

The PREMIER: Oh!

Mr. Raphael: You went out with your eyes closed and your mouth open.

The PREMIER: Well, I did not let the hon. member put his forceps into my mouth, anyhow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member to refrain from interjecting.

The PREMIER: It was announced by the Treasurer of the day that £2,800,000 of loan money would be available during my first year of office. That was fixed by the Loan Council in February, 1930. Western Australia actually received £1,750,000. There were 4,000 people out of work then. The million pounds that this State lost would easily have provided work for them. It must be admitted that none of us expected prices to fall as they did; they fell like a bolt from the blue. I believed that production would be increased in various industries but the fall in prices meant a loss of £9,000,000 to our production last year as against the average of prices for the previous 12 years. That was a terrific loss of money which no one anticipated this State would be called upon to bear.

Hon. J. C. Willcock It ought to be a lesson to you never to promise again!

The PREMIER: I have particulars of a few promises made by the other side, but I do not wish to quote them just now. I have some bricks to throw, but I shall not throw them just at present. They are pretty hard bricks. Hon. members opposite have been remiss, as I too have been remiss, in congratulating the newly-elected members.

Hon. P. Collier: Good men, all of them!

The PREMIER: I congratulate those hon. members from the bottom of my heart. I feel sure they will serve the country faithfully and well, doing their best for Western Australia. When a man becomes a member of Parliament, he is not a member merely for the district he represents, but is a representative of the State, and has to do all that he can in the interests of the State and of all sections of the people. I think the new members will find that in this House there is very little divided opinion on that responsibility. I believe they will find that in this Parliament we conduct affairs in such a way as to get through without having very unpleasant differences in the Chamber, although of course we do differ. I believe the newly-elected members will find that most

of us are more anxious for our country's good than for the good of any particular section of the people. It is only by advancing the interests of the people as a whole that the interests of any of them can be advanced. If we set out in the hope of advancing a section at the expense of some other section, failure is bound to result. We have in this House for many years endeavoured to do what is best for the State, and I hope the three new members will have a very comfortable time—some of them of course only a short time, I hope.

Hon. P. Collier: In an Assembly of 50 members the great Smith family is represented by three.

The PREMIER: We shall have to expel one. I suggest—last on, first off. I confidently hope that the three new members will be of great service to Western Australia. So far I have omitted to say a word concerning the demise of our late Sergeant at Arms, Mr. C. B. Kidson. He was here years before any of us came here, and in the recess he passed away. I should like to say how sorry we all are that Mr. Kidson is not in his old place.

On motion by Hon. J. C. Willcock, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.25 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 24th August, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways, cream cans	190
Unemployment—1. North-West grants; 2. Provision of medical services	190
Harbour dredging, costs	190
Hospital tax, collections and subsidies	190
Finances, loan interest	190
Stock, wasting disease	190
Leave of absence	191
Address-in-reply, third day	191

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

QUESTION—RAILWAYS, CREAM CANS.

Mr. McLARTY asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is he aware of the fact that cans containing cream are left standing in the sun at a number of railways stations? 2, As this is one of the causes of cream becoming second grade, will the necessary action be taken to provide proper shelter for these cans?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No. 2, Shelter sheds exist at all stations and sidings, and owners can place cream in these sheds prior to the arrival of the train.

QUESTIONS (2)—UNEMPLOYMENT.

North-West Grants.

Mr. COVERLEY asked the Minister for Railways: What was the total amount of money granted to the Gascoyne, Roebourne, Pilbara, and Kimberley districts respectively for the relief of unemployment during the past two years?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: Gascoyne £464, Roebourne £220, Pilbara £260.

Provision of Medical Services.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Is there a doctor situated at Mt. Barker? 2, If so, why was a Mr. Clarke without medical attention for three days when his condition was so low? 3, In future, will the Government take necessary action to see that a medical officer is available at that and other unemployment camps?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, He declined transport to the doctor as he believed his condition did not warrant it. 3, The question is receiving consideration.

QUESTION—HARBOUR DREDGING, COST.

Mr. DONEY asked the Minister for Works: 1, What was the average annual cost over the past ten years of dredging the harbours of Fremantle, Bunbury, Geraldton, and Albany, the figures for each port to be given separately? 2, What is the antici-

pated cost of similar work at the same ports for the current year?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Albany—total, £40,696; average, £4,070. Geraldton—total, £280,072; average, £28,007. Bunbury—total, £60,856; average, £6,085. Fremantle—total, £204,890; average, £20,489. 2, Albany, nil; Geraldton, £12,600; Bunbury, £5,000; Fremantle, £7,000.

QUESTION—HOSPITAL TAX, COLLECTIONS AND SUBSIDIES.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Minister for Health: 1, What was the amount of hospital tax collected—(a) for the year ended 30th June, 1931; (b) for the year ended 30th June, 1932? 2, What was the amount paid as hospital subsidies from general revenue—(a) for the year ended 30th June, 1928; (b) for the year ended 30th June, 1929; (c) for the year ended 30th June, 1930; (d) for the year ended 30th June, 1931? 3, Were there any surplus funds from the hospital tax collections; if so, how were they distributed?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH replied: 1, (a) £64,835; (b) £133,885. 2, (a) £68,051; (b) £67,125; (c) £68,146; (d) £23,702. 3, At the end of June, 1932, there was in hand £6,369 to meet current expenditure.

QUESTION—FINANCES, LOAN INTEREST.

Mr. RAPHAEL asked the Treasurer: How much interest was paid by or debited against the Government of Western Australia for the years ended the 30th June, 1930 and 1932, respectively, on—(a) overseas loans; (b) internal loans?

The TREASURER replied: 1930—(a) £1,904,088, (b) £1,353,244; 1932—(a) £2,022,650, (b) £1,246,125.

QUESTIONS (2)—STOCK, WASTING DISEASE.

Vita Lick Treatment.

Mr. WANSBROUGH asked the Premier: 1, What was the total number of stock placed under the Vita Lick treatment for wasting disease in the Denmark district since December last—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c)

adult? 2, Are there any signs of permanent cure—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 3, Were there any losses under treatment—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 4, What was the cost per head, including fodder—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 5, What is the total cost to date? 6, Is it proposed to continue such treatment? 7, To whom is the cost debited? 8, What is the period of treatment—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult?

The PREMIER replied: The answers to the questions are in the form of a table, which I will place on the Table of the House.

McGough Treatment.

Mr. WANSBROUGH asked the Premier: 1, What was the total number of stock placed under the McGough treatment for wasting disease in the Denmark district since December last—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 2, Are there any signs of permanent cure—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 3, Were there any losses under treatment—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 4, What was the cost per head, including fodder—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult? 5, What is the total cost to date? 6, Is it proposed to continue such treatment? 7, To whom is the cost debited? 8, What is the period of treatment—(a) calves; (b) young stock; (c) adult?

The PREMIER replied: The answers to the questions are in the form of a table, which I will place on the Table of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Wilson, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. Lamond (Pilbara) on the ground of urgent public business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. J. C. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [4.41]: The Governor's Speech is valuable as giving an outline of what the State has done during the preceding 13 months, but it would be much more valuable to the public and particularly to members of Parliament

if it contained some indication of what policy the Government intended to adopt regarding some phases of administration and also with respect to legislation that, presumably, will represent the main business for the current session. Parliament should receive information as early as possible as to what the Government propose to do. In the Speech before the House, half a dozen matters are dealt with, but we get more information from what Ministers say at public gatherings regarding administrative and legislative matters than we get in Parliament itself. When a Minister attends a social gathering, it depends upon what sort of a report of his remarks the Press contains as to what information is available regarding prospective legislation that will considerably affect the whole of the community. It would be better if the Governor's Speech, instead of dealing so much with what has occurred in the past, contained at least the broad outlines of legislation foreshadowed. Even the references that are contained in the Speech to legislation to be placed before Parliament are not satisfactory because more often than not, more important measures to be considered are not indicated, while less important Bills are mentioned. We are told in the Governor's Speech that the emergency legislation passed last year will be re-enacted. We have had some experience in regard to that legislation, and, as the Leader of the Opposition indicated last night, we have also had experience regarding the working of the Premiers' Plan. We were told that the Plan was one and indivisible, and that all States and the Commonwealth had agreed to it. On the other hand, we find that, in the application of the Plan, there are differences between the legislation passed by this Parliament and that agreed to in other Parliaments. We should be told, having had 12 months experience of the legislation, whether it has proved satisfactory here and elsewhere, and in what manner it is proposed to alter that legislation. For instance, in this State alone authority has been given for the Arbitration Court to deal with private enterprise under the Financial Emergency Act. That does not exist anywhere else in Australia. So, strange to say, the one and indivisible Plan allows one State to do one thing and another State to do another thing. From our experience of the turmoil and dislocation of industry and the discontent caused by the passage of the legislation, the number of times the Arbitra-

tion Court, the Supreme Court, the Full Court and other courts have been engaged in deciding jurisdiction and authority to deal with those questions, perhaps the Government could tell us whether, in the interests of accord in industry rather than of discord, it has been decided that that portion of the legislation which is peculiar to Western Australia has been found prejudicial to the general interests and will be scrapped. Then, in regard to legislation dealing with rent, this one and indivisible Plan has no effect in the other States, notwithstanding which we have the anomalous position in this State that most rents have been reduced by 22½ per cent., in other cases rent has not been touched at all, while some rents have been increased. Perhaps the experience of the last 12 months will serve to indicate to the Government the justice of amending this legislation by making it apply to rents of all kinds, instead of exclusively to tenancies. Touching weekly tenancies, some landlords are receiving no rent at all, others have granted a reduction, while, as I say, a third class or section have increased their rents. If we are to have that equality of sacrifice, about which we have heard so much, we ought to take decisive steps to put these rentals on a common footing. The member for Brownhill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) said that in his district rents had been seriously increased, despite the fact that the whole of the community of the State is going through extremely difficult times.

The Minister for Mines: It is scarcely fair to quote the instance of Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Nevertheless, I think there is no place in Australia where the people are not going through difficult times. There may be one or two places the people of which are not suffering as much as are those in other communities, but we do know that if men go to Kalgoorlie looking for work they will endeavour to secure a home in which to wait until finding opportunity for employment. Certainly we have been told that there are very serious increases in the rent formerly charged in the Kalgoorlie district. That aspect should be dealt with by the Government. Then we were given to understand that under certain legislation suitable action would be taken in regard to the banking institutions, if the Government were not satisfied with what was being done soon

after the passing of the emergency legislation. At this stage, to-day, we should be told whether the Government are satisfied with the actions of the banking institutions. If so, naturally the Government will take no further steps in that direction, but the Government if they are not satisfied should stand up to their obligations. In that event we should be told whether they are going to ask the House to pass further legislation dealing with the banking institutions and their interest charges. It is generally agreed that the people themselves are not satisfied with the attitude of the banks, and I think the time has arrived when we, as representatives of the people of Western Australia, should be given an opportunity to consider legislation which will bring the banks into line with other organisations. I am aware that the banks are popularly supposed to be doing wonderful work for the people of Australia, but I am aware also, or at all events I have a shrewd suspicion, that that work is being done at a profit to the banks. The next subject touched upon in the Governor's Speech is transport. Goodness only knows what that reference means, whether it means something to do with the railways, or the formation of a transport board, or the co-ordination of all methods of transport. We have nothing whatever to guide us in solving this problem. Then we have in the Speech a reference to the control of monopolies. Surely the people of Western Australia can be entrusted with what is in the minds of the Government regarding that control. From what I can gather from statements of various members of the Government, they are divided in their opinions as to what should be done. It is not fair either to members or to the people of the State that, some day during the session, the Government will suddenly make up their minds and bring down a Bill which will then be put through Parliament without proper consideration. The Government should have sufficient faith to confide in the people as to their intentions regarding broad general questions. It would not be too much to ask the Government at this stage to tell us broadly just what their attitude is towards lotteries, and who is to reap the benefit of the money contributed by the public in the building up of those lotteries. Then we have in the Speech a bare word in regard to elections. That is a subject in which members of Parliament and the people of the

State also are extremely interested. We do not know what this reference means. It might mean that the Government are seriously considering the prolongation of Parliament.

Hon. A. McCallum: Or the abolition of Parliament.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Yes, or the abolition of this House, or of the Government, or of voting by secret ballot, or of the giving of effect to the representations of the people's representatives in Parliament, or perhaps an alteration of the day on which elections are held, or the amendment of the provisions for postal voting, or even perhaps an intention to increase the number of members. We do not know what is in the minds of the Government, and it is only right that we and the people should have some indication of what will be the effect of the Government's proposals. In fairness to the people of this State, the Speech should at least indicate what the Government are thinking of doing in that respect. The Speech does not give the faintest indication of any principles which are to be altered or amended in regard to legislation. Most people meet in assemblies or conferences or congresses, and at the first of their sittings they are given in the agenda paper clear indications as to the business to be considered. Something of that kind should be afforded us in Parliament also. When Parliament has been called together for the purpose of dealing with industrial and economic questions and the social life of the State, there should be given in the Speech some indication of what is proposed, so that we might know the effect it is likely to have on the general life of the community. We should be able to gather an idea as to the principles of the proposed legislation. Not infrequently have we passed Bills having a more or less important bearing on people at a distance from Perth, and those people have had no opportunity whatever to consult their respective members regarding that legislation. That is unfair. It might be only a comparatively small matter, but the proposed amendment should be indicated to the people at the beginning of the session. Both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, when speaking dealt with finance. I do not wish to say much about it, but I must remind the House that, apart from unemployment, the factor that has most effect on our financial position is that of exchange.

The Premier, in reply to a question by the member for Victoria Park (Mr. Raphael), said that last year we had paid in interest overseas £2,200,000.

Mr. H. W. Mann: It is a bit staggering.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Yes, but I do not know whether that includes the exchange. If not, it means that our interest bill is increased by over half a million more than the figures given. If that be so, it is of considerable importance to the people of Australia to know what action the Government propose to take, either as a Government or through the Loan Council or some other authoritative source, to ease the burden of the payment of exchange. Of course the exchange benefits our industries, particularly our primary industries, because it enables the producers to get a greater amount of Australian currency for their produce than they would if the exchange were at par. By that means our pastoralists probably are getting 7d. or 8d. per lb. for their wool whereas without the exchange they would receive only 6d. per lb.

Mr. Patrick: It raises the price of gold also.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Yes, it increases the price of every commodity.

The Minister for Lands: Everything that is exported.

