting, and the price of wheat will probably go up to 5s. a bushel.

The Minister for Lands: What America has done has been a great help.

Mr. LATHAM: The member for North-East Fremantle requires more money for education. It is well that the House should

know that 93 per cent. of the expenditure on education goes in salaries.

Mr. Tonkin: I want more teachers and smaller classes.

Mr. LATHAM: No State has done more for education than has Western Australia. We provide free education right to the University, and it is no use asking the State to agree to further expenditure until we can be told where the money is to come from. The extraordinary thing is that people believe the candidates who stand on a platform and make promises that they will get them something. But the people forget that the cost of whatever is obtained for them does not come out of the pockets of the candidate. All the money that is spent by the State is taken from the pockets of the people or else it is borrowed on their account. It is no use making oneself a good fellow unless one tells the people how the money is to be got. I venture to believe that very few of the electors are prepared to back the hon. member's proposal to spend more money on education unless he tells them whence the additional funds are to be obtained.

Miss Holman: People are positively asking for more education.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course, because they think that they will get it at the other fellow's expense.

Mr. Tonkin: You should not judge everybody by yourself.

Mr. LATHAM: The Government have to take the additional money out of the pockets of the people, and so impoverish the people. If we were to provide education for our children ourselves, without using State funds, we should do much better.

Mr. Tonkin: Where does the money go to when it is taken out of the pockets of the people? It circulates.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member wants to put more money into the pockets of the teachers.

Mr. Tonkin: That money would go into business channels.

Mr. LATHAM: Some of it would be lost in the process, though.

Mr. Tonkin: No.

Mr. LATHAM: I repeat that 93 per cent. of the money spent on education is absorbed in salaries. I do not know why the officers of the Education Department should expect to be relieved of cuts which

everybody else has had to suffer—members of Parliament, judges, public servants, and so on. It is utterly unfair to exempt one section while asking all the other sections to bear cuts.

Miss Holman: But you cut down the educational facilities; you closed the Training College.

Mr. LATHAM: Should the State go on training teachers when there is no employment for them?

Miss Holman: Teachers are being trained.

Mr. LATHAM: The hon. member should know that during the last three years there has been a great falling-off in the marriages of female teachers. There is no use in training teachers who cannot be absorbed.

Miss Holman: You put on monitors aged 24 years.

Mr. LATHAM: Many men will not go to country schools. But for women teachers, there would be great difficulty in supplying educational requirements in the country. At this period we should give consideration to heads of families instead of teachers.

Miss Holman: Speak for yourself.

Mr. LATHAM: I do speak for myself, and I associate myself with the hon. member interjecting. I know of no school which has been closed simply because of the depression, and teachers have merely been asked to make the same sacrifice as the rest of the public servants.

Mr. Tonkin: Salaries were cut down, and classes were increased in size.

Mr. LATHAM: I have never heard it asserted that the efficiency of our educational service is not up to the general standard.

Mr. Tonkin: It is not what it should be.

Mr. LATHAM: There were some teachers who ought never to have been teachers.

Mr. Tonkin: Not so.

Mr. LATHAM: Generally speaking, I have never heard any complaints that teachers in Western Australia are not capable of doing what teachers elsewhere do. Some of our teachers have realised that they had better not teach, and in consequence have left the service.

Mr. Tonkin: You will admit that classrooms are over-crowded. There must be a limit to the number of children a teacher can deal with efficiently.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not doubt that there must be a limit. It is admitted that some of our schools are over-crowded; but, after all, we can give the people only what they

can afford to pay for. It is wrong to advocate increased payments in that direction while so many of our people are unable to find employment. The hon. member further said that there should be a higher standard of education to enable persons to enjoy increased leisure. My experience tells me that the more educated and the more sophisticated people become, the greater is their expenditure on pleasures and luxuries. As regards the difference between prosperity and depression, it has been said that in times of prosperity a man can have wine and pleasures, whereas when depression comes along he has beer and his fireside. The more highly educated people become, the more extravagant do their tastes become.

Mr. Tonkin: And so those people create more employment, as the result of their greater demands.

Mr. LATHAM: Their demands are generally for foreign wines, foreign tobacco, and that sort of thing. The only reference that I see in the Speech to the North-West deals with bananas and pineapples. I am pleased to know that at Carnarvon pineapples and bananas are being grown. Latterly we have heard nothing of the production of peanuts there. The hon. member representing that district was rendering a great service to the people of the North-West, but he left the district for a sphere in which his services cannot be so efficiently utilised. On behalf of the people of the North-West and on behalf of the hon. member I regret that he cannot render here half the service he could render in the North-West. Tropical advisers are scarce in Australia, and I dare say it will be a long time before the present Government fill the position which the hon. member has vacated.

Mr. Tonkin: Cannot he advise them from here?

Mr. LATHAM: Personal demonstration is worth more than all the talking. Some means must be found of providing a market for the surplus sheep of the North-West. Such a market will bring greater prosperity to the North-West than will the employment of some 60 men in banana-growing. The people of the North-West cannot expect to engage in an export trade of either bananas or pineapples. Having had something to do with irrigation, I know that one cannot profitably irrigate country except by gravitation. Where water has to be pumped, it is impossible to compete with such countries as the Straits Settlements and Queensland.

Supplying our own requirements in the way of bananas and pineapples is a sound business proposition, but it is wrong to suggest that Western Australia can export those fruits.

Mr. Wise: No one has ever suggested it.

Mr. LATHAM: Let me read the relevant paragraph from the Lieut.-Governor's Speech—

The growth of pineapples in the Gascoyne was first attempted in February, 1931. One hundred cases have been placed upon the Perth market since fruiting commenced two months ago. The quality is superb; there is a splendid export trade ahead, and there appears to be no reason why the North-West should not at once satisfy the demands of local markets and, at the same time, establish an important canning and export trade.

I did not write that paragraph.

Mr. Wise: That refers to pineapples.

Mr. LATHAM: Using irrigation otherwise than by gravitation, we cannot possibly compete with such countries as Queensland or the Straits Settlements. Let us turn our attention to seeing what can be done to help the pastoralists of the North-West.

The Minister for Mines: You did not help them very much.

Mr. LATHAM: We at least provided them with some security to offer to the people who had advanced them money. Thus we saved those pastoralists from being harassed for repayment.

The Minister for Mines: There will be no prosperity in the North-West until there has been a readjustment of holdings.

Mr. LATHAM: No purpose will be served by cutting up the holdings. Millions of acres of Crown lands are still available in the North-West. However, it is impossible for pastoralists there to carry all the stock they are now forced to carry because of the absence of a market. I will finish by asking the Minister for Mines whether he proposes to tell the House something about the prospecting parties he has sent out. I know he has sent out coachloads of men. As to the capabilities of these men I say nothing, not being competent to judge; but it is no use for the Minister to expect them to find gold in the townships.

The Minister for Mines: If they stay in the townships, they will not get sustenance in the following month.

Mr. LATHAM: They should go into areas not already fossicked-over.

The Minister for Mines: No, they should not. That remark shows how much you know about mining.

Mr. LATHAM: Time alone will decide the question. Men are being sent up who know little or nothing about prospecting, and they are to prospect areas already examined, wherever there is water, by the old prospectors.

The Minister for Lands: More gold is being got on prospected areas now than has been got during the past 20 years.

Mr. LATHAM: But it is not being got by new men.

The Minister for Mines: Those men have not yet gone out. Give them a chance.

Mr. LATHAM: What provision is being made for water supplies for those men, for the conveyance of their tools and so forth? I know what happened when the previous Government sent out prospecting parties.

The Minister for Mines: You need not worry about what will happen under the present Government's scheme.

Mr. LATHAM: Now as to the reclamation work at the Causeway. That work was closed down because it was found that only 20 per cent. of the expenditure went in wages.

The Minister for Works: Who told you that?

Mr. LATHAM: We found out that 80 per cent. of the expenditure went in material.

The Minister for Works: Just the reverse. Over 80 per cent. of the expenditure goes in wages.

Mr. LATHAM: I am sorry I have not the papers here. On the Estimates I shall have an opportunity to quote the Minister's own figures. Twenty men were going to be employed within a certain time.

The Minister for Works: I never said anything of the kind. Do not quote the "West Australian" to me. It is frequently wrong with regard to me.

Mr. LATHAM: Could it not be wrong in my case? We have now got an admission with which I am highly pleased. The reason why the late Government shut down an oil-burning engine was simply that we could not afford to use our valuable funds to buy material. We had to use our funds for wages. I counsel the Minister to give serious consideration to the cost of running that engine before he re-starts it.

The Minister for Works: The machine in question was doing the work more cheaply than any similar work had ever been done

in this country. In connection with that job a larger percentage of the expenditure goes in labour than is the case on any other job.

Mr. LATHAM: I do not know where the expenditure on labour is, then. The bridge-building must be all wages.

The Minister for Works: It is not all wages.

Mr. LATHAM: It must be, unless the Government are using imported material, and I hope they are not. I shall have something further to say regarding this matter on the Estimates. I hope the Minister will not start the Fremantle road work until the House has had an opportunity of expressing its opinion on that project. A road to cost £20,000 or £22,000 per mile is something the small population of this State cannot possibly afford under existing conditions.