Hon. J. C. WILLCOCK: Yes. The burden of exchange has a hampering effect on Government finance. Even in this comparatively small State, on the figures given by the Premier, we have to find at least half a million of additional money by taxation or otherwise to pay exchange on interest commitments in London. We have heard a lot about Mr. Bruce's negotiations to convert the Australian loan falling due in Britain a few months hence. While that may be important, it will not make such a wonderful difference to us. Everyone realises that the loan will have to be converted, that Australia has not the money with which to pay the £13,000,000 due in November, but conversion will make a difference of only about £130,000 a year. If we were able to obtain new money in England to the amount of £13,000,000, it would make a difference of about £3,250,000 by way of exchange. We would have money in Britain to meet our commitments and would not have to pay the huge sum for exchange that we are now paying. To use the vernacular, there is money to burn in Britain. Every issue of British financial papers shows there is a huge sum of money

awaiting investment. The bank rate is down to 2 per cent. If there was any shortage of money, the rate would go up, just as prices go up when there is a shortage of other commodities. As there is plenty of money in Britain, Australia should point out the immense advantage that would accrue at present if Britain made available some money with which we could carry on. Every member knows that during the last two or three years of stress arrangements have been made almost invariably with people in difficulties to capitalise their interest payments. If the interest payments due to Britain during the next couple of years were capitalised—that is, if we were allowed a couple of years in which to pay—Australia would save £7,000,000 a year. It is true that the export industries benefit by the high exchange rate, but such excessive burdens are being imposed upon Governments by the exchange that considerable sums of money are taken from industry by taxation to meet those obligations. I am sure the country is not receiving any benefit from the high exchange, but people are being taxed in order that relief may be afforded to export industries. That is quite right, but if we were permitted to capitalise overseas interest payments during the next year or two—it would not be an inordinate request to make—we would save £7,000,000 a year. That would be something worth striving for. Members have pointed out what Great Britain has done for foreign countries, such as Germany, Austria, Greece; huge amounts of debt have been remitted. I believe Italy has received a remission of 82 per cent., and other countries have ranged as high as 68 per cent. Would it be unreasonable for the people of Australia to ask that, during a time of depression and distress, the interest should be capitalised for a couple of years? If a spirit of forbearance had not been exercised during the last two years hundreds of thousands of producers would have gone to the wall. If we could do the fair thing by them in their difficulties, it should not be too much to ask Britain to show us similar forbearance. The Premier agrees that we have been able to meet internal interest commitments only by inflation. Funded deficits and the floating debt amount to about £18,000,000, all of which has been met by inflation. The Premier has discussed the whole ramifications of finance at Premiers' Conferences and Loan Council meetings, and he admits that inflation has been indulged in. The trouble is

that the banks have found the money and are making a profit out of it. Real money has not been found; it is only manufactured credit, and this has been utilised by the banks for their own immediate profit. The inspired propaganda issued by banking institutions dwells upon the great national service done for Australia by the banks in finding the money to meet Government needs. As I said, the money is not provided; it is manufactured credit out of which the banks are making a profit. If a Government attempt to do anything along similar lines, it is condemned as a national calamity, an end to financial stability, jeopardising the whole structure of civilisation. The greatest national service that could accrue to any country would be to place control of currency and credit in the hands of the Government, subject to the advice of an independent board, if necessary, thus ensuring that the profit made from manufactured credit or manipulated currency went to the people rather than to the shareholders of banks. A scare is invariably raised when anyone attempts to do anything in the interests of the people as a whole. When the Commonwealth Bank was inaugurated and the printing of notes was taken over from the trading banks and made a function of Government, critics declared that such a step would be detrimental to the interests of the country. Yet no detriment has resulted, and the large amount of profit formerly made by the banks has been retained for the people and used for the reduction of the national debt. Similar action should be taken in respect to other forms of currency, cheques and Treasury bills. Any profit arising from manufactured credit belongs to the people of Australia and should go to them, not to the shareholders of banks. The propaganda issued by the banks disgusts me, especially when I recall that the people responsible for it are making money out of it. The Premier stated last night that he would be glad to see an increase of importations into Australia. I suppose he meant that he would be glad to see Australia doing more trade with other countries of the world. It might be desirable to trade with other countries, but we have some responsibility to the people of Australia to build up industries of our own. As far as is economically possible, we should manufacture sufficient to make the country almost self-contained. Some people say that this is a country of

primary production, and that we should concentrate on primary production, but no country that restricted itself to primary production ever became really great. No country has emerged from the stage of infancy until it embarked upon secondary industries. Before Great Britain became industrialised, it was a comparatively poor country. The United States, 140 or 150 years ago, were not nearly so important commercially or so wealthy as Australia is to-day, and yet during that period the United States, by a policy of industrial expansion, has become the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world. If we want to build Australia into a great country and provide opportunities for our children, we must concentrate upon making it self-contained, at least in respect of its own requirements. It is very desirable to trade with other countries, but we in Australia have all the things necessary with which to supply our own needs. All that is required is the stimulus and co-ordination of money, work and people. Potentially Australia occupies a position not inferior to that of the United States 150 years ago, but unless we concentrate on the industrialisation of the country and give every encouragement to industry we shall remain an infant among the nations and not accomplish much for the generations that come after us. I cannot agree with the Premier that we should set about importing a lot of things from other countries. What we should do is to build up our own industries, and so to a large extent become self-contained. We might import our requirements of those things which can be manufactured to much better advantage in other countries, but generally speaking we should do all we can to build up industries of our own. I agree that we should, in the immediate future, endeavour to take advantage of any possibilities that exist for the development of agriculture and allied primary industries. The world is a hungry place. Foodstuffs will not always be produced at a loss and prices will eventually come right. We should make preparations for the exploitation of our own country so that we may be in a position to take advantage of that improvement. In that regard I wish specially to mention an area of land in my own electorate. The Minister for Lands knows it and was immensely impressed by what he saw of it. I am also glad to know the Premier is suffi-

ciently imbued with the importance of the area to say that he is prepared to visit it in the near future. This area consists of 400,000 acres of excellent agricultural land within approximately 80 miles of the port of Geraldton. It possesses a warm and genial climate, a plentiful rainfall, ensuring good and early seasons, no salt, and no poison of any consequence, and clearing is very inexpensive. There is everything that could be desired in any new agricultural belt, and it is only awaiting development to be turned to profitable use. We should prepare for the time when we shall be able to sell our primary products at improved prices. I am sure that in this particular area there will be no difficulty about development and about putting the land to good use. The member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) has some knowledge of the area, and many other members have also seen it. I know of no other belt of country within reasonable distance of a port that can be opened up and developed at anything like the cost of this one. From experience that has already been gained, I am sure this land will produce excellent crops of good quality grain. When it is opened up it will add immensely to the productive value of that part of the State. I do not know that many people will be anxious just now to take up virgin land, but this can be opened up by roads and cleared so that when the time arrives for people to want land it will be waiting for them. An area such as this should not be reserved for migrants. Never again shall I favour migration or lend any support to any migration scheme, no matter how favourable it may seem to be and no matter what advantages it may seem to offer to the State. Whenever a silver lining appears in the cloud the Premier, instead of wondering what he can do for our own people, rushes off to make such arrangement as he can to bring new people into the country. Our job is to make things so attractive by building up our own State that people will come here of their own accord. If we can show that there is a distinct advantage to be gained by those who are prepared to work, they will come here readily enough. Our most prosperous time was when people were coming from the Eastern States to exploit our gold-mining industry. They paid their own passage money over, were glad to come here, and worked hard when they arrived. That had a tremendous effect in building up the State. Last century Victoria and New South Wales were not

built up by assisted migration, but by a virile people who went there from all parts of the world because they knew there would be a reward for their industry. Furthermore, they went there of their own accord. We should build up the conditions of work and labour so that people may be attracted to the State, and we should not pay them to come here. Under such a system we should be doing a good job for our own people as well as for those who elect to make their homes with us. If the Government are prepared to give a fair deal to all the people of the State during the coming session, I shall not be one to offer any carping criticism. If, however, they continue as they have in the past two years, to place an unduly large proportion of the existing burden upon the working classes, I shall do all I can to harass them and prevent them from doing those things. The working population, including the farmers, have not been given that measure of justice and consideration at the hands of the Government which has been meted out to other people. If that sort of thing continues, I shall not give support of any kind to the Government. To get my support they will have to alter their policy of making the workers carry a tremendously large proportion of our existing difficulties.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.23]: It is natural that during the last session of this Parliament the Governor's Speech should put forward the best possible aspects relating to the affairs of the country. The Government have had little else to congratulate themselves over during the recess than the propaganda they have issued in their favour, in anticipation of coming events. The Premier is a past master at propaganda. He is always lecturing and offering advice, and employing other people to do things, but doing nothing himself. No Premier of Western Australia has ever been guilty of such a great amount of propaganda as Sir James Mitchell has been guilty of in the life of the present Parliament. The achievements of the Government are not many, but the Government have been very industrious in respect to propaganda, particularly in the Nationalist Press. The Speech does contain the admission that there was a deficit last year of £1,557,000. This is excused on the ground that it was almost wholly made up of exchange, £620,000, and unemployment relief £643,000. The exchange rate is not

a vital handicap to the Government. Although they have to pay a considerable amount of exchange in the discharge of debts abroad, the Government would not receive nearly as much in taxation as they get now, but for the exchange and the benefit that it is to the primary producers. Last year wheat brought 3s. 4d. a bushel. There was a bounty of 4½d., so that this year taxation will be paid by quite a number of farmers who otherwise would not be doing so. It is possible there will be returned to the Government a considerable sum as a result of the existing exchange rate. Some explanation is required of the Government regarding the expenditure on unemployment relief. They were pledged to find work and opportunity for all. That was the one policy on which the Premier depended for his return to power. He must now give some explanation because the pledge, the most important one that could be given to the people and the one upon which the Government were able to occupy seats on the Treasury bench, was not kept. During the recess members supporting the present Government were at great pains to explain why those promises had not been kept. They declared that the Premier would never have made such promises had he known the condition of the finances, that it was due to his ignorance concerning the position that he made the promises. There are two replies to that. The Premier was an ex-Premier of the State and he was also Leader of the Opposition. If he did not know the position he was not the man to fill the office of Premier, or even that of an ordinary member. Every other member of the House knew about it. If he did not know it there is another answer, namely, that he was told by the Leader of the Opposition at the last general election. The Leader of the Opposition told the people how matters stood, but the Premier strenuously denied the statement. The Premier maintained there was plenty of money in the country but that the administration was wrong. Now we have the whining cry that they did not know things were so bad. It is a fact that the finances of the State and of the Commonwealth are in a serious condition. It is only by the maintenance of the tariff, by reductions in salaries and wages, by appealing to people to make great sacrifices, and by the imposition of heavy and crushing taxation by the Commonwealth and State Governments, which have practically taxed the shirts off our backs, that the Premier has

been able to get within £1,560,000 of balancing the Budget.

Hon. P. Collier: After passing five additional taxing Bills.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. Every possible means of taxing the people has been adopted. Yet, with all that, the Government have only got within £1,577,000 of balancing the Budget. The Leader of the Opposition says the Government have imposed additional taxation. Of course they have. They have imposed a hospital tax, which, in my opinion, is a delusion, a snare and a fraud. They promised the people that they would get certain benefits from this tax. Immediately it had been imposed, the benefits were taken away, so that the people got nothing. In the first instance, they were getting hospital treatment; now they get none. They have to be paupers before they get treatment: they cannot get it as long as they have a pound in the bank.

The Minister for Lands: That statement is not correct.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Government have got fully £100,000 additional taxation out of the people to meet hospital subsidies which previously were paid out of revenue. The Government have increased taxation on cheques by no less than 100 per cent. All that is carried by the people of this country. It is not carried by the business men, but passed on to the people, who cannot afford it. The Government have increased dividend duties. Even the Act relating to firearms, which was passed in order to give the Commissioner of Police power to regulate the use of guns in this country, has been made a taxing measure, imposing the exorbitant license fee of 5s. Many a poor man depending on a ration of kangaroo and damper has to pay a license fee of 5s. The House would never have passed that Bill had members known that the measure was to be a taxing measure. It is true the Government wiped out land tax on agricultural and pastoral areas, but they raised railway rates on many of the goods required by farmers. This was a shrewd move on the part of the Government, because the farmer cannot pay the land tax. The farmer cannot pay either land tax or vermin tax, but he has to pay the railway rates which have been increased by 15 per cent. In addition, the Government have put further burdens on

the farmers. They have abolished the flat rates by which the farmer was able to sell his potatoes and his wheat direct to consumers in the country. The farmer now has to send his products to Perth, and sell them here in competition. Previously the farmers had large numbers of customers in the country. Those customers have been wiped out by the abolition of the railway concessions in question. The Government have thus prevented the producer and the consumer from coming together. No vermin tax has been collected. The Government know the farmer cannot pay either land or vermin tax. However, he must pay the additional railway rates. I have paid those rates to the Railway Department, and therefore I know. The farmer is penalised in that way, and so is every other producer in the country. Let me point out that all these taxes are not paid by business men. The stamp tax, which has been increased by 100 per cent., is not paid by business men but is passed on to the community. It can be said that the working community, including farmers and pastoralists, has to carry the whole burden of taxation. The same remark applies to taxation through the Customs; it is all passed on by the commercial community. The people who build up the country bear the whole of the burden. This is how the present Government have administered the country in the pretended interests of the people. The Governor's Speech would have stated the facts correctly had it quoted the "Statistical Abstract." The Governor's Speech is not a remarkable document. I was not present when it was delivered, but I read in the Press that it breathes a spirit of optimism. All one gets from the present Government is optimism. Sir James is a professional optimist, an optimist as a politician; but he is not a practical optimist. The Governor's Speech stated that the Government had had regard to the maintenance of the progress of the country. True, we have had an excellent season. There has not been a bad season since 1914, a wonderful record which I hope will be maintained. The yield of wheat, which fell off as against the previous year, is being largely maintained. But the progress of this country in the past has been due to land settlement and development, and land settlement has

fallen off appallingly. The figures show that in 1928 there was approved, to applicants, land to the extent of 2,615,000 acres. In 1929 the area was 1,835,000 acres. In 1931 it was only 702,000. For the six months of this year it is only 234,000 acres. During the present Government's term of office land settlement has fallen off by a million acres. If we take into consideration the approvals passed of pastoral and special leases, the figures become still worse. In 1928 there was approved for applicants of all lands 12,563,000 acres, and in 1929 the area approved was 13,879,000. In 1930, when the present Government came into office, the area was 4,215,000, or a falling-off of some 9,000,000 acres in land applied for. For the half-year in 1931, the area approved was 1,500,000 acres. These figures indicate that progress as regards land settlement is at an end in this country. One need only go to the Lands Department to realise that. All enterprise and activity are dead in the department. The departmental offices are as quiet as a morgue, absolutely nothing is doing in them. The figures of the Government Statistician show that nothing can be doing. Were it not for the fact that during the administration of the Collier Government millions of acres were taken up and thousands of settlers put on the land, this State could not have had the wheat and wool production it has to-day.

The Minister for Agriculture: There was a vast difference in commodity prices when you were in office.

Hon. M. F. TROY: But we financed all the people we put on the land. The only reason why wheat and wool figures are being maintained is that those properties are productive. Even the group settlements, which are now approaching their tenth year of establishment, are in a desperate state. No progress is being made; the settlements are going back; the Government even have settlers milking 12 cows on sustenance of £2 per week, while other settlers are being denied any assistance whatever. The group settlements are in a state of muddle, discontent, and absolute despair. The Royal Commission have recommended a further reduction in value, and the State has already written down the valuations 50 per cent. The Premier has had charge of group settlement for three years, and this is the unhappy result. The falling-off in land settlement and

production and development is indicated by the fact that although Sir James Mitchell is always boasting secondary production, we although his lieutenant, Mr. Scaddan, is always boasting secondary production, we have actually imported more foodstuffs from the Eastern States this year than we did last year. The importation of foodstuffs from the Eastern States for the 12 months ended on 30th June, 1931, amounted to a value of £6,819,000, and the importation for the 12 months ended on 30th June, 1932, to £7,532,000, or approximately £700,000 in excess of the preceding year.

The Minister for Lands: Do you mean that those figures represent foodstuffs?