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

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the House will have an opportunity to know exactly how much money is to be spent on the Fremantle-road. The information we have gleaned through the Press indicates that between £20,000 and £23,000 a mile is to be spent. In view of present-day conditions, any such expenditure is not justified.

The Minister for Works: It will not be Government money.

Mr. LATHAM: If it is not Government money, I do not know what money is to be spent there.

The Minister for Works: You ought to know.

Mr. LATHAM: It will probably be money received from traffic fees.

The Minister for Works: Yes.

Mr. LATHAM: If that is so, it is a tremendous amount of money to spend on one road. I predict that the Government will receive many requests from local governing bodies to make up the deficiency, seeing that they will be deprived of the use of that money.

The Minister for Works: You had better talk to the member for Nedlands about this matter because he wants it.

Mr. LATHAM: I hope the Minister will stand up against unreasonable demands.

The Minister for Works: I will remember that when you come to me with requests.

Mr. LATHAM: So far as I know, I have made one request and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, my application was turned down. Naturally I shall be envious regarding what other hon. members may be able to secure. In my opinion, the heavy traffic to Fremantle should be diverted to the expensive road that the Government built some time ago.

Mr. Sleeman: How would you get the heavy traffic across the river, seeing that the Canning Bridge will not take it?

Mr. LATHAM: It would be preferable to put that bridge in order rather than spend upwards of £23,000 per mile on 12 miles of road between Perth and Fremantle. As a matter of fact, this proposition was placed before the previous Administration but the cost of removing the pipe from the centre of the road was found to represent a tremendous item in itself. In these circumstances, I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to the matter before he decides to go on with the work.

The Minister for Works: I have not yet decided what is to be done.

Mr. LATHAM: According to the Press report, I understood this was what the Minister intended to do.

The Minister for Works: No, the Press statement was that it represented the engineer's estimate. It was not represented as my idea.

Mr. LATHAM: I can refresh my memory from the newspaper cutting on that point. Members will not have an opportunity to pass the expenditure involved if the money is to be taken from the traffic fees received by the Government. This phase is serious enough, but a still more serious feature is the competition that may be developed between motor vehicles and the railways with regard to passenger traffic. If the Government construct a reinforced concrete highway between Perth and Fremantle, pressure will be brought to bear on the Government to permit the carriage of passengers by road, which will represent a very serious form of competition with our railway service.

The Minister for Works: That is going on now.

Mr. LATHAM: Not to the extent that is likely should the road be constructed along the lines indicated.

The Minister for Works: At present there are taxis leaving Perth for Fremantle every three minutes.

Mr. LATHAM: Perhaps the problem would be nearer solution if the Minister for Works were to take up residence in the city, for he would not then require such a good road upon which to speed home at night.

The Minister for Justice: The Minister for Works does not proceed home along the Perth-Fremantle road.

Mr. LATHAM: He will in future. I am concerned about this matter, and I hope the Minister will take the position of the railways into consideration before he arrives at a definite decision. During the last election there was a lot of talk about the Greenmount road deviation. I have been informed by the ex-Minister for Works (Mr. Lindsay) that the present Minister for Works signed the contract for that work.

The Minister for Works: That is absolutely and entirely wrong.

Mr. LATHAM: Perhaps the Minister will refresh his memory by having a look at the file to ascertain whether or not he did sign the contract. The Mitchell Government carried out the work.

The Minister for Works: There is not an ounce of truth in that.

Mr. LATHAM: That was the information given to me, and if that were the position, the criticism against the Mitchell Government was quite unfair.

The Minister for Works: It was not unfair: it was absolutely correct. Do you think the former Minister for Works would have sat still in his place here and not advanced that point if it had been correct?

Mr. LATHAM: I do not think it was mentioned.

The Minister for Works: It was, by one member on this side of the House.

Mr. LATHAM: If I had been left to my own resources, I would have completed my remarks before the tea adjournment and thus obviated the necessity for members returning to the Chamber. Before concluding, I want the Government to understand that criticism offered by members of the Opposition will not be of an obstructive nature. I do not think it would be fair for one moment for ex-Ministers, with the knowledge they have of administration during the past three years, to adopt tactics calculated to make the position of the present



Government harder than it will necessarily be during the next three years. During that period, the Government will be hard put to it to give effect to the wishes of the people and to provide the necessary money. There are one or two matters that could be taken in hand with a view to assisting the primary industries upon which the State depends. The bulk handling system, if installed, will materially assist the farming community who will be saved between £400,000 and £500,000 a year. I hope whatever steps are taken regarding bulk handling will not have the effect of unduly delaying the introduction of the system. We cannot increase prices, but we can reduce costs, and it is the responsibility of every member to reduce the cost of primary production in every possible direction. The money saved if we do not have to buy our jute supplies from India will be circulated within the State.

Mr. Wansbrough: What about the long haulage over the railways?

Mr. LATHAM: The haulage in this State is nothing compared with that obtaining in Canada, America and the Argentine. In Canada wheat is railed for 2,000 miles from the central provinces to the Pacific coast.

The Minister for Lands: Canada has water traffic.

Mr. LATHAM: Not in the direction I have indicated. They have water traffic from Fort William and Port Arthur but, in the other direction, there is the long railway haulage that I have indicated to the Pacific coast, and huge terminals have been erected at Victoria Island and Vancouver.

Mr. Sleeman: What do you propose to do regarding the large number of men who will be displaced from their present employment?

Mr. LATHAM: The money saved by the installation of the bulk handling system will be spent here. It is preferable to circulate that money among the workers of Western Australia than to send it to India for circulation among the workers there.

Mr. Hawke: A little while ago you were arguing to the contrary.

Mr. LATHAM: Not at all.

Mr. Sleeman: You said we sent our goods elsewhere and secured their goods in return.

Mr. LATHAM: Of course, because we have to buy those goods. It is regrettable that the primary producer has to sell his produce in the cheapest markets of the world in competition with that produced most cheaply and, in turn, buy in the dear-

est markets. If members give a little consideration to this important problem, they will realise the importance of bringing the industrial section into closer touch with the producing section. I assure the Premier and members of his Government that for the next three years I hope the Opposition will not be charged with obstruction tactics to the disadvantage of the State. While we reserve the right to criticise the Government, we shall endeavour to see that the policy upon which they were returned to power is given effect to as much as possible, always seeing to it that due regard is shown for the requirements of industry as well as the interests of the industrial movement.

MR. WISE (Gascoyne) [7.40]: It is my desire to take this early opportunity in the debate to submit a case particularly on behalf of those people who reside within the boundaries of my constituency and north of the Gascoyne. I am prompted to speak thus early for several reasons, and I hope that in following the Leader of the Opposition, I may be able to submit more concrete facts to the House than he has succeeded in doing. Before proceeding with my remarks, I desire to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the honourable position you now occupy. To the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Leader of the Nationalist Party, I also extend my congratulations and sincere wishes that each of them will retain, for a very long term indeed, their present respective positions. I listened intently to the reading of the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. Doubtless there were many interesting features. Something was said about the North Western portion of the State, and more was said in the Speech under that heading than in any previous Speech of which I have any knowledge. More might have been said to advantage. If members representing North-West constituencies may regard what was stated, even in passing, as an augury of the intention of the Labour Government to realise, as they have done in the past more than any other Administration, the needs of that part of the State, we shall be very happy. Should that not be the position, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the comparative silence of the Governor's Speech will not necessarily commit members representing northern constituencies to a policy of silence. On the contrary, it will stimu-

late enthusiasm and provide inspiration to them to present to members a case that will be unanswerable. Before proceeding along these lines and quoting definite instances of the injustice that has been meted out to the North-West, I must point out that every worth-while facility that the North enjoys at present—the State ships, the meatworks, bridges and roads, where there are any—all stand to the credit of previous Labour Administrations. Because of that, it is clear that the greatest boon to that part of the State for the last four years has been not the supposed extension of the pastoral leases, but the return to power of a Labour Government. If members read the country newspapers, they will know that there is at present an agitation throughout the North-West, which has emanated from branches of the Returned Soldiers' League at various centres, the object of which is to have something better accomplished in the interests of the North-West in particular. Great prominence has been given to this agitation in the columns of the local Press. I will refer to a recent leader in the "Northern Times" of Carnarvon. It is headed "Wake up North-West," and it outlines what the previous Government did for the North-West, such as the appointment of that burlesque North-West committee consisting of one or two St. George's Terrace pastoralists, members of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, Perth merchants and a few politicians from the North-West. One of those politicians has a knowledge of the North-West which would be embraced in a comfortable tour on the "Koolinda" now and then. He rarely goes ashore, and I believe his impressions of that part of Western Australia are obtained by looking through the wrong end of the telescope from the ship's deck, firmly believing that "distance lends enchantment to the view." He was interested in a property within 120 miles of a North-West port, but he has never been on that property. His interest is purely of a speculative nature, just as most of the people of the South regard the North in speculative terms only. Turning for a moment to finance, just consider all the money which has been derived from the North-West in direct taxation. Those figures have never been made available. It is just as possible to burn asbestos as to bring a blush to the cheeks of an established politician, but if politicians could blush I am sure