Hon. M. F. TROY: I shall give the commodities in a moment. They include foodstuffs. The Minister can consult the "Statistical Abstract" for himself, and see the facts. Really, the figures indicate a greater increase, because the values of the commodities have fallen. The values were less in the last financial year than they were in the preceding financial year, and thus the people of this country have actually imported a greater quantity of Eastern States goods than that indicated by the figures. With all the boosting, therefore, Western Australia is now importing more from the Eastern States than it did 12 months ago. Despite the expenditure of nearly £10,000,000 on group settlements we imported, for the 12 months ended on 30th June of this year, butter to the value of £236,000, cheese to the value of £90,000, eggs—I hope the member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) will bear this in mind—to the value of £6,000, fish to the value of £27,000, bacon and hams to the value of £68,000, milk and cream to the value of £143,000, and other animal products to the value of £36,000; making a grand total of £626,000.

The Minister for Lands: Now tell us the excess of exports.

Hon. M. F. TROY: These figures represent what was imported. We do not export to the Eastern States. Importation from the Eastern States this year is £700,000 more in respect of these and other commodities than it was last year.

The Attorney General: But is not that circumstance created by the reduction of imports from overseas?

Hon. M. F. TROY: I recommend the Minister to look up the "Statistical Abstract."

Milk, butter, cheese, eggs, bacon and hams are imported from the Eastern States. As regards secondary industries we have imported from the Eastern States during the last 12 months biscuits to the value of £11,000, confectionery to the value of £168,000, dried fruits to the value of £32,000, preserved fruit to the value of £49,000, oatmeal and wheatmeal to the value of £19,000, jams and jellies to the value of £138,000, pickles and sauces to the value of £37,000, and other foodstuffs to the value of £159,000; or a total of approximately £615,000 in those secondary commodities. This is the result after all the boasting by the Premier and the Minister for Industries with regard to the production of Western Australia. The failure of the Government programme in this respect—and it represents their only programme—is indicated by the fact of this great increase in the importation of commodities which could be produced in this country, a total increase of about £700,000. Some excuse might be offered if the population of Western Australia had increased meantime. If the population of this country had increased considerably, there might be some excuse for this huge importation. But the population has not latterly increased to any extent at all. In fact, our population has decreased by emigration. People have left Western Australia while the present Government have been in office.

The Minister for Agriculture: What has become of our increased production?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Production, apparently has not increased. The hon. member can consult the "Statistical Abstract," and he will find that the facts I am giving cannot be denied. They were published in the "Abstract" issued a few days ago. The population of this country in 1930 was approximately 418,000, and in 1932 it was 4,000 greater. But we actually lost by emigration. Whereas in 1930 the excess of departures over arrivals was 1,583, in 1931 it was 3,863. For the first quarter of the present year the excess of departures over arrivals was 1,150. So we have lost by emigration over 6,000 people, and if it were not for the excess of births over deaths this country would have made no progress whatever. In 1929 the excess of births over deaths was 5,121; in 1930 it was 5,426; in 1931 it was 4,868; and for the half-year ended 30th June, 1932, it was 2,260. Thus the birth rate has fallen off. No fewer than

6,000 people have left the country, and we have made no progress whatever in spite of all the boasting, advertising and pretending on the part of the Government. I should like to have an explanation of the position.

The Minister for Lands: There is another side; you have not told the people that the State is exporting butter, eggs and bacon.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I will come to that now. The Governor's Speech does not contain any of these facts at all. We are told that interstate and overseas imports, which in 1929-30 amounted to £18,781,000, were reduced last year by almost £8,000,000, and this year the value of imports was still further reduced to £10,656,000. But the Government are not responsible for that. As a matter of fact it was the Scullin Government that were responsible. They brought about that state of affairs.

The Minister for Lands: You know that the people have not had the money to spend.

Hon. M. F. TROY: We are told that all this is the result of the present Government's administration, but we know that it was the Scullin Government that imposed an embargo on the importation of luxuries. So it is the high tariff and embargoes as well as the incapacity of the people to buy, that is responsible for the present position. It is not due at all to any Act of the present State Government. The Governor's Speech also tell us that the value of the overseas exports from Australia for the past year was £16 per head of the population, and that the overseas export of Western Australia amounted to £37 per head, which is twice as much as that of the next highest State. Of course gold is included, but all the same the figures are misleading. They do not indicate the position at all. They only indicate that we are obliged to export because our own consumption is so limited. It is mentioned that the next highest State to ours in the matter of exports is Queensland. But Queensland has sugar production which is equal to our wool production, and the sugar is all consumed in Australia. In addition to sugar, Queensland produces bananas, pineapples, peanuts, broom millet, while the States of New South Wales and Victoria have large home markets. If we had a market like Sydney, we should not be looking for markets or making an endeavour to export frozen lambs. The only

reason why we export is that we are obliged to do so. We cannot consume our products, and therefore we must export.

Hon. P. Collier: Those remarks in the Governor's Speech prove nothing.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Why there should be all that verbiage in the Governor's Speech I do not know. It may be a pretence—a desire to show that the Government have done something, whereas they have done nothing. I have no objection to the statement made that one of the brightest features in the State's development is the condition of the gold mining industry. I admit that that is so, but the Mitchell Government are not in any way responsible for it.

Hon. P. Collier: It is forging ahead in spite of them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The industry that can absorb so many men and afford opportunities that are denied to them by other industries, is goldmining. Yet we find that it receives but scant attention at the hands of the Government. The Government can give the man on the land 30s. a week, but they cannot give the prospectors even £1 a week. I do not blame the Minister for Mines; I blame the Premier, because I know he will not provide any money. At the same time the Government are spending hundreds of thousands of pounds on works that are not necessary. The Government have refused to encourage an industry where the opportunities are so great to-day. The industry is particularly sound because of the high price of gold, the exchange and the bonus that is being paid by the Federal Government. Incidentally, the Labour Government were largely responsible for the bonus. Again I should like to ask who was responsible for the loan of £80,000 to the Sons of Gwalia mine which enabled that property to be developed to its present extent? The Government of which Mr. Collier was the head granted that loan. Who was responsible for the position the Wiluna mine occupies to-day? Who stood behind the Wiluna company, guaranteeing it to the extent of £300,000? At the last elections the Premier said that the Labour Government had not considered the people at all. The revival of the goldmining industry was largely the result of the administration of the Collier Government.

During the time the Labour Government were in office, we helped the goldmining industry to the extent of no less a sum than £509,000. If the present Government remained in office for a hundred years they would never spend a fourth of that total. And, I remind the House, that that £509,000 does not include the £300,000 guaranteed the Wiluna company. But for that guarantee, Wiluna would not be what it is to-day. Reference is made in the Governor's Speech, and in my opinion properly made, to the unemployment difficulty now existing. We have to admit that there are between 13,000 and 16,000 men who might be said to be out of work—in work to-day and out of work to-morrow. The Government have been giving these men a few days' work a week and telling the country that all are employed. Thousands of the unemployed are hard-working men who owned their homes and were paying them off, at the same time bringing up their families. Many of them have lost their homes, and their furniture has found its way to the auction marts. Those people have no prospects at all to-day. They have been denied and are still being denied sustenance. That kind of thing is no credit at all to the present Government. During the debate last week the Minister for Works declared that there were many more men at work now than there were during the administration of the Labour Government. It astounds me that the Minister was able to make such a statement in this House. I could understand his making it in the country where perhaps it would pass unnoticed. He knows well that during the administration of the Public Works Department by Mr. McCallum there was constant work, not weeks or months of it, but work for a year or more. Yet he declares, and in this House too, that more men are employed to-day than were employed during the administration of the Collier Government. I cannot understand how any man could say such a thing. There is something morally wrong about the whole assertion. I can understand a man taking the risk of making such a statement outside, but when he makes it in this House, I can only say that there is something wrong with his make-up. The Minister made that statement not only in this House, but he made it when he opened the South-West conference some time

back. He told the people there what he was doing. He was reported as follows:—

Referring to the reduction of expenditure on Government departments, Mr. Lindsay said that only one person could bring that about—the Minister in charge. He happened to be the Minister in charge and the previous Government had two Ministers doing the work he did now. "I am proud of what I have done in my department," Mr. Lindsay continued.

The Minister in charge is the great "I am" in this case. He told the conference that he happened to be the Minister controlling the Public Works Department, and that the previous Government had two Ministers doing the work that he alone was doing now! This giant! This extraordinary man!

Mr. Millington: Who is the man?

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister for Works, who says, "I am the only man."

Hon. P. Collier: He is the Bill Adams of the Government.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Members will notice in all the Minister's statements the prevalence of the pronoun "I." He says, "I am proud of what I have done, and what I am doing." What is he proud of? Is it that he is doing the work of two Ministers who were there before him? "I am proud" he tells us. "I," "I," "I." It is all "I."

Hon. P. Collier: His "I's" are as big as the wireless station at Applecross.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, all "I's," and I wish "Hansard" to emphasise that.

The Minister for Lands: You are emphasising it sufficiently.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister also told the South-West conference—

"I have reduced the cost by 45 per cent. It costs £135,000 less than it did previously." His department had reduced taxation by £80,000 and he claimed to have more men employed with a third the amount of loan money available.

He could employ more men with a third of the money available! What an extraordinary chap he is! Not only can he do more than two men, but he can employ many more men, with one-third of the amount his predecessor had at his disposal!

Hon. P. Collier: Why not make him Treasurer and let him find money for everything?

Hon. M. F. TROY: There is, seemingly, no need for any of the other Ministers in the Cabinet, for the Minister for Works can do more than two men formerly did! The Agricultural Department is non est, so to speak, but, on the other hand, the Minister

for Mines is a busy man. The Chief Secretary has not much to do, and as for the Premier, we can agree that he is useful. He can be retained, perhaps, for advertising purposes as a propagandist. He certainly fills that role, and it is the only one he does fill. So we may well ask: What are the other Ministers doing? Here we have this astounding man, this astonishing character—the Minister for Works! We are particularly lucky in this, our day of trial and tribulation that we have a man of his capacity. What a farce it is! A few years will pass and people will say, "Lindsay? Who was he? Was that the name of a Minister for Works at one time?" What is the use of all his talk? He may say things like I have quoted at the South-West Conference, but it is puerile for him to make such assertions in this Chamber. It is absurd to tell us that with what is at his disposal now he has been able to employ more men than did his predecessor, the member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum). It is utterly wrong to make such statements.

The Minister for Lands: It is very annoying, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: His proneness to make such statements does not raise him in the estimation of members of this Chamber. It may serve a purpose now and again, but that sort of conduct will not stand him in good stead, and the sooner he refrains from such a course, the better it will be for him. The other evening the Minister for Works attacked the member for South Fremantle, and stated that that hon. member, when Minister for Works, had had £100,000 at his disposal, but would not utilise it to find work for the unemployed. Although he made that statement at the South-West Conference, his assertion was contrary to what he said at Beacon Rock. At that centre he and the Chief Secretary, Mr. Baxter, attacked the Labour Government, and said they had not left a penny in the Treasury.

The Minister for Lands: But I understand that £100,000 represented trust funds for use on road work. It was no good to the Treasurer.

Hon. P. Collier: It was good for the country, in helping to find work for the unemployed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I will leave the Minister for Works, and will say no more about him.

The Minister for Lands: It is just as well; there may be something more to say on his part.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The fact is the Minister for Works has not employed more men than did his predecessor. During the recess I saw about 150 men camped at my siding. Their condition was pitiful and deplorable. I could not help them very much, for I have no power. They were living, some with their wives and children, in little bits of camps; they were suffering from various ailments, and no medical attention was available.

The Minister for Lands: The men were employed under exactly the same conditions as you employed them.

Hon. A. McCallum: But they received from us a full week's wages.

The Minister for Lands: The wage conditions are different, but the general conditions are the same.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The people I refer to did not have even the necessities of life. No hardship is imposed through having to live in tents during portions of the year, but it is a different matter during the summer months when, in addition to the heat and the dust, they suffer from the lack of other requirements. Those people had to live in their flimsy tents month after month, and suffer the effects of heat, flies and dust.

The Minister for Lands: Just as they did when you were in office. I saw them in the same district on road work when you were a Minister.

Hon. M. F. TROY: No Minister has any right to go to the country and tell the people that he has employed men as the Minister for Works asserted, and claim that the conditions are all right.

Hon. P. Collier: The wages the men receive do not enable them to clothe themselves properly. Two days' work will not permit them to do so.

The Minister for Lands: Those men must be single men.

Hon. P. Collier: They were.

The Minister for Lands: But the member for Mt. Magnet talked about wives and children.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Many of them were married. I have seen distress in other parts of Australia and have met thousands of men tramping New South Wales in search of work. I have never before seen men in such

a deplorable condition as those I refer to at my siding.

The Minister for Lands: At any rate, this State is the best of the lot just now.

Hon. A. McCallum: Nonsense.

The Minister for Lands: I say that it is.

Hon. A. McCallum: What about the position in South Australia?

The Minister for Lands: The Queensland Government provide one day's wages a week, which is 15s. 7d., and give them one day's sustenance the next week at 6s., making an average of about 11s. a week.

Opposition members: Where did you hear that?

The Minister for Lands: I read the statement in the "Australian Worker," your paper.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I do not think that information is correct, but the facts could be obtained from the Queensland Government, who will supply the information.

Hon. P. Collier: But the Queensland Government have been in office for 25 minutes only.

The Minister for Lands: I know the conditions are new, but I took the "Australian Worker" as an authority.

Several members interjected.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mt. Magnet has the floor.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I sympathise with the difficulties of the Government, but Ministers have no right to attend public meetings and tell the people that everything is all right. Everything is not all right when we have people suffering conditions such as I have referred to. No other section of the community has suffered as they have. Most people have made sacrifices and some have had to give up extravagances, which has been good for them. Those people, however, have never been short of the necessities of life. On the other hand, workers, such as those I have referred to in the employ of the Government, are in a miserable condition.

Mr. Millington: Statements that everything is all right must be misleading to the Loan Council.

Hon. M. F. TROY: According to the Governor's Speech, the emergency legislation in connection with the Premiers' Plan is to be re-enacted. This legislation was introduced to bring about national convalescence and as an alternative to inflation. The Premiers' Plan has not achieved national

convalescence, nor has it proved an alternative to inflation. There certainly has not been inflation to the extent of £18,000,000 as proposed by Mr. Theodore, but rather to the extent of £80,000,000.

Hon. P. Collier: It is over £80,000,000 now.

The Minister for Lands: Part of that authorisation was while Mr. Theodore was Treasurer.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Government members will bear with me while I remind them that their party unanimously condemned inflation as a disastrous policy that was likely to prove a disturbing factor in the future of Australia. Of course, the banks have been able to find money for Governments because they have been able to make a profit out of it. In January last, the floating debt of Australia had risen from £5,000,000 in 1929 to £78,000,000.

Hon. P. Collier: And it is now £84,000,000.

The Minister for Lands: You know what the explanation was. That was the last year they floated any loan.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That has been the increase in the floating debt.

The Minister for Lands: Now tell us what was the increased capital debt during the previous five years.

Hon. P. Collier: It was nothing like that.