the figures I am about to quote would bring about that phenomenon. I have striven hard to get the whole of the figures, but the only ones I am able to secure are Commonwealth figures, and that by the grace of the Deputy Commissioner of Federal taxation, figures which speak for themselves. It is no imaginary case; this is no Father Christmas story, it is not just a myth for I have here figures for five years, and they will surely give an indication of what the North has paid. During a five-year period the North paid in Federal income taxation alone, £282,000. In Commonwealth land tax, the Lord knows how much the North has paid. That is the most iniquitous tax this State or any other part of the Commonwealth has ever had inflicted on it. That tax has never served the purpose for which it was originally intended. It was instituted to keep a check on the over-running of the country by large estates, and it has failed miserably. But although the figures regarding that tax are unavailable, I should imagine a sum far in excess of our State income tax has been gleaned by the Commonwealth from that source. However, £282,000—these are certified figures—has been collected in five years by the Commonwealth in income tax north of the 26th parallel, which is a little north of the Murchison River. The State income tax collected up there in the same period would, I suppose, approach that sum. I tried to get the figures of land rentals, but although the Minister endeavoured to assist me in that, there was not sufficient time for the purpose before the House sat. It is the right of every member of the House to have those figures; it is not right that they should be kept from members, and it is certainly not our fault if the departmental system of bookkeeping does not permit of our procuring them. I have quoted to you the £282,000 paid by the North in Federal income tax in five years. The North-West has contributed no less than, and probably a great deal more than, £4,000,000 to the combined Treasuries during this century. And what have we had in return? However, that is not where the value of the North has really existed: from a production point of view it has had the South-West or any other part of the Commonwealth per capita knocked into a cocked hat. There are living north of the 26th parallel at the moment not so many as 6,000 people. In an area which comprises almost half the State, or nearly 450,000 square miles, there are fewer people than are to be

found within a mile of this House at the present moment. And those people of the North have contributed the direct taxation I have mentioned, and from a national wealth-producing point of view they have produced one-third of our wool cheque, have been prominent in the production of beef and the export of sheep, and have produced £10,000,000 in pearl shell and pearls. And what have they had? The South-West, in addition to having had many millions expended on it, has enjoyed every possible facility that successive Governments could afford to provide, has indeed reaped the benefit of all the money advanced by the North-West. In every district down South where Government money has been spent every possible facility has been provided. But that is not so with us. We have no roads, no railways, and very few telephones. We have very little of which the poorest village in the South-West can boast. I am actuated to bring up these arguments because already, very early in my parliamentary career, I have been told by Under Secretaries when putting up a case for a certain function that that particular utility owes the Treasury so much. From Ministers I have had a wonderfully sympathetic hearing in every instance, but my answer to the Under Secretaries would be, "The North owes you nothing. Never mind whether any particular item owes you anything." Whatever is just or justice for us, we endeavour to fight for to the last ditch. I find that within the area north of the Murchison River there are about one-third of the total sheep of this State; about one-third of our wool cheque comes from that region while from the Port of Carnarvon a total of 26,000 bales of wool was shipped last year. Members, of course, are aware that the total wool production of the State was only 220,000 bales. So it is quite fitting that every possible consideration should be given to that part of the State whenever any facility seeks assistance. Very few people realise what the rest of Australia owes to the North-West. Very few people have had the case presented to them, and in view of the response I have had from Ministers I feel sure it has never been justly presented before. Should anything happen which is at all to the detriment of the North-West it receives the utmost publicity in our metropolitan newspapers; but suppose the South-West meets with any such mishap, it will be found poked away in some

remote corner of the paper. If the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway does not show a profit you will find the announcement set forth under great headlines, with the suggestion that the continued existence of the railway is in danger. I know the Government recognise that that railway is a necessary service and is not likely to be discontinued. But it is remarkable that although perhaps £14,000,000 has been expended to bolster up the rural industries in the South-West, when an extra million or so is needed in the case of towns that have been built up and have prospered on Government losses, we do not see any mention of it in the Press. Let me return for a moment to that famous North-West committee which I mentioned earlier: One of its recommendations was an extension of pastoral leases, and another was that there should be no restriction of areas of pastoral leases. Both those recommendations were calculated to assist in the populating and developing of the North-West. Be that as it may, the passing of the Land Act Amendment Bill of 1932 relating to pastoral leases may or may not have been the outcome of that recommendation. In any event, perhaps the biggest piece of political bluff this country has known for many years is that Act, which is supposed to extend pastoral leases. It does nothing of the sort. It is not possible under that Act to extend a pastoral lease until 1932, as the Act purports to do. Let me explain: In Section 2 of the Act, Crown lands open to selection for pastoral purposes may be leased, subject to the provisions of Part X. of the principal Act, for a term expiring on the 31st day of December, 1932. That is only Crown land open for selection. This Act, I take it, emanated from the party which claims to know all the requirements of those people whom I represent, but it seems to me they were beautifully hoodwinked in the presentation of the Act. That Act for the purpose for which it was intended is useless, and under it no lease has been extended, although the Act has been in operation since the 1st of January. Why? Because under that Act it is not possible so to do. Section 6 hunts it along a bit further and mentions existing pastoral leases. Early in March I criticised that Act from the public platform, and was severely taken to task by an accidental Minister, who criticised me in many ways. But Section 6 permits of the extension of pastoral leases only at any time within one