The Minister for Lands: Yes, it was.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Premier's Plan was said to hold out some prospect of improvement, but it has not affected that result at all. The people are taxed overwhelmingly to-day and hundreds of thousands are out of work. The Governments of Australia will have to find some other means by which the situation may be met. The other evening the Leader of the Opposition spoke of the propaganda indulged in by Mr. E. W. De Rose and other members of the Perth Chamber of Commerce, in favour of the present Government. That propaganda is easy of explanation. It is not in prosperous times that such a body would help the Government to effect economies, and to eradicate certain phases of extravagance. But when times are difficult, taxation must be imposed and must be passed on to the people. The members of the Chamber of Commerce do not pay stamp duty or other forms of taxation; they pass the imposts on to the general community. They make pro-

vision for the taxation that is imposed and, therefore, that taxation has no effect upon them at all. They do not have to go without anything in order to make ends meet. They still have their homes and what they require. Their assets may not be worth quite so much as formerly, but they have every hope that those assets will regain their value in a few years' time. They can afford to be complacent about the situation and congratulate the Government upon what they have done. Those people know what a change of Government will mean to them. They know that the Labour Government would not be able to achieve everything for the people, but that we would temper the wind to the shorn lamb. Take the position in the Federal arena. Mr. Scullin was not acceptable to people of the type I have referred to, but he would have been acceptable if he had been content to do as Mr. Lyons has done. Mr. Scullin endeavoured to protect the masses, and so he had to be set aside. Members of the Chamber of Commerce and others like them are not fools. They know that if a Labour Government assumed power, we, too, would endeavour to protect the masses. They know that we would impose greater burdens upon their interests, and so they are anxious to stick to their own crowd. So the propaganda Mr. De Rose and others have indulged in is quite intelligible, because those gentlemen are looking after their own interests. Despite the depression, the banks are still paying dividends and big outside concerns, like the "West Australian" Newspapers, Ltd., are paying dividends on an immense capitalisation. All the farmers and pastoralists throughout the State have had to reduce their capitalisation, and where their properties may formerly have been valued at £80,000 or £10,000, they now are valued at £15,000 or £2,000, as the case may be. On the other hand, the big concerns that have been floated on an immense capitalisation, which was entirely wrong, are still able to pay their dividends, and no wonder the Press and commercial interests are able to say that the present conditions are unavoidable, that the people must be content with what is being done for them, and that the Government are doing the best they can. In indulging in such propaganda, the Press and Mr. De Rose are merely looking after their own business. I do not suggest that the Labour Government would be

a menace to those interests but, on the other hand, those people know that a Labour Government would look after the whole of the people, and do what was possible to prevent burdens being passed on to the masses. They would endeavour to see that taxation, both State and Federal, including primary duty and sales tax, was not all passed on to the general public. To-day the public have to shoulder that burden and no wonder Mr. De Rose and his friends are anxious that the present Government shall be retained in office.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Before tea I was speaking of the propaganda indulged in by Mr. De Rose and the Perth Chamber of Commerce in favour of the present Government. I said there was nothing remarkable in the commendation of the present Government by merchants and manufacturers and newspapers, because to a great extent those people had escaped the full consequences of the depression, had been able to carry on and will be found, many of them, still paying handsome dividends and evading a great deal of taxation. But we have arrived at the stage when a great number of other people are utterly impoverished, having lost their homes and their furniture and all their material prospects. The pastoralist's property has depreciated, and his difficulties have so greatly increased that it is wellnigh impossible for him to meet his obligations. The farmer, the pastoralist, the miner and the worker are all satisfied if, in these days, they can pay their way. It is an astounding state of affairs that the Government should permit that sort of thing to continue without making any special effort to come to the relief of those people. Still, it is not to be wondered at that some of those in the community who are still able to carry on and live comfortably should be in favour of the present Government. The Premier said the Government were not in favour of reducing wages. Still, we know that the self-same Government have deliberately assisted private employers to reduce wages. Some of the farmers were not paying more than 10s. a week to their hands, and still were not satisfied. A great many to whom I spoke expressed dissatisfaction at not being able to pay a fair rate. These farmers, or most of them, are of a very fair disposition. Of

course, when they go to their conferences the reactionaries amongst them take possession and so resolutions are passed to which many farmers are actually opposed. During the recent Legislative Council elections I spoke for Mr. Moore, now a member of that Chamber, and had no hesitation in putting forward my point of view in regard to maintaining fair wages, as being reasonable not only to the worker but also to the farmer. It has been said by the country section of the Primary Producers' Association that Mr. Moore was elected by the industrial section of his constituents. That was not so. He certainly received a majority of the votes of that section, but he secured also many votes from other sections. Mullewa, to a certain extent, is an industrial section, and there are in that district a number who are not entitled to the Legislative Council franchise.

The Minister for Lands: Can we take that statement as authentic? You say they are not entitled to vote for the Legislative Council.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is so. There were not very many of them, of course. I say those men ought to be entitled to vote. However, Mr. Moore got a large number of votes amongst the farmers. The Premier says the Government are not in favour of reducing wages, but we know that he amended the Arbitration Act when the cost of living was falling, in order that a more rapid reduction of wages might take place.

Hon. P. Collier: And the percentage reduction, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, that was the policy of the Government, so I do not understand the Premier saying he is not in favour of reducing wages. The position to-day is that, although the great mass of the people have made all the sacrifice that it is possible for them to make even now some of the States cannot pay their debts. The Commonwealth Government will balance their Budget this year, but only because of the extraordinary taxation and of the moratorium. In this State we have a deficit of £1,700,000. How are we going to balance the Budget next year? People cannot pay any more taxes, and so something must be done. What must be done is that we shall have to approach the British authorities, or the investors in England, in order to get a reduction in the interest on our debts. We are one of the few countries that are pay-

ing their interest. Many debtor nations in the world have defaulted, but we have not. If we read the comment in official English circles, in the Government and business circles, we find a note of pleased surprise that we should have been able to meet our obligations. I feel that now is the time to go to those people, and say we need a conversion loan in order to ensure our stability—which would be just what they themselves have done. That is something the Governments, Federal and State, ought to do, inasmuch as the Australian people cannot bear any more sacrifice. We cannot put any more men out of work, and this body of people, the unemployed, cannot live under existing conditions very much longer with no clothes, no comforts, and only two days' work per week. So we shall have to approach the investor for some relief in our payments. That is one of the things the Commonwealth Government should take up, and the Premier at the Loan Council should make every effort in support of that attitude. Our difficulties in Australia are partly of our own making. We have lived extravagantly, and successive Commonwealth Governments have been reckless in expenditure. Mr. Scullin's predecessors left him a very heavy burden, for they had a favourable trade balance only three times in 13 years. They bequeathed to him a considerable floating debt, and I think that in four years of office the Bruce-Page Government borrowed £72,000,000, while there was an adverse trade balance of £75,000,000. Mr. Scullin had to meet that position. Four or five years earlier he warned the then Government that disaster was ahead, and, singularly, he was the person to undertake the responsibility when the calamity came. It was extraordinary that the man who had pointed out the wrong course the country was pursuing should be the one who had to take the blame for the whole position.

Mr. Kenneally: And the man who, before the depression came, pleaded with them in Parliament, to mend their financial ways.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, years before the coming of the depression he said we were riding for disaster. We were then selling our commodities at the very highest price, and still we could not pay our debts. He declared that the course pursued was bound to be disastrous, and unfortunately he came into office just in time to take the conse-

quences. Mr. Bruce, one of the important Ministers of the present Commonwealth Federal Government, is very largely responsible for the disaster. When travelling to Sydney, several years ago, I was surprised to learn that the Federal Government, for sentimental reasons, and decided to hold occasionally Cabinet meeting in Sydney. That of course, would mean a special train for the Prime Minister and Ministers, and an army of retainers, something like the entourage of a baron in the Middle Ages. It is for that sort of thing we are paying to-day. Mr. Scullin had to face an impossible position, and he went down because he had to do difficult and obnoxious things in order to meet the situation. But our greatest difficulties are due to the colossal war debts and the loans raised after the war with a view to creating industry and finding employment for the peoples of the various countries. In consequence, the whole world finds to-day that it cannot meet its difficulties and bear the burden. So before we in this country can carry out any positive reconstruction, there must be a world reconstruction in which, of course, we must accept our part. Our Governments must govern wisely and carefully, and must be fair and sympathetic to all sections of the community. The merchant class, and the exploiting class, will get through all right, but already the great masses of the people are down and under. Never before in my life have we had such a condition of affairs. It cannot be allowed to continue. For what has happened in this country in that respect the present Government must take a fair share of responsibility. The people who made the Peace determined that Germany should pay the war debts. I remember attending a civic reception tendered to the Hon. W. Watt, then Treasurer of the Commonwealth, in the Perth Town Hall, when passing on his way to Britain to take part in some of the negotiations. He said he was going to Britain to collect Australia's share of the German indemnity, and he was cheered to the echo. To show how utterly impossible it was for Germany to pay, I wish to quote a statement extracted from an English journal which a friend showed me the other day. A conservative banker was responsible for the statement, which, had it been made eight or nine years ago, would not have been very

popular in England or in Australia. It read—

It is madness to assume that the German, British, French, and Italian nations are to remain in mortgage to the United States for three generations, because that is what war debts and reparations mean. Four very simple statements will put the whole business in a nutshell. The total amount of gold in the world is about £2,240,000,000, of which two-thirds is held by the United States and France. Germany has to pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ times all the gold in the world.

Germany cannot pay $2\frac{1}{2}$ times all the gold in the world, because Germany has very little gold, and the other nations do not want to be paid in goods and services, because they can provide the same goods and services for themselves.

Britain has to pay half as much gold as there is in the world.

Britain has not half the gold in the world. She has comparatively little gold compared with America and France.

Inter-Governmental war debts, excluding Russia, equal nearly five times as much gold as there is in the world, and more than twice as much as is known to have been discovered since history began.

Members will thus realise the impossibility of nations paying their debts in gold. The creditor nations do not want to be paid in goods and services; in fact they have raised trade barriers to prevent the importation of goods. That is why trade channels have become blocked; the nations have been trying to pay their debts, but they cannot pay them in gold and they are not permitted to pay them in goods.

The Attorney General: They cannot pay in goods, because the creditor nations will not take the goods.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The creditor nations produce similar goods, and, to prevent the flooding of their markets, have erected trade barriers. Unless we can cut ourselves off from the world entirely and live, as it were, within a Chinese wall, we in Australia cannot alter the situation. World reconstruction must first take place. These facts are becoming recognised. Conferences have recently been held, and it is now almost generally accepted that there is no possible hope of world populations carrying the burden of war debts. Again, the whole system of currency has broken down. Before the war a majority of the nations were on the gold standard. Since the war the South

American States, Mexico, India, and China have gone on the gold standard. Before the war there was not sufficient gold in the world to provide the gold standard. Of the world's gold France possesses £537,000,000 worth and the rest of the world, excluding the United States, but including Egypt and the continent of Africa £516,000,000 worth. There is no chance of nations operating on the gold standard. America possesses £839,000,000 worth of gold, and France and America combined have two-thirds of the world's gold. If nations operate on the gold currency, they must fail, because they have not the gold with which to carry on. Australian Governments have appointed a number of economists who are to show us the way of escape from our difficulties. There seems to be something sacred about an economist; we have a sort of reverence for him. If we read an article written by one of them, we are inclined to say, "Here is something of which he possesses great knowledge, such as is possessed by very few men." Governments have great respect for economists, and have adopted their schemes designed to tide the Commonwealth and the States over their difficulties. But I have come to the conclusion that economists do not know too much about our problems. They also are working in the dark. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is not lack of knowledge on the part of the economist, but the fact that nations cannot agree amongst themselves. There are difficulties other than financial; I refer to political difficulties. France does not wish to see Germany rise again, because of the fear that Germany may be at her throat once more in 20 years' time. Consequently I think it will be some time before we get a world understanding. Permit me to read a reference to show how little economists know, and how they have been responsible for some of our difficulties. We members of Parliament do not pretend to know how to solve these difficulties. We are ordinary men; we know how to build railways, roads and bridges, and grow wheat, wool, fruit and other commodities. We govern the country in these interests, and with such knowledge as we possess. Mr. Winston Churchill, who took England back to the gold standard after the war, was reported as having made the following statement a few months ago:—

He contended that the chief cause of the troubles of the world was the attempt to pay

war debts and reparations over the tariff barriers while supplies of gold were inadequate.

I have been discussing that aspect, and am evidently in good company.

In advising a return to the gold standard in 1925, he adopted the advice of the highest experts, but they proved to have neither reality nor stability. The price of gold advanced 70 per cent., demanding that an enormously increased volume of wealth be produced to pay the debts.

When we remember that Mr. Winston Churchill was advised by the experts of the Bank of England, we realise how hopeless the position becomes when experts make such a grievous mistake, as was apparently the case. Mr. Amery, who visited Australia, was a member of the same Government with Mr. Churchill, and he said—

The essence of the world crisis is the breakdown of the international monetary and financial system. The gold standard has now collapsed. Nothing can be attained at Lausanne or elsewhere to put Humpty Dumpty back on the wall in the near future.

Those difficulties are not of the common people's making; they have occurred after following the advice of experts; consequently people here must not expect too much from economists. We understand the material needs of the country, and try to govern from that aspect only. I do not know whether the placing of banking in the hands of governments would be altogether advisable, especially as I appreciate the pressure that outside people can bring to bear on Governments. Probably the directors would require to be secured in office by some means or other; otherwise Governments subjected to pressure might make grievous mistakes. However, the position is hopeless when the government of the country is really controlled by financiers. If the Labour Party took control to-morrow, the banks could make things most difficult for them. The same applies to the Press of the country.

Hon. P. Collier: They could make it impossible.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, we should have to walk their path in order to finance affairs. Members will recollect that when the chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board was called to the Bar of the Senate, he stated that to export the gold reserve would be disastrous to Australia. Senator Sir Hal Colebatch and Senator E. B. Johnston claimed that his attitude had saved Australia. De-

spite those statements, when a change of Government occurred, the gold was exported, and all the talk about the injury that would be done to Australia has not been borne out by experience. The chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board gave very hostile evidence and misled the country. The path of those who try to initiate reforms is very difficult indeed. They have the hostility of the Press which, in Australia, is largely controlled as one concern. Then they have the hostility of vested interests and the ignorance of the masses of the people to contend with. While Governments are in the hands of financiers who act in that way, it is impossible to govern in the interests of the people. I do not suggest that a Government like that of Mr. Lang should control the banks; I do not suggest that a Government like that headed by Sir James Mitchell should control the banks. The Premier of this State would soon be undertaking many costly schemes. He has a peculiarity in that respect, and is very similar to Mr. Lang.

The Minister for Lands: There are a few men I could say should not control it, too.

Mr. Kenneally interjected.

The Minister for Lands: You are one of them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister for Lands has a better knowledge of his intimates than I have; he may have friends whom he cannot trust. It is utterly wrong that there should be standing over the nation people who can control the finance of the country; people who can create booms, such as occurred in America recently; people who can bring about financial crises and cause widespread ruin. If civilisation is to survive, things of that kind will have to be altered in the interests of the great masses of the people. There are, at the same time, some men whom I should not like to see in control of banking, and they might get into power. The most we can hope is that attempts made by statesmen and economists the world over will be successful and that we shall find a way out of our difficulties. But it will not be too easy. Steps have been taken, for instance, at the Lausanne Conference. It was agreed that Germany should not be called upon to pay any more indemnity, but I feel sure that is conditional upon America agreeing to cancel her war debts. After the presidential election in America the Government there may face the position.

Meanwhile we ought to approach our creditors for relief from the interest burden. It is as reasonable for us to ask for relief from high interest rates as it is to insist that Parliament shall give relief to farmers, squatters and miners from the heavy interest burden they are bearing. There is no harm in saying, "We have done our best, and we cannot pay." That is the honourable course to adopt. We have done our best. So long as we were able to pay, we did so, but we cannot allow our people to go down and out. As Great Britain relieved France and Italy of a large amount of their debts, 63 per cent. in the case of the former and 83 per cent. in the case of the latter, I believe, it is reasonable we should ask for the same treatment for Australia. We are perfectly justified in going to the British investor, who has put money into the Australian loans, and asking for relief until such time as the world has overcome its troubles. I wish to refer to certain statements which have been made by Ministers by way of interjection. They referred to the expenditure of £4,000,000 by the Collier Government. No one denies we had that money and spent it. The important thing is to remember how it was spent and what resulted from the expenditure. The money was spent wisely and provided for a development from which the State is now reaping advantage. Ministers talk of that expenditure as if the money had been wasted. Let them look around the country and see what the Collier Government achieved. We built bridges and thousands of miles of roads, giving communication to thousands of settlers by means of which they are able to market their produce to-day. The Government constructed railways costing millions of pounds. We have only to recall the completion of the Busselton-Margaret River railway, the Flinders Bay railway, the Dwarda-Eastward railway, the Esperance-Northward railway, the Narembreen-Merredin railway, the Piawaning-Northwards railway, the Albany-Denmark railway, the Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway, the Jarnadup-Pemberton railway, the Lake Grace-Newdegate railway, the Norseman-Salmon Gums railway, the Brookton-Dale railway, the Ejanding-Northwards railway, the Kalkalling-Bullfinch railway, the Kulja-Eastward railway, the Meekatharra-Wiluna railway and others of importance. The Wiluna people could not operate to-day ex-

cept for the assistance given by the Government in the form of a guarantee, and except for the building of the railway.

Hon. P. Collier: There were a few water supplies, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Magnificent water supplies were provided by the Collier Government and great work was done by the ex-Minister for Water Supply (Hon. J. Cunningham). Let me instance the Barbalin scheme, a veritable lake in the wheat belt, the Narembreen scheme, the Kondinin scheme, the Walgoolan scheme, the Wagin scheme, the Goomarin scheme, and others, and the MacPherson Rock scheme.

The Minister for Lands: That dam leaks. How many are using it?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Thank God it is there. It will be used. In the old days of the goldfields the Government put down wells along the roads. These wells are now of great advantage to all concerned. The pastoralists rent them and carry on their holdings with the aid of them. Travellers benefit, and the whole country is rendered accessible because of the expenditure on those facilities. In the wheat belt one can now see concrete tanks holding millions of gallons of water, by which the settlers are able to remain on their holdings. There is an Arab proverb that the man who begets a son, digs a well and plants a tree has lived well. The ex-Minister for Water Supply, in his official capacity, undoubtedly dug hundreds of wells throughout the country and was the means of hundreds of trees being planted. The present Minister for Works claims that he is doing two men's work. He will now understand what work a Minister had to do. The Collier Government spent thousands on workers' homes in the city and suburbs, in the country and on the goldfields. We put thousands of new settlers on the land, financed them and kept them there. Their developmental work is to a large extent responsible for the high yield that has been recorded in this State. It is impossible to put thousands of people on the land without getting an improved yield. All this work has been of great and definite benefit to the State. Through the experimental farms that were established by the Collier Government we made a practical effort to settle the country. We did not try to push settlers on to the land before it had been approved. We

did not spend thousands of pounds of the people's money on rash experiments, but proved the country first. Ministers have only to look at the Muresk College and the metropolitan markets to see some of the monuments to the Collier Ministry. And yet Ministers opposite talk about the waste of money. Who introduced the stallion subsidy, and the Cattle Compensation Act, for the compensation of dairymen whose cattle are destroyed because of tuberculosis? The Labour Government!

The Minister for Lands: Who reduced the hours of labour?

Hon. M. F. TROY: Not the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: Who gave long service leave?

Hon. M. F. TROY: In his own department the Minister for Lands cannot be very active. His hours of labour have been materially reduced. He no longer controls the Agricultural Bank. The Premier will not permit him to do so, and will not trust him to control group settlement. I know what the job means, for I was there myself.

The Minister for Lands: I know you left a lot of work behind you.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister knows that is incorrect. I left him a clean page. He must have some regard for the facts. In the Speech we are told that the Government advanced 406 miles of wire netting to settlers. The Collier Government ordered a thousand miles of netting in one order, and gave 600 miles to a local firm to encourage the industry. Altogether we approved for issue to farmers 7,773 miles of netting. We introduced the Vermin Act, which I am sorry to see is now practically a dead letter. Everywhere we hear complaints of the devastation by foxes and other vermin, which are taking control of the country. Foxes are prevalent everywhere, and dogs are beginning to abound. It is a disastrous thing that funds are not obtainable for the destruction of vermin.

The Minister for Agriculture: I am paying all the vermin bonuses that are claimed.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister is not collecting the money to-day.

The Minister for Lands: He is paying for all he gets.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The bonus has been reduced from £2 to 5s.

The Minister for Lands: What has been reduced?

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Government are not making any effort to collect money. I read in the papers that Queensland was making a special drive against dingoes this winter.

The Minister for Lands: They have just wakened up.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This country will not wake up until there is a new Government in office. The Queensland authorities are spending large sums of money to cope with the pests. Who introduced the Dried Fruits Act, by which the producers are able to market their goods?

Mr. Parker: The High Court knocked it out.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The hon. member should know better than that. The Collier Government also spent large sums of money on the introduction of the system of fallowing. Prior to that farmers were not fallowing; they were not encouraged to do so. They were planting a large acreage in any sort of way and gradually getting into debt. We compelled them to fallow. Last year the average yield of this State was materially increased because of that fact. In the face of all these things we still hear delegates at the Primary Producers' Conference using the words, "If your enemies, the Labour Party, get into office." We hear this from such distinguished farmers as Mr. Pickering and Mr. Shallcross, who are farming only the Terrace. Mr. Monger is a distinguished farmer and a good man, but he too has large city interests, city influences and city associations. In order that the farmers may vote back into office the present Government they are told to beware of their enemies, the Labour Party. The merchants in the city can still carry on and pay their dividends, while the people in the country are down and out and are oppressed by heavy taxation. The whole thing is a fraud. People have had the impudence to tell the farmers that the Labour Party are their enemies, in face of the facts of which members themselves are well aware. The mining industry owes much of its prosperity to our influence and help. Not only did we guarantee the Wiluna Company, but we built the railway there.

The Minister for Railways: You did not guarantee them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: We did.

The Minister for Railways: Your guarantee was subject to a further guarantee by the Commonwealth.

Hon. A. McCallum: The Commonwealth refused to give any guarantee unless we first came in.

The Minister for Railways: You know you could not have lost a farthing. Why take credit for something that does not belong to you?

Hon. A. McCallum: It does belong to us.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I can hear only one member at a time.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Those are the achievements of the Labour Government: Then £80,000 was advanced to the Gwalia Mine.

Hon. A. McCallum: And £40,000 of that advance has been repaid.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Labour Government insisted upon the amalgamation of the Kalgoorlie mines. We brought to this State a Royal Commissioner to inquire into the mining industry, and he reported that Kalgoorlie could never prosper until there was amalgamation and new plant, and largely new management. We urged those things. These are some of the achievements of the Collier Government, and I can say that through them the mining industry was helped over a difficult period. In their term of office the Labour Government helped that industry to the extent of £505,000. Nowadays mining is one of the most profitable industries in Western Australia. When hon. members opposite talk again about the expenditure of the previous Government, and the money the previous Government had, let them remember some of those achievements. They are achievements which, I venture to say, will certainly not be surpassed during the next generation.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.16]: It is my intention to refrain from making a lengthy speech, and to take my cue from the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths), who said it was desirable not to have too much hot air but to show a little consideration for "Hansard" and for the country's finances.

Miss Holman: But the member for Avon did not mean that to apply to the debate on the Address-in-reply.

Mr. BROWN: We know that "Hansard" costs 9s. or 10s. per page.

Mr. Withers: And well worth it!

Mr. BROWN: Having heard the debate on the Supply Bill, I am more convinced

than ever that party politics is not in the best interests of the country. For hour after hour, night after night, we listened to repetitions; and meantime the country was being put to considerable expense. The sooner there is an alteration in that respect, the better it will be for the State.

Miss Holman: What is the remedy?

Mr. BROWN: This is, I believe, my eighth speech in an Address-in-reply debate. The first two remarks I made on originally entering this Chamber were that I was not a strong party man, and that I believed in elective Ministries. The discussion on the Supply Bill has strengthened my view in favour of elective Ministries. Again, I think it likely that the country would gain if there were fewer members of Parliament. My own view is that the membership might well be reduced by one-third. I would go even further and abolish Parliament altogether for three years, during which the country would be run by a Commission. Six or seven good business men could bring the country out of the slough of despond far more quickly than 50 men each having a policy of his own. We know well what happened in the case of the Sydney Municipal Council. The numerous councillors brought about such a condition of financial chaos that the New South Wales Government had to step in and appoint a small Commission. The Commission in three years restored the finances, so rendering it possible to reintroduce the system of administration by municipal councillors.

Hon. A. McCallum: Who told you that?

Mr. BROWN: Everybody knows it.

Hon. A. McCallum: How did you find it out?

Mr. BROWN: From results which spoke for themselves.

Hon. A. McCallum: Then how did you find out the results?

Mr. BROWN: That question is not worth answering. The member for South Fremantle should have sufficient intelligence to answer it himself. On the Supply Bill the Opposition spoke principally about unemployment, but not one Opposition member put up a constructive idea. The Opposition simply abused the Government for not giving the worker a fair deal, as they said.

Miss Holman: That is pretty true, too.

Mr. BROWN: Did Opposition members say they could do better? No, and that was

why the Leader of the Opposition said they would not show their hand.

Hon. P. Collier: You are quite wrong. I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. BROWN: If there should be a change of Government, it will be due to propaganda from beginning to end, particularly by the hon. member who spoke before me. On the hustings the Opposition will put a policy before the people, saying, "Place our party in power and we will show you what we can do." But can the Opposition do any better than the present Government? The member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) just now enumerated the good works of the previous Government, but he forgot to mention that the Collier Government were able to borrow £4,500,000 annually. I would like to see the Opposition in office now, to show whether they could do any better than the present Government. The state of the finances was not known to the present Government when taking office. The Leader of the Opposition is aware that he left not a shilling in the Treasury or in any of the departments. If the Leader of the Opposition were to attain the Treasurership again, he might learn a good deal. Do Opposition members really think that if returned to power they could give everybody full-time work on the basic wage? Could they do that without increasing taxation?

Mr. Kenneally: That is what your Premier said at the last election.

Mr. BROWN: What fresh taxation have the present Government imposed? Very little.

Hon. A. McCallum: Taxation to the extent of £350,000.

Mr. BROWN: I do not think so. The income tax has been raised by 13 or 14 per cent. A stamp duty has been imposed.

Hon. A. McCallum: And a hospital tax.

Mr. BROWN: Who gets the benefit of that? The worker.

Opposition members: Oh!

Mr. BROWN: Nobody else. The man who pays the tax is not getting the benefit.

Miss Holman: Is not the worker paying the hospital tax?

Mr. BROWN: I regret exceedingly that State finances are not in a good position. Any right-thinking person must admit that the present Government have done wonders with the small funds at their disposal. Undoubtedly unemployment has increased, and it is likely to increase. I agree with the

Leader of the Opposition that we have not yet turned the corner in that regard. Throughout their speeches Opposition members have not said one word for the primary producer outback, who is battling to keep the life-blood of the State circulating. All their talk has been about the unemployed in the towns.

Hon. A. McCallum: Have you been asleep for the last two hours?

Mr. BROWN: I am speaking of the debate on the Supply Bill. The Opposition spent three sittings on that Bill, and all their talk was about the unemployed.

Hon. A. McCallum: Did the Premier mention the farmer when moving the second reading of the Supply Bill, or in replying to the debate?

Hon. P. Collier: Think for a while.

Mr. BROWN: If I remember rightly, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Premiers' Plan was not working to the best advantage, and that the carrying-out of that Plan was not in the best interests of the State. But for the financial emergency legislation which has been passed, what would have become of the State? Thousands of people were in jeopardy by reason of mortgages, the mortgagees having power to foreclose. But for the financial emergency legislation, what would have happened? Thousands of people have been saved by it. And the mortgagee is not suffering, because he is still getting 5 or 6 per cent. interest on his money; at least, in many cases he is. If his interest is not paid, he can apply to the court for redress. One thing I cannot agree with in the financial emergency legislation is the range in the reduction of civil service salaries, a range from 18 to 22½ per cent. The minimum civil service salary is a little under £200 per annum. A civil servant may be getting only £5 over the minimum, but he must suffer a reduction of 18 per cent., whilst the maximum reduction is only 22½ per cent.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We told you that when the Bill was before the House.

Mr. BROWN: It is not fair. A sliding scale would be better.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We pointed out that that could be remedied, and we asked for your vote in that direction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The member for Pingelly will get on better if he takes no notice of interjections, but confines himself to addressing the Chair.

Mr. BROWN: I am pleased that the financial emergency legislation is to be continued. It is essential to the welfare of the country. I should like to see voting at elections made compulsory. Under the compulsory system a true reflex of the opinion of the people would be secured. That is not the case when only 60 per cent. of the votes on the roll are cast. There is already compulsory registration, and it might as well be accompanied by compulsory voting. Now I wish to refer to unemployment. I endorse what has been said by the member for Forrest (Miss Holman) and the member for Leederville (Mr. Pantou). I quite believe that the depressing and even heartrending conditions which those hon. members describe exist. I assure the two members, however, that the same position obtains in the country districts.

Miss Holman: Then why did not you speak up?

Mr. BROWN: I am sorry to add that great hardship exists among primary producers. I have been on farms where the farmers' wives were dressed in clothes that a black gin would not wear. We do not see that sort of thing in town. So far as my observation goes, the women wear decent clothes here.

Mr. Marshall: Your observation is strictly limited.

Mr. BROWN: I have seen houses in which some of the early settlers and pioneers are now living, and they are not fit for a black-fellow. In one place where there was a rush roof, the people had to use milk dishes, wash-up dishes and other things on the beds to keep some of the water off.

Mr. Marshall: They are lucky to have wash-up dishes with the present Government in power.

Mr. BROWN: I have known farmers, with families, at their wits end to get food for the children. These are the men who are keeping the railways going and the lumpers in employment, and causing ships to come to our ports. Yet not one word about the farmers was to be heard from the Opposition!

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What do you think the Government have done regarding the Disabilities Commission's report and recommendations?

Mr. BROWN: The Government are endeavouring to carry out the recommendations. They have dealt with the land tax. On the other hand, when Labour was in power and we were able to reduce the land

tax by one half as the result of a catch vote, the Premier took the earliest opportunity the next day, when he had his followers present, to recommit the Bill and restore the heavier tax.

Mr. Hegney: What about the increases in railway freights?

Mr. BROWN: There have been no increases in those freights.

Mr. Withers: Yes, by 15 per cent.

Mr. BROWN: We have heard about the distress of the workers, but is it not advisable to have half a loaf rather than none at all?

Mr. Marshall: You are all loaf; that is the trouble!

Mr. BROWN: The Attorney General quoted the position of a shipwrecked party and the disposal of the limited water supply. The Leader of the Opposition said that there was no comparison between present-day conditions and the shipwrecked party, because the latter had no more water at their disposal. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition painted a picture of workers who were hungry and without funds, walking down the streets, the shop windows of which were crammed with foodstuffs. What did he mean? Why did he not go a little further? Did he mean that the workers should commandeer the foodstuffs? I can come to no other conclusion than that is what he meant.