year from the commencement of the Act. It provides that the lease to be extended may be surrendered and a new lease may be granted under Section 2 of the Act, provided that if the lease is subject to any registered mortgage or encumbrance the consent of the mortgagee or encumbrancer shall be necessary. So if there is a mortgage on the lease that mortgage must be lifted, and should new leases be applied for it is likely to cost many of the unfortunate leaseholders a sum up to, say, £500 for stamp duty alone. I take it that as Labour Governments have always had to amend the mistakes of other Governments, it will be found necessary to amend this mistake. The Act, as it stands, is quite ineffective and quite inoperative. It defeated its objects. Neither has the Act been availed of, nor were the four North-West seats won. I was very pleased to notice a reference in the Speech, to one portion of which the Leader of the Opposition alluded and on which he and His Excellency agreed. I, too, quite agree with them on that point, but it is remarkable that he waited until he was in Opposition before agreeing to it. I refer to the reduction of interest, a matter that is very vital to anyone engaged in primary industry. The Leader of the Opposition made use of these words, "Primary industries are languishing on account of interest charges." There is considerable similarity between that statement and the statement of a prominent pastoralist, Mr. Robinson, who returned from the North recently. Mr. Robinson was reported to have said, "Interest generally is too high; 6 per cent. to pastoralists when money is so plentiful is more than the industry can pay." In the annual report of Messrs. Goldsbrough, Mort & Co., the chairman after condemning all Governments and their charges, said, "There is a huge amount of money being spent which we definitely cannot afford, and which should be saved for the benefit of rural industries, which are languishing under conditions which it is within the power of Australian Parliaments to alleviate." I agree with those remarks with the addition of the words "with the introduction of a Bill to reduce interest rates," though the chairman of the firm did not use those words. The greatest burden on the industry is represented by the excessive

interest charges made possible and imposed by such usurious people. To-day the equity in property has diminished considerably. I know men who took up sheep stations to the value of £10,000 to £20,000. To do so they had to borrow money, and money was poured out to them. If they wanted £1,000, it was suggested that they should take £2,000. To-day their equity has vanished in diminishing values, but the amount owing has not been reduced. The rates of interest charged during the period of depression have been the same. Although other costs controllable by the pastoralist have been reduced, no reduction has been made in charges outside his control. Let me quote Mr. Robinson again. He said, "The handling charges by brokers have been doubled since the appraisal scheme." Stock and station firms have built up wonderful reserves. Some of the smaller firms have reserves of £2,000,000, most of which money has been made by selling commissions, interest charges, agencies for pastoralists, and trading generally. In some instances where those firms have controlled property, two, and at times, three, commissions have been made on the one sale. That is unfortunate for the pastoralist who is now nominally the owner but is really only the manager. It is sad that such a state of affairs should be possible. I would welcome any suggestion by the Government for the introduction of a Bill to reduce interest rates. The Speech said it would be a good thing for us, internally and externally, the Leader of the Opposition applauds it, and the chairman of Messrs. Goldsbrough, Mort & Co. says it is within the power of Governments to do so. I trust the Government will see its way clear to introduce such legislation. Referring again to stock and station agents, I find they are more concerned with paying dividends than with the general welfare of the industry. The chairman of directors of one of the firms, speaking in London, stated that although they would be able to pay 8 per cent. on that occasion, he deplored that owing to the possibility of the introduction in Australian Parliaments of legislation to reduce interest, they might not be able to pay that dividend next year. That is a very unfortunate position for the shareholders! What is the other side of the picture? In my electorate recently I came across a young man working at an out-camp 300 miles from a port and 30 miles from the homestead, and he was receiving 35s. a week. He also re-