Mr. Marshall: Do not educate the Leader of the Opposition along those lines, or there will be trouble in this State.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to understand what the Leader of the Opposition meant.

Hon. P. Collier: It would take too long to make you understand.

Mr. BROWN: Perhaps so, but I think there was something behind the hon. member's remarks. One Opposition member said that there was still money available and that the Government were hoarding it. That is news to me. I understood the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) to say that there was enough money at the disposal of the Government to enable them to provide full-time work for the unemployed.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: I asked the Government to experiment with full-time work.

Mr. BROWN: In one town in my electorate, which I shall not name, there are 14 men working on sustenance, and another 12 men employed by the road board, but not on sustenance. The 14 men get three day's work a week and earn up to £2 9s., according to the

number in the family. When they go away from their homes, they get an away-from-home allowance, and they are able to earn up to £3 a week.

Mr. Withers: They are lucky; our people at Bunbury cannot get that much.

Mr. BROWN: The 12 men who are working for the road board get two days' work a week, and are able to earn 22s. They have families and own their homes. They are rate-payers and have to pay land tax. The other men on sustenance are not in that position and yet the road board workers can receive 22s. a week only. Is that fair?

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Why do you not rectify the position?

Hon. A. McCallum: Why do you not elect a new road board?

Mr. BROWN: The other road boards are working on the same principle.

Mr. Corboy: No, they are not.

Mr. BROWN: At any rate, it is absolutely wrong, and should be rectified. I think the way out is to cut out sustenance altogether and treat every unemployed man on his merits.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Give him work.

Mr. BROWN: That is what I suggest.

Mr. Corboy: That is what your Premier said he would do.

Mr. BROWN: If he is going to do that more power to him! The Opposition should realise that we are passing through one of the worst financial crises the world has ever seen. I do not know whether the monetary system has something to do with it. We have an abundance of foodstuffs, and the world is almost overstocked. Despite that, the people have no money with which to buy. Where is the money? If the price of wheat were increased to 5s. or 6s. a bushel to-morrow, there would be plenty of money at the disposal of eager buyers. We hear a lot about the Douglas credit system, but whether that would be advantageous unless adopted throughout the world, I cannot say. It appears to me that the whole world would have to adopt that system before it would be of any use.

Mr. Corboy: Do you approve of that system?

Mr. BROWN: I have to be educated regarding it.

Hon. P. Collier: It could operate in one State.

Mr. North: That is the whole point about it.

Mr. BROWN: I should like to hear the system explained if that is so. Then there is the question of the gold reserve. At one time we had £10,000,000 or £12,000,000 worth of gold in reserve, but when the price of gold increased appreciably and the exchange position operated, the reserve was sent to London and the cash came here. It is possible that the reserve was utilised to help in the payment of overseas commitments.

Mr. Corboy: What came back in the form of cash if we sent our gold away? Dollars?

Mr. BROWN: We have been working on notes, silver and copper.

Hon. P. Collier: We should adopt a silver and copper standard, I suppose, as well as a gold standard!

Mr. BROWN: We cannot get away from the fact that all Australia is working on now is paper money. I suppose it is guaranteed by the Commonwealth. It is reasonable that our notes should not be worth so much outside Australia, but if that is the position, what is to prevent our inflating the note issue a little more?

Opposition Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. BROWN: I know many people do not believe in inflation, but that is exactly what we are working on now.

Hon. A. McCallum: Do you approve of that?

Mr. BROWN: Where is the gold reserve?

Hon. A. McCallum: You were talking about inflation.

Mr. BROWN: Well, where is it? I do not think the hon. member can tell me where it is. The gold reserve is not in Australia.

Hon. P. Collier: They are still carrying on salvage operations on the "Egypt."

Mr. BROWN: Compare the position of our State with that of other States. The unemployment problem is just as rife elsewhere as it is here. In fact, it is more so in some States. Western Australia is doing more for the unemployed than any other State, and the Government have provided more money than is being made available in any other part of the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Railways: We even provide a special train to bring men from Mt. Barker.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so

Mr. BROWN: In New South Wales there are over 100,000 unemployed, and about 70,000 in Victoria.

Hon. P. Collier: About 70,000 in Victoria! A few thousand more or less is neither here nor there.

Mr. BROWN: If that is the position, we can congratulate ourselves upon having done so much in Western Australia. Every member sitting on the Government side of the House has feelings of deepest sympathy for those who are out of work and for families in distress. I am positive that Ministers are doing all that they can. There are anomalies, but it is impossible to rectify them all at once. It takes time to do so. I was struck by the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition when he objected strongly to the use of barrows on the Harvey irrigation scheme, and asserted that it would be much better if the work were done by machinery. He said that one machine could do as much work in a day as a hundred men. I suppose the Leader of the Opposition knows that it is the increased use of modern labour-saving machinery that has given rise to so much unemployment throughout the world.

Mr. Kennally: That is why you advocate increased hours of work for those in employment.

Mr. BROWN: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in his assertion that work of greater advantage to the State could be undertaken by many of the unemployed. If the Government cannot purchase rails for the construction of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway, they can at least proceed with the earthworks. The Brookton-Armadale railway was authorised nine years ago.

Mr. Marshall: What about the Yarramony-eastward railway?

Mr. BROWN: I have nothing to do with that line. If the earthworks in connection with the lines I have mentioned were undertaken, it would be of advantage to the State. Another line that could receive attention is the Brookton-Corrigin railway, which requires to be regraded. The first 15 miles of that line are along heavy grades with short curves. At one stage nothing above 200 tons can be hauled. Twenty-five miles out of Brookton the traffic has to be diverted to Narrogin, thence to Perth. That means haulage over 70 or 80 miles more than should be necessary. Is that economical? Then I come to the question of

water supplies. I have still something to say regarding the Pingelly water scheme. We want a new scheme there. It is absolutely necessary. The present scheme is not paying, because the people are not using the water. It is not fit to drink. They cannot even wash in it. If a man has a bath in it, he is lucky if he has any skin on him when he comes out. I remember on one occasion when the ex-Minister for Works was there I invited him to taste it, but he declined. The construction of a new scheme would be a very useful work. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, who said we could go on with a lot of these works which eventually would be reproductive. I was struck by the speech of member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) who said we should encourage prospecting for gold. I know nothing of gold at that stage, but I know that many people from my electorate are on the goldfields at present, dryblowing. Some of them, married men, have been up there for quite a little time and are making fair money. The Minister for Mines, I am sure, is doing his utmost to encourage prospectors, and I say that is the right policy. It is quite possible that a new goldfield will be discovered. That would put a very different complexion on the finances of Western Australia. Before the Coolgardie goldfields came into being, men of the Eastern States were working at 10s. per week, and some of them were unable to obtain employment. Immediately Coolgardie was discovered every man that could do so went there, and in consequence up went wages all round. Again, just before the war, we were in a similar position and men were unable to obtain employment. But immediately the war broke out every able-bodied man went to the front, leaving behind only a few to produce the commodities for those at the war. During the war, of course, money flowed like water and we were able to find the wherewithal to put many men on the land. Only this morning I went to the pictures and saw "Dad on our Selection."

Mr. SPEAKER: He is not in the Address-in-reply.

Mr. BROWN: No, but Maloney said, "There is my neighbour. He came on his land two years ago, and to-day he owes £2,000." That is exactly what does happen in putting our men on the land. Many of our settlers went on the land without a

penny, and in a couple of years they were owing thousands of pounds. They were inexperienced men with no knowledge of farming, and their only object was to get from the Government as much money as possible. In consequence they are over-capitalised.

Mr. J. J. Mann: You are talking utter rubbish!

Mr. Hegney: Many inexperienced men did better than experienced farmers.

Mr. BROWN: That is quite possible, but there have been many failures among men who through inexperience have not made the best use of the money supplied them. To learn the reason for their failure you would have to investigate their conditions. There may have been many causes. And as soon as a man came into possession of a piece of land, every machinery agent in the country would call on him and persuade him to buy a machine. So there was not only the money he was owing to the Government, but there were also the hundreds of pounds he was owing to machinery agents. I have had long experience of farming and I know what I am talking about. At the same time it would be a shame to let those men go off the land. Of course there are isolated settlers who would never do any good, and the sooner they are removed from the land, the better. I am thankful to say they are in a minority. I wish to speak a word about the Lake Carmody settlers, sent out by the previous Government. Reports came in that there was a lot of good country in that district, and the settlers were promised a railway. But in a year or two the Government sent out Dr. Teakle to make an inspection of the land. That expert discovered that half the country was unfit for wheat production on account of the salinity of the soil. Consequently the Government decided to remove the settlers to other districts. One man was removed to an abandoned farm without a horse or any implements. He had a debt of £2,000 over him, and the Agricultural Bank concluded it would be a mistake to lend him any more money. So that man was stranded on new country, unable to put in a crop, and had to sell some of his possessions to get food for his children. That is the position of many more who have jumped from the frying pan into the fire. It would have been better to let them remain on their Lake Carmody holdings. Now it is rumoured that all that land is going to

be reclassified. Some of the condemned farms have produced from six to eight bags of wheat per acre. But the men still there will all be isolated, for what chance is there of a railway being run out to that condemned district? Yet those men went there on the promise of a railway. At present they are from 50 to 60 miles from the nearest line. That is why I asked the Minister whether it was the intention of the Government to re-enact the wheat carting bonus. I am pleased to know from the Minister that the Government are going to consider that at the proper time. Then there is the important question of the over-capitalisation of settlers on the land. Many of them are over-capitalised and, to a certain extent, as the direct result of too liberal advances from the Government through the Agricultural Bank. Some farms of less than 2,000 acres are carrying a liability of £4,000. There is no equity in the land, nor would there be any demand for the land if the settlers were to leave it. But what are we going to do with those who wish to remain? Security of tenure is a dangerous thing, but could we not do something in the way of writing down the settlers' debts, or postponing them? Many settlers I have spoken to are of opinion that if they were given a concession for a term of years without interest they would be able to make up their leeway. I want the Government to consider this. I believe the Government, especially the Minister for Lands, is in sympathy with those settlers and that if it be possible to grant them concessions, it will be done. But the trouble is that the Agricultural Bank has no money. Only this afternoon I received a letter showing that a man had four horses, the best of which died, while the other three were not up to much. He applied to the bank for another horse, but the bank in reply regretted inability to grant him the necessary money. That man is now stranded. Is that the policy of the Government? Would it not be better for the bank to try to find the money to enable that man to buy another horse and so be in a position to put in his crop?

Mr. Sleeman: Will this Government allow a man to be stranded for the want of one horse?

Mr. BROWN: I do not expect the Minister for Lands to know all these things. And certainly neither the Premier nor the Min-

ister for Lands would attempt to dictate the policy of the Agricultural Bank. With so many settlers up against it, I often think that if we had a tribunal consisting of two or three highly competent farmers, it would be advantageous to the Agricultural Bank to have personal inspections made of their holdings. Then it would be possible to locate the leakage, and the tribunal could take into consideration what work each man was doing and the quality of the land he had. And if it was decided that a man should vacate his holding, it would be more satisfactory to everyone. But at present, men who think they can make good get notice to quit because there is no more money for them. It is not a general thing, of course, but we cannot afford to let any of these men go off their land.

Mr. Doney: Are you quite sure when you say they are getting notice to quit?

Mr. BROWN: If not done directly, it is done this way, that the bank refuses to give them any more money. So they are stranded and have no alternative to leaving their holdings. And when they leave, what happens? We all know what an abandoned farm is like. The fences get into disrepair, and if there be a house on the place some of the people in the district steal what they can out of it. Windows and doors are taken from the buildings; often wire is taken out of the fences. There is no one in charge of the properties to protect them.

Mr. Sleeman: You are libelling your own people.

Mr. BROWN: What I have stated is a fact. The land lies idle for about 12 months and then the Agricultural Bank receive a tender for probably one-half of the liability, and it is accepted. Would it not be better to give the concession to the original selector, the man who, with his family, has done the toil?

Hon. P. Collier: We amended the Act to permit of that being done.

Mr. Doney: And it is being done.

Hon. P. Collier: I should think it was.

Mr. Marshall: The Collier Government introduced the amendment.

Mr. BROWN: It depends upon the report of the inspector. Possibly the inspector has a set against a man.

The Minister for Lands: Did you do that when you were there?

Mr. BROWN: No, there was an abundance of money at that time. A man had only to apply for money and he could get it. To-day, however, things are different. To the credit of the Government I say that although millions of pounds are owing to the Agricultural Bank, they are not pressing reliable clients. The question of farmers' debts is a burning one. As a representative of a farming constituency I am expected to secure relief for clients, but when I go to the Agricultural Bank and see the files, I can come to no other conclusion than that the position of some of the farmers is untenable. I would not recommend more money being advanced to some of them. Something different from the existing system, however, is needed. There should be a proper inspection and investigation. That would give greater satisfaction. I consider that the Minister for Works is giving good service. He is trying to do the best with the limited means at his disposal. Of course it is impossible to satisfy everybody. The Perth City Council, in view of the bad times, have reduced their rates by 33½ per cent.

Mr. Hegney: Is that in operation?

Mr. BROWN: Yes. The City Council rates on a certain house were £30, and have been reduced to £20 10s. 10d. The water rates, however, which were £28, have been reduced to £23 7s. 6d. Thus the water rates levied by the Government are pounds more than the rates levied by the municipal council. That is not fair. I understand that the Metropolitan Water Supply Department is a paying concern, and it is not fair to people who are trying to keep a roof over their heads to charge so much for water rates. On another house, the City Council rates were £8 and they are now £6 3s. 3d., but the water rates are £7 0s. 3d. It is extraordinary that the Government should be charging unfortunate householders higher rates than the City Council impose. I understand that the Minister for Works is considering the matter, and I hope he will reduce the rates at least to the level of those imposed by the City Council. Many of the houses on which rates are charged are unoccupied, and the rates on shops are particularly heavy.

Mr. Wells: Are not the water rates based on the municipal rates?

Mr. BROWN: I am glad that the Traffic Act is to be amended. I hope that the amendments will be acceptable to the men in the country, as well as to others interested. I do not intend to say anything about bulk

handling, except that a majority of the farmers are pleased that the Government intend to introduce a scheme.

Mr. Sleeman: Which scheme do you favour?

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member will be informed at the proper time. The Commissioner of Railways is following out ideas expressed by me many months ago that he should reduce freights in order to compete with motor traffic. The people should realise that the railways belong to them and should patronise them more freely. The reducing of fares in the metropolitan area was a step in the right direction. Many of the buses use the by-streets, and it may be necessary for people to travel by those buses in order to reach the railways. Such buses will always command a certain amount of traffic, but people living between Fremantle and Guildford should use the railways as much as possible. Regarding unattended sidings, I wish to bring under the notice of the Minister for Railways that it would be more convenient to people ordering trucks, and particularly sheep trucks, if the nearest station-master had charge of them. A truck of super is loaded and its arrival is advised for a certain date, but when the farmer goes in he finds it has not arrived. It has been shunted off somewhere along the line. In such a case demurrage should not be charged. I do not know what action the Government intend to take regarding State lotteries.

Mr. Sleeman: Did you notice that the Federal Government propose to tax them?

Mr. BROWN: In almost any street of Perth one can see people selling tickets.

The Minister for Railways: Tickets for what?

Mr. BROWN: For a lottery authorised by the Government.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Mr. BROWN: Or solutions for crossword puzzle competitions.

The Minister for Railways: Most of them would be crossword solutions.