ceived rations, but anything particular such as spuds and onions he had to buy for himself. I should like to point out the difficulties under which the small pastoralists particularly, but pastoralists generally, labour with respect to transport and the cost of commodities. When potatoes and onions are £3 per ton in Perth, in portions of my electorate they cost £20. When I suggest and invite consideration for the difficulties arising from freights and transport in my electorate—all other parts of the State have received benefits in this direction—I feel sure that my pleadings will not be in vain. One matter which, amongst pastoralists of the North, is very contentious, is that of the appraisalment of leases. One of the legitimate charges made by Governments for the use of our heritage is that of land rentals based on appraisalment values. Those values are not arrived at by guesswork. Nearly all Government charges are based on something, but it would be difficult to find a basis for nearly all the charges made by the firms to whom I have referred. A suggestion was made to me recently by a very successful pastoralist, and I feel sure members will appreciate it if they realise the difficulties of transport. He pointed out that 70 per cent. of the cost of land rentals—in other words, appraisalment values—is a matter of transport. Anomalies exist such as land adjoining a port being appraised at 32s. 6d. per 1,000 acres, while land 200 miles from a port is appraised at a figure almost approaching it. In the one case transport costs to and from the port may be 15s. per ton; in the other case transport costs may be £15 per ton. When any re-appraisalment is possible, I trust that the existing anomalies will be removed. One thing is very necessary and I commend it to the attention of the Government, and that is the need for an officer engaged solely in research work for the benefit of the pastoral industry. It is vital to the industry. In my previous position I had, in some small measure, to couple that work with my other duties. When an officer is appointed in my stead, I trust that the words of an hon. member in another place, to whom I have previously referred, will be remembered. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that, in entering politics, I had deprived the people of that service, but I would remind him that since my election, I have carried out every duty of that posi-

tion in an honorary capacity. By my election the people of the North have so far been deprived of nothing.

The Minister for Lands: We are saving money by it.

Mr. WISE: I challenge any member present to say that my knowledge of the North-West, regarded as a district, is not comparable with that of any member in either House.

The Minister for Works: The State will now have the benefit of that knowledge.

Mr. WISE: Whether the words of the Leader of the Opposition prove true or the words of an hon. member of another place, his forecast proved incorrect when he predicted for me a very sad and watery end, whereas the electors decided otherwise. That gentleman stated from the platform that I was only appointed to a permanent position because I promised to show no interest in politics. That is a dreadful thing to say of any civil servant. Because I was a civil servant and, I trust, an efficient one, perhaps his remarks were hostilely directed to me.

Mr. Thorn: Who was the hon. member of another place?

Mr. WISE: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Hawke: He would say anything.

Mr. WISE: Mr. Baxter said, "When the Mitchell Government are returned to power. I will take steps to introduce legislation to prevent civil servants from taking an undue interest in politics." Fortunately, not very much notice was taken of his ramblings while he was on that North-West tour. Members might consider me failing in my duty if I do not mention bananas and pine-apples. During the course of my speech I have endeavoured to deal with the past rather than the future, and though I have not purposely mentioned what, at times, are termed our vast potentialities. I would rather refrain at this stage from mentioning such as exist. I was very glad to see a reference in the Speech to the new industry in Carnarvon, with which I can claim to have had something to do. Very few people in the South, who are now paying from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a dozen for Javanese bananas, know the extent to which they are contributing to the Federal Treasury. It may be a startling announcement to make that in the past three years no less than

£25,000 has been gathered in from that direction alone.

The Minister for Lands: In duty?

Mr. WISE: Yes. This has come from the people of Perth, not so much from the people in the country, because the trade there is not yet sufficiently organised. I can see a definite way of preventing that money from going out of the State, and will use every persuasive power I have to induce the Premier to overcome this situation. I say definitely that a third of that sum at the most, if advanced to assist those at present engaged in the industry at Carnarvon, would enable us to overtake our present requirements in Perth in the matter of bananas. If the people of Carnarvon had the Agricultural Bank Act extended to them, they would quickly overtake the demand for this fruit. This £25,000 is a colossal sum for the people of Perth to have to pay for Javanese bananas. I have seen the local industry grow. When I returned from Queensland in 1929 there were 70 banana suckers in Carnarvon. I had to face the hostility of the local people who had experienced previous failures, and who claimed that they had had no one to advise them along right lines. I hope my word on irrigation matters will be taken before the word of the Leader of the Opposition. It is a fact that from the 70 plants, coupled with many thousands of suckers which have since come from Queensland, the Perth markets are now receiving practically 200 cases of bananas a fortnight. When the new blocks which were recently made available by the Minister for Lands have reached the productive stage, they will be able to produce all the requirements of this State. The bananas from Carnarvon have been the cheapest the people have ever been able to enjoy. If the growers were to receive an adequate return for their products, there is no reason why the people of the metropolitan area should pay more than 1s. a dozen.

The Minister for Works: What about the supply overtaking the demand?

Mr. WISE: I am thankful to say that the area of country suited to the production of this fruit is limited. If the Treasurer is able to make available a sum not exceeding £6,000 or £7,000—and possibly not as much will be required—with which to assist the industry, it will not be long before the

growers are able to wipe out this annual contribution of £8,000 to the Federal Government.