Mr. BROWN: Evidently some of the newspapers are receiving as much as £1,500 a fortnight for crossword puzzles, and it is time the Government announced their intention. I have no objection to crossword competitions, but I believe that revenue could be derived if the Government conducted a State lottery. At one time I was opposed to State lotteries, but in view of the lotteries being conducted, I now consider that the sooner

we have a State lottery the better. It is gratifying to me that some of the requests for school accommodation that I have been making for years have been complied with. The Minister is now able to provide a school building at Boddington. One or two other small schools have been built, but I wish to direct the attention of the Minister to the need for a school at Bullaring. The children there assemble in an unlined wooden hall, and when the inspector went there on a very cold day he found 50 or 60 children crowded around a fire in a kerosene tin in the middle of the hall. That is not a fair thing. The number of children warrants the erection of a school building, and I hope the Minister will do his best to provide one. I know that he is sympathetic towards the people in the bush. I am glad that the subsidy for farm stallions is being continued. A few years ago farmers disposed of their horses and bought tractors, but they have realised that the cost of upkeep is too great and are reverting to the use of horses. A good quality of horse is required, and the importation of stallions should be encouraged. Many diseases affect stock. I understand that the wasting disease is still prevalent in the Denmark district. According to the member for Albany (Mr. Wansbrough) there is a man in the district who is able to effect cures.

Mr. Wansbrough: The departmental officials do not think so.

Mr. BROWN: They will not recognise him because he is not a qualified man.

The Minister for Railways: That is not correct.

The Minister for Lands: If he has a cure for the disease, he should make a fortune out of it.

Mr. BROWN: He has demonstrated what he can do.

Mr. Doney: But you are merely passing on information given you by the member for Albany.

Mr. BROWN: No, I read an article stating that the residents complained that the experimental farm was treating sheep only. The people were only too glad to send their cattle to the man to be cured.

The Minister for Railways: He will not tell anyone what he can do unless he is paid.

Mr. Withers: Quite right, too.

Mr. BROWN: Men who have been accustomed to stock are often able to advise treat-

ment for disease although they may not have a knowledge of the technicalities of veterinary science.

The Minister for Railways: People can go to him if they like.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know whether he is considered to be a crank or not. He came to my house a little while ago, and said he was prepared to go to the laboratory in Beverley and demonstrate his cure. He was quite willing to take sheep and cure them. All he wants is to be allowed to give the demonstration, but the Department of Agriculture will have nothing to do with him. None of his sheep has died for many years.

The Minister for Agriculture: That is the old Brookton chap?

Mr. BROWN: Yes.

The Minister for Agriculture: He has a rat.

Mr. Wansbrough: He is not far wrong.

Mr. BROWN: Even a scientist may learn something from an experienced layman. If it costs the Department nothing why should they not allow this man to make his experiment?

The Minister for Agriculture: He wanted £25,000 for doing so.

Mr. BROWN: I do not know what the man at Denmark requires. I have had information from people who have been there.

Mr. Wansbrough: The Denmark people will tell you all about that.

Mr. BROWN: The red mite and the lucerne flea are causing a great deal of destruction.

Hon. P. Collier: And white mice?

Mr. BROWN: We have no mice plagues here. It might be possible to send abroad an entomologist who would discover a parasite for the red-legged mite.

The Minister for Agriculture: People all over the world are looking for parasites.

Mr. BROWN: Meanwhile, the pest is doing a lot of damage to fodder paddocks. In the towns along the Great Southern railway it is impossible to grow late vegetables, and in some paddocks one cannot grow peas. The red mite is travelling all over the country. It was brought from South Africa and made its first appearance in the Bunbury district. At present there are two vermin rates, one levied by road boards and the other by the Govern-

ment. The Minister for Agriculture should insist upon one vermin rate administered by the road boards.

The Minister for Agriculture: Who would pay the bonuses?

Mr. BROWN: The road boards.

The Minister for Agriculture: One would pay 5s. and another £5. Would that not be absurd?

Mr. BROWN: Foxes are increasing in number. In the older settled districts I used to think it was an imposition to charge a vermin tax for the benefit of the people in the North and the extreme South West, but I am now satisfied that the tax was warranted. Foxes are appearing all over the district, and they are a greater menace to sheep breeders than are dingoes. A fox will go into a fowl house and take away the fowls. One man in the Wandering district is unable to keep turkeys because of the foxes. I do not know the price of opossum skins just now, but I do know that these animals are increasing in the South-West. If it were a paying proposition to market the skins, I think the unemployed could earn a good deal of money if they were allowed to trap. Whatever the Government do they should do quickly, because the fur is now in a good condition.

The Minister for Railways: Would you suggest that the unemployed be engaged by the day or on regular wages?

Mr. BROWN: On piece-work, of course. One could not expect men to catch opossums by the day. We are passing through troublous times. If we could all co-operate and work for the general good of the State it would be much better than the destructive criticism we have heard. I have no doubt we have different policies on the two sides of the House, but we all know the position of the country. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we may not have turned the corner. We are going to receive special concessions as the result of the Ottawa conference.

Mr. Wansbrough: Not very much.

Mr. BROWN: We are to get another 3d. a bushel for our wheat, and so much more for our meat and dried fruits. These concessions must be advantageous to Western Australia. I should like to see re-enacted the bonus of 4½d. on wheat. In lieu of that the Commonwealth should bring down a flour tax which all the consumers would pay. A tax of 3½d. a bushel would make

very little difference to the price of bread. The man who is producing the wealth and life-blood of the country must be kept going, because every worker gets some benefit from his enterprise. I should like all parties to do their best to assist in improving the position as we find it in Western Australia.

MR. DONEY (Williams - Narrogin) [9.25]: I thought members opposite would be prepared to carry on the debate.

Mr. Withers: We are taking time in which to consider things.

Mr. DONEY: Last week they gave us a taste of their qualities. Using the Supply Bill as cover, they slung quite a number of wild charges at the Government. On examination these were shown to be harmless, but they were noisy. I do not think the noise frightened anyone, least of all any member on this side of the House.

Mr. Sleeman: It would take more than that to frighten you.

Mr. DONEY: Yes.

Mr. Sleeman: I was thinking of the unemployed.

Mr. DONEY: The contribution of the member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum) was very interesting. We do not complain of his outspoken utterances. We rather appreciate, them, because when he is speaking, we know where we stand. I wish he had been as fair as he was outspoken. He took a number of innocuous happenings and magnified them into serious crimes, suggesting that those crimes had been committed by the Premier and the members of this Government. The more youthful auditors in the gallery must have had the impression that the Premier was developing along dangerous lines, and that the very genial gentleman they had thought him to be had in him the makings of a very bad old man. The member for South Fremantle travelled half-way over the civilised world in search of ammunition to use against the Government. Apparently he could not find much in Western Australia. He merely glanced at Ottawa; he looked in on London long enough to speak disparagingly of the foreign policy of the Old Country. He found a few flaws in the Old Country's relationship with Germany and Russia. He derided the magnanimity of the Old Country towards the smaller nations, and then came back to Canberra and spoke of what he regarded as the shame and feebleness

of the Lyons Government. He paraded before us the iniquities of half Europe and then asked the Premier what he was going to do about it all.

Mr. Kenneally: The Minister for Works took us on a trip around the world.

Mr. DONEY: All that has nothing to do with the Premier. His care is to look after the troubles of Western Australia, and he has no time in which to solve those of Europe. All this, in my opinion, was merely intended to lead hon. members and other hearers to form the impression that this would be an excellent world provided only that the member for South Fremantle and his colleagues were in charge of affairs in Western Australia. The actual result was that most of us thought the Government must have an extraordinarily strong case if that was the utmost the Opposition could urge against it. Thanks to the sane and healthy outlook of the vast majority of people in Western Australia, the Government have an ample control of the situation here. The majority of Opposition members, I am glad to admit, commented fairly upon the work of the Government. However, I give it as my opinion that what annoyed some members of the Opposition was the fact of the Government having an able control of the situation. No Government's programme is ever so good, nor are any Government's methods ever so perfect, as not to need helpful, constructive criticism from a friendly Opposition. I know of very few people in this State better qualified than the hon. member I have mentioned to give that aid, provided he uses his undoubtedly fine gifts for that excellent purpose. Two or three nights ago the Attorney General demonstrated by a happy simile that where there is a shortage of some necessary commodity, it is not only desirable, but imperative and even inevitable, to ration it. I do not see how in any circumstances one can escape that method of adjustment. To say, as hon. members of the Opposition did, that the shortage is not in goods, but in money, does not help the position at all, especially when we recall that under the existing financial system goods are the only acceptable exchange for money. The Opposition argued that because in the world to-day there happens to be an ample supply of food, raiment, and shelter, the Government should, for some obscure reason which I cannot

fathom, pay the full basic wage to every man out of work. I fervently wish that it were possible; but hon. members opposite, like hon. members on this side, must surely know that it is not possible. Members on this side are troubled with exactly the same stupid anomaly as troubles members opposite. We know, just as they know, that the world to-day is very badly off, for the reason that it has too much. We know too, as they do, that there is insufficient currency to-day to buy to-day's needs, owing to prices being altogether too high. Equally do we know that three-fourths or so of the gold supply of the world is to-day in the hands of the two greediest nations on the face of the earth. This aggravates the position considerably. The point I wish to make is, whilst the existence of all these factors is admitted, why must the Opposition pretend that the present Government are responsible for them and for the existing unfortunate situation. I ask members opposite whether the unemployed got the full basic wage when the Opposition were in power. There was at that time money to burn, but we know well that even then the unemployed did not get the full basic wage. Therefore it seems extremely unfair to press for that wage at such a troublous time as this. One or two members opposite screamed most venomously at the Minister for Works when that hon. gentleman was explaining that it had become necessary to put men on part-time. Our friends of the Opposition saw no sense or decency in part-time. Yet when the Minister explained, and very clearly, that our part-time rates and part-time methods were infinitely superior to the corresponding rates and methods in vogue in other States, the Opposition quickly, in fact too quickly, came to light with the claim that their Government had initiated that very favourable part-time basis. But one cannot have it both ways, and I hope the Opposition realise that. If, as they claim, they initiated that part-time basis, why should they blame the present Government for continuing it?

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member is confusing part-time work with sustenance work, a different subject altogether.

Mr. DONEY: I will cite the attitude taken by the Opposition at the time the Minister for Works was speaking. I believe that a reference to "Hansard" will show the Leader

of the Opposition that what I have said is substantially correct.

Hon. P. Collier: I am sure the hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. DONEY: The point is that Opposition members were accustomed for six years to finance the country from an almost inexhaustible supply of money. However, conditions have changed vastly, and the present Government have to run the country on considerably less than half of the money that was available at the time hon. members opposite occupied these benches.

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member was one of the candidates who said that they would find work for all and balance the ledger. I have the report of his speech here.

Mr. DONEY: The Leader of the Opposition is wrong. He is at liberty to look up my speech, and if he is able to find such a statement in it, I shall be greatly surprised. I know such a statement is not there.

Hon. P. Collier: I will show you it is there.

Mr. DONEY: Could hon. members opposite finance their own plan to-day? Of course they could not. If they could, I am surely entitled to ask why other Labour Governments in Australia have not been able to do so, and why, equally with a Nationalist Government, Labour Governments have been put out of power. I hold that I am entitled to ask the Opposition why, in the interests of the State and of poor people generally, do they not tell us their financial secret, if they have such a secret? It has just occurred to me that I might quote Bairnsfather and ask, if the Opposition have "a better 'ole," why do they not go to it, and tell their friends the way to it? That would be only right and proper. The reason they do not tell us the way to a better hole is that they do not know of one. They are well aware that we are doing our level best, and I would like them to understand that we know, as do they, that they could not do better.

Mr. Kenneally: Why sing a swan song now? Leave it till the next election.

Mr. DONEY: Just for the moment the hon. member is not talking sense, though he usually does. The Opposition know pretty well that we on this side would feel the greatest joy in paying a living wage to all men now unemployed if only it were possible; but just because we do not do it, the Opposition denounce us as lacking the milk of human kindness. They surely do not be-

lieve that by some extremely lopsided allocation of human decency, the Opposition have all the sympathy, all the helpfulness, and all the understanding. I make bold to say those qualities are divided on pretty well a fifty-fifty basis between the Opposition side and this.

Mr. Kenneally: Why not let private employers pay full-time if they wish to?

Mr. DONEY: That is an entirely different question, with which I may deal presently. It is certainly not too much to claim that as regards the question of unemployment Opposition members have not substantiated even one of the major charges they have levelled at the Government. Speaking for myself only, I would like to see a clear and concise list of those charges printed in the public Press, but without embellishments to obscure the issue, so that the charges might be thoroughly understood and in due course answered. The only point which, so far as I recall, hon. members opposite came anywhere near to establishing was the contention of, I think, the member for South Fremantle, that whereas in this State a boy ceases to be a boy at 14 years, and therefore ceases to receive sustenance on attaining that age, in New South Wales, per contra, a boy remains a boy until he is 21 years old, and receives a child's sustenance allowance during that period. We have to remember that in this State where a family comprises children over the age of 14 years, if the special circumstances of the family warrant it, one at least of those children is still regarded as entitled to sustenance allowance, and receives it up to the age of 21 years. I agree that partly the Opposition's point is established, but the disadvantage in the aggregate amounts to a very small sum.

Mr. Kenneally, In addition, there is the child allowance in New South Wales.

Mr. DONEY: I recall reference being made to that the other evening, but personally I do not know enough about the matter to comment on it. I will take the hon. member's reference as being correct. It is very pleasing to know that the unemployed here co-operate with the Government in every way possible. They seem to understand the Government's difficulty, and the Government attempt to understand that of the unemployed.

Mr. Kenneally: As per the Mt. Barker contingent!

Mr. DONEY: The hon. member knows as well as I do that the position at Mt. Barker became acute following speeches delivered in this Chamber about a week ago.

Miss Holman: Oh!

Mr. DONEY: I am merely pointing out the coincidence.

Hon. P. Collier: Those men never had a newspaper out there. They were 50 miles away from the railway line.

Mr. DONEY: We know that it does not take the "West Australian" long to reach that district. I am making no assertion, but am drawing attention to the fact that the two things happened at exactly the same time.

Mr. Kenneally: Do you not know that the agitation started a fortnight ago?

Mr. DONEY: No, or I would have said so. The point is worth repeating that we in this State pay higher rates and deal more considerably with the unemployed, and certainly have secured a greater degree of contentment among them, than is the case in any other State of the Commonwealth. At this juncture I would appeal to the Opposition not to do the State a really great disservice by broadcasting ideas that neither they nor we have the slightest hope of living up to, certainly not until good prices return and the depression is, from that cause, swept away. It is not only in the domain of unemployment but in its care for the distressed primary industries that the Government, after passing through what is undoubtedly the most stressful period in the State's history, have come through with a record of which they have every right to be very proud. It cannot be denied that the Government have placed to their credit a splendid achievement, and the finest word of eulogy to be found in the English language can be applied to their work during the past two or three years. It cannot be denied that they have done most urgent and essential work at a low cost.

Mr. Kenneally: And with low wages.