Mr. Ferguson: Would the Agricultural Bank help them in that way?

Mr. WISE: I would rather see the money made available by the Treasurer, and have a board appointed to attend to its distribution. I should not like to see a lot of the machinery which I know is tacked on to the Agricultural Bank operating in the Carnarvon district. The business could easily function through the present representative of the Lands Department, who knows everyone, at Carnarvon. I will take care, for my part, to see that only legitimate cases are helped. With the assistance of the sum I have mentioned, the district is capable of producing all the bananas required by the State. I should be averse to seeing a boom created. I am thankful the area capable of producing this fruit is limited. I should be very hostile to anything being done that would lead to over-production. With pineapples, however, the matter is on a different footing. It will be news to the Leader of the Opposition that last year Queensland exported to Canada £68,000 worth of canned pineapples.

Mr. Latham: And we imported pineapples from Singapore, too.

Mr. WISE: But I hope the hon. member does not eat them. It is quite possible to get the Australian article, and I commend the idea to the hon. member until such time as we are growing our own pineapples. It will be many years before we overtake the local demand for this fruit in its fresh state. The people of Perth are not yet educated up to eating it fresh. Members will agree with me, if they have ever tasted the Carnarvon product, that it leaves nothing to be desired. Recently I gave the Premier a pine, selected at random, weighing 9½ lbs.

Mr. Hawke: You should treat us all alike.

Mr. WISE: Great credit is due to two young Queenslanders who have made history in Carnarvon by their development of the pineapple industry. I know of no parallel in the world to the success which is attending the growing of pineapples under irrigation at Carnarvon. Whether the water is delivered by reticulation or pumping does not matter. In Queensland the cost of cultivation and chipping in the industry exceeds the cost of pumping at Carnarvon. That will

be news to the Leader of the Opposition. It is a tribute to Messrs. Cattamull and Beamai, the two young Queenslanders to whom I have referred. I have been connected with the pineapple industry as long as I can remember. With my father I had the honour of placing the first fresh pineapples on the London market. I was very sceptical about the success that would attend the efforts of these young men. I thought that the atmospheric dryness would be against them in their attempts to grow the fruit, but I am pleased to say they have met with a success of which they must be justly proud. Anything we can do to induce our people to eat that fruit in preference to the Queensland or Javanese commodity we should do. I hope we shall never catch either members of the Opposition or members on this side eating imported pineapples or bananas. There is another matter to which I desire to draw the attention of the Government. Although it may be regarded as a minor matter, it is worthy of consideration. I refer to the necessity for the abolition of the royalty on kangaroo skins. To some members this may be of less importance than peanuts, but to the men who get their livelihood by shooting kangaroos, it is a serious matter. The anomaly of the position is that kangaroos are declared to be vermin, but the Government collect 2d. royalty on each one. It is rather a startling position. In the past skins have been selling at a low price, but the royalty of 2d. means a good deal to the man who buys his ammunition, and it may cost him 3d. a head to shoot the kangaroos. I hope this anomaly will be removed. America has captured the trade in kangaroo leather against the wonderful tanners in Northamptonshire, England. I am pleased that the Premier is so interested that he is getting into touch with the Northampton people, to see whether we cannot keep within the Empire and away from America the many thousands of pounds involved. I am very gratified on behalf of those of my constituents who are engaged in the sandalwood industry over the consideration I have already had at the hands of the Government. As a final shot I wish to say I am proud to think that every case I have so far put up to the Government has been so good that everything I have applied for directly I have received. I may be considered lucky, and I may be an exception, but

my cases certainly have all received the utmost consideration.

The Minister for Lands: You put up a good case.

Mr. WISE: In every instance I have received a most sympathetic hearing.

Mr. Stubbs: I hope you will win regarding the kangaroo skins.

Mr. WISE: I shall certainly continue to be a trier. Certain claims for my district have received more consideration in the past three months than has been accorded to them altogether in the past four years. I am proud to say that. I thank members for their kindness to me in not putting me out of my stride. When any particular case for the North-West presents itself to the House, I trust members that no consideration will be given to what the North may have owed in actual money, but that consideration will only be given to what we as individuals and what the Treasury in particular owes to the people living north of the 26th parallel.

On motion by Mr. Withers, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—(Boulder) [8.27]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 p.m. to-morrow.

Question—put and passed.

*House adjourned at 8.28 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 20th July, 1933.*

	PAGE
Federal Senate vacancy...	37
Sitting days and hours...	37
Government business, precedence...	37
Bill: Supply (No. 1), all stages...	37
Chairman of Committees, appointment...	37
Address-in-Reply, third day...	43

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