Mr. DONEY: To-day the Government have their backs to the wall, and they are forced to fight friend and foe alike as they have had to do, in fact, from the very start of the period of depression. To-day it is not too much to declare that the Government have the respect even of their foes, and at long last there is a proper understanding of the position on the part of their

friends. One point I want to draw attention to is that in the country areas as well as in the city during the past two years, our friends, who admittedly have had their judgment warped as a result of their terrible troubles, have endeavoured to stampede the Government into legislation of a sectional and, perhaps, individual character. The people have been altogether too panicky to be fair. There is no doubt about that. The outlook of the vast majority of the people has been individual and sectional, and, quite naturally, the result has been that Governments and established authorities generally throughout the world have been booted from pillar to post. But that result is not likely to be so apparent in Western Australia where we have managed to retain our sanity to a greater degree than in any of the other States of the Commonwealth.

Hon. P. Collier: And the hon. member might be fair enough to say in the course of his comments that no Government have had a fairer Opposition than the Government of Western Australia during the last two years.

Mr. DONEY: I was going to say—

Hon. P. Collier: The hon. member should be fair in his comments. There has been practically no criticism of legislation, and the Opposition have been fair.

The Attorney General: We all agree on that point.

Hon. P. Collier: To listen to the member for Williams-Narrogin, one would not think so.

Mr. DONEY: Had the Leader of the Opposition waited for a moment he would have heard me say almost exactly what he himself has stated. I was about to proceed to express gratitude to the Leader of the Opposition—

Hon. P. Collier: What attitude did Mr. Latham and his followers adopt towards the Scullin Government? They kept up their criticism day and night. One would have thought the Opposition in this Parliament had adopted the same course during the past two years, seeing that the hon. member has been whining so much ever since he started to speak.

Mr. DONEY: I am not whining.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course you are. You have done nothing else but whine.

Mr. DONEY: We heard the Opposition during the last three sittings of Parliament.

Hon. P. Collier: You do not know what criticism is.

Mr. DONEY: Very well, we will say that I do not know what criticism is. We will take it that what the Leader of the Opposition says is correct. I desire to give some credit to the Government for the comparatively happy state of affairs within the State, and not to do so would be unjust to a Cabinet that has weathered what is probably the most destructive storm, commercially and socially, through which the State has ever passed. The question is being asked every day, "What have the Government done?" Some people spend their time in looking for someone to blame, instead of searching for a remedy and they say that the Government have done nothing at all. There are others, including some members of the Opposition, who say the Government have legislated completely and only in the interests of primary producers. Then, again, there are those who say that the Government have done nothing for the primary producers. I feel inclined to say that the Government, recognising that the very life of the State depends upon a contented and prosperous countryside, have necessarily and ungrudgingly legislated for the prosperity and encouragement of primary industries to the greatest degree consistent with fair play to all classes. I must have regard to the obstacles in the way, perhaps not so much political as psychological and financial obstacles, when I assert that the Government have achieved a great measure of success. There are those who insist, in making a comparison between this State and the Eastern States, upon voicing that comparison in a manner detrimental to Western Australia. Particularly do they detrimentally compare this State with South Australia. Surely those people cannot quite know what they are talking about, because Western Australia has less taxation and less privation, higher sustenance rates and a greater degree of contentment that obtain in any other Australian State. I can truthfully say that Press statements in the other States show that those States are envious of the conditions that obtain in Western Australia. Surely that implies a very favourable record on the part of Ministers in the present Government. Premiers of the other States have been insistent that, in all fairness, we should increase our taxation and reduce our sus-

tenance rates, but I am glad to know that so far the Premier and his Ministers have withstood that insistence. It might be appropriate briefly to examine the remedial legislation that has affected farmers in this State and in South Australia. It will be noticed that almost without exception the dates of the several Acts I shall refer to will indicate that the legislation was first introduced in this State and was later submitted to Parliament in the sister State. On the 30th December, 1930, the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act was introduced in this Parliament. That measure was to secure the adjustment of the debts of farmers and to make provision for them for the year 1931-32. On the 2nd April, 1931, the South Australian Government introduced their Farmers' Relief Act, which was for a similar purpose. During 1930 and 1931, £600,000 was distributed in this State through the Agricultural Bank to secure supplies of super and cornsacks, make provision for sustenance and so forth. The raising of money under a Loan Act or the provision of machinery for the distribution of that money in this State was quite unnecessary. In addition, we did the industry a great service by permitting farmers to retain the whole of the wheat bonus money. That was not done in any other State. On the 2nd April, 1931, the Farmers' Relief Loan Act was passed in South Australia and later that State raised £400,000 for the assistance of necessitous farmers. We then passed two amendments to the Land Tax and Income Tax Assessment Act, one of which provided that land tax would not apply to improved land used wholly or mainly for agricultural or pastoral purposes. The land tax passed a few months later in South Australia was a measure merely to extend the time for the payment of land tax. I certainly think we had the better legislation in that respect. In the years 1930, 1931 and 1932 arrangements were made in this State with the Agricultural Bank, the Associated Banks and merchants for the supply of cornsacks to farmers on their own credit, on the basis of a first preference charge against the crop proceeds for the respective amounts involved. At the end of 1931, the South Australian Government passed the Cornsacks Act, which has not worked quite so smoothly as our arrangements have done in this State. On 18th August, 1931, the present Government passed a unique and useful piece of legisla-

tion in the Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act. Hon. members know the purpose of that Act without the necessity of information from me. Shortly after that the South Australian Government passed the Mortgagees' Relief Act, which was virtually a copy of our legislation. On the 18th August, 1931, we passed the Hire Purchase Agreements Act, and six months later a similar Act was passed in South Australia but without the retrospective clauses that were included in our legislation. It is fair comment to say that those who set out to belittle this State should first of all examine both sides of the question before they commence to make detrimental comments such as those I complain of. The depression, if it has done nothing else, has certainly given this State an agricultural outlook. Every phase of thought in this State unites in realising that we are dependent entirely on the primary industries. But we are depending on a broken reed unless we set about mending those industries. The task of mending is urgent. We cannot build a successful future on industries that show a loss to those in them. By common consent we are facing a very tricky future, and there is a number of industries that are due for reconstruction. I have heard one or two members, I think on this side of the House, say that agriculture has no future. I do not think that can be correctly said. In fact, of all the occupations that we on this side are concerned in, the one surest of survival is the art of growing things. Man must eat and man must clothe himself, and so it is difficult to believe that either of our two major industries is going to the wall. The future of the wheat and wool sales is likely to be on an entirely new basis, and we must necessarily reconstruct on that new basis at the earliest possible moment, so that we may be ready with suitably ordered and properly manned farms to take advantage of the lower costs and better prices that already are looming on the horizon. The immediate task is to reconstruct farm values and thereafter reassess the farmers' liabilities. The task, besides being difficult, is very dangerous and risky. I do not think there can be any two opinions about that. Fortunately, in a rough and ready way certainly, we have already re-made our farm values. The old high values have gone, and lower values have taken their place, and it has become merely a matter of recognising that new change on a few thousand ledger sheets

in this State. Even that might be comparatively easy if it did not involve a general depreciation in values and bring about, almost of a certainty, the destruction of our financial system by making the assets of less value than the loan upon them. It is no doubt difficult to find a basis upon which to revalue. What farmer is there to-day who knows the value of his farm? And unless he knows that value, how can he know the measure of assistance he requires. But even that can be overcome by a tentative revaluation of farming properties. There is that method, frequently referred to lately, where that portion of a man's capital liabilities not offset by some productive asset is placed in cold storage for a period of, say, five years, without interest, at the end of which time a further and final revaluation would determine what portion of the stored amount was to be finally written off. Even that would leave us without any basis of valuation, but as a basis is not easily computable it would be necessary to assume one. We do not dare to base our expectations at higher than 3s. 6d. per bushel for wheat, or 1s. 3d. per lb. for wool. I have no doubt it is upon the basis suggested by those figures that the new valuations will be made. Recently I heard a Minister say that a reconstruction must certainly take place very shortly, and that when it does take place those men who have stuck to their farms will assuredly receive the major benefits. I hope that at the same time the Minister to whom I refer will give an equal consideration to the need for strong preference to those who have been forced off their farms despite their having done their level best along sound farming lines. Of all the schemes that have been submitted to the Government or talked about in the street, this particular scheme, involving the freezing of assets, is likely to be the one adopted, for the reason that it is the only one I have heard of that gives an equal measure of fair play to both debtor and creditor. Of course reconstruction is a long, irksome and risky job. We cannot foresee what pitfalls it may lead us into. We know it is difficult, because some six months ago Mr. Hill, the Premier of South Australia, set about the task of reconstructing farm values in his State. But he had not gone very far before he found so many difficulties in his path that he was forced to give up the job. I see now that he forms one of a committee of three, the others being Mr. Stevens, the Premier of New South Wales, and Mr. Lyons, the

Prime Minister, whose job it is to bring order out of the chaotic state of farm values. I await with a great deal of interest the report of that committee. Because it is plain to all of us that whatever plan is put into operation in one State will be put into operation in all the other States. I believe that we in Western Australia, as soon as we know the meaning and purpose of that report, will jump into harness on this particular job. There is one thing we must not forget, namely, that if we jump in too early we shall find ourselves forced to go through the work again at a later period. It is essential, therefore, that we guard against making any false start. About the trickiest difficulty confronting the farmer is the getting of his costs lower, but I have a feeling—and it is to some extent borne out by facts and figures—that at last we can see some daylight and some hope. Bulk handling, for instance, will give us relief to the extent of some 3d. per bushel. Probably 99 per cent. of the farmers of this State are asking for bulk handling, and it therefore becomes the plain duty of the House to give them bulk handling. I, and I think other members on the cross benches say the sooner the better. A reduction of interest from seven per cent. to five per cent. will, according to the computation I have made, give us another 4d. per bushel. We know that the Agricultural Bank, after reducing the interest rate from seven per cent. to six per cent., have recently announced a further reduction to 5½ per cent. I think that when the proceeds of the next harvest are known, provided they are favourable, there will be a further reduction of half per cent., which will give a further saving of 4d. a bushel. The Associated Banks are coming into line very slowly indeed.

Hon. A. McCallum: How do you calculate that a half per cent. will give you 4d. a bushel?

Mr. DONEY: I said that a reduction from seven per cent. to five per cent. would be equal to 4d. per bushel.

Hon. A. McCallum: You said another half per cent. would mean 4d. a bushel.

Mr. DONEY: The whole saving, I figure, would be 4d. a bushel.

Hon. A. McCallum: Why do you expect that to arrive in six months' time?

Mr. DONEY: Why does one expect anything, except that one receives an impression, based on calculation and experience,

The hon. member cannot expect me to be more explicit on the point. If he were in my place I do not think he would be more explicit. We know that a reduction in the capital liabilities of farms is coming about, although we cannot fix a date for it. It is inevitable that it must come because we cannot carry on without it. A reduction in the capital liabilities of farms by 33½ per cent. would mean yet another 3d. a bushel saving. The next item in my little addition sum is not so satisfactory. If the requirements of the primary industries, by some chance, were made duty free—I admit this is more than I dare to hope for for a long time—we would then save another 3d. a bushel. Some people set it at a far higher figure.

Hon. A. McCallum: I should say it is impossible to calculate.

Mr. DONEY: I admit it is extremely difficult to calculate. No two men making the calculation would take into consideration the same factors and consequently would not arrive at the same conclusion. As the matter has been referred to by members opposite, may I say that we certainly can rely upon the enthusiasm, the industry and the proper intent of Federal Country Party members with respect to the tariff, but I do not mind admitting that we cannot place the same reliance upon the intentions and the work of their colleagues in the Government. If the Federal Government would only give the farmers ten years freedom from the tariff and then revert to it, that would be sufficient to enable the industry to dig itself well in.

Mr. J. H. Smith. Why ten years? Why not get rid of the tariff?

Mr. DONEY: Gladly I would if I could, but ten years would enable the farmers to achieve the results indicated.

Mr. Kenneally: You would bring in all their requirements free.

Mr. DONEY: Yes, in the national interests, until such time as the industry had dug itself in. The hon. member will agree that, when it was dug in, the farmers could much easier than now give the good living conditions so constantly and properly looked for.

Mr. Kenneally: And by bringing goods in free, providing work in other countries for other people and throwing our people out of employment.

Mr. DONEY: If this were a debate on the tariff and if the hour were not so late,

I would not mind joining issue with the hon. member on that point. The question of granting £150 a year sustenance to farmers has been freely referred to lately. I have repeatedly brought the matter to the notice of the Government, whose attitude to the farmer is quite satisfactory, but members know as well as I do that no matter how carefully they may search their pockets, there is not at the moment money for that very just demand. They could, if they were prepared to accept the principle—and I think it would be a proper and just principle—scale the amount downwards according to the number in the family and according to whether the applicant was a married or an unmarried man. I have heard the view expressed that, if the system were adopted, the thriftless farmer would take great care not to put in more crop than would just about yield £150, but I think most of us realise that thriftless farmers in these days are extremely few and far between. The Government are prepared to give relief work up to £3 per week, and remembering that, the Government may perhaps find it a little easier to extend the same benefit to distressed farmers.

Mr. Kenneally: They pay that amount only in prescribed cases. It ranges down as low as 7s.

Mr. DONEY: But it rises as high as £3 in certain cases, no higher. By the same token farmers would receive £150 only where the number in the family more or less demanded it.

Mr. Kenneally: They would be content with 7s. for single farmers?

Mr. DONEY: I do not mind accepting as a basis for the calculation of additional relief payments the same figure for them as for unemployed single men. I desire to plead for a closer welding of the railways and the people of the State, particularly the producers. The interests of the railways and of the producers are to a large extent identical. The instructions given to the Commissioner of Railways by successive Ministers for Railways do not allow these two peoples to work co-operatively. They have a deadening effect upon the discretion of the Commissioner in respect to freights. I believe the instruction is that the railways must pay. When times were normal and our industries were profitable enough to pay the freights demanded of them, this

was a desirable instruction, but it is a thoughtless instruction to-day and has led to a great deal of bickering and loss of trade as between the producers and the railways. If that instruction means anything, it means that the railways must pay even if that leads to jeopardising the out-back wheat industry and the railways themselves.

Mr. Withers: If they are not assisted to pay, the general taxpayer must make up the difference.

The Minister for Railways: How will you make up the money if they are not made to pay?

Mr. DONEY: It is not a matter of much consequence whether the railways pay or not. The instruction should be not that the railways must pay, but that the railways must assist to make the country pay. The railways are a means to an end and they should be utilised in that capacity.

The Minister for Railways: All members make the same statement in regard to every Government activity.

Mr. DONEY: It is not necessary to make the railways pay. It is the insistence upon making them pay that has to some extent led to the crippling of primary industries.

Mr. Wansbrough: Do you think they should cart wheat at 1d. per ton per mile?

Mr. DONEY: I do not say that the freight on wheat or super is too high.

Mr. Wansbrough: Yet you are hinting at a reduction.

Mr. DONEY: I am not. I suggest a freights board should be formed, consisting of the Minister for Railways, the Commissioner or his deputy, a wheatgrower, a woolgrower, and a retired guard.

Mr. Wansbrough: What about the consumers?

Mr. DONEY: Such a board would secure a revision of freights that would be equitable to all parties concerned. We should adopt a broad outlook. A capital of £26,000,000 is at stake and we cannot deal lightly with such a sum. I am not speaking disparagingly of railway control. I think the railways are ably officered and manned. I am, however, complaining about the restrictions put upon the Commissioner and his officers by successive Ministers for Railways. I have to thank the Commissioner for recent reductions in the freight on wool.

I have specialised in that matter for a long time and am pleased to see such a radical amendment in the rates. The Commissioner started last year with a reduction of 12½ per cent., and this has been followed by another of 25 per cent according to the distance from Fremantle. I made representations to the Minister and the Commissioner to have special reductions made in the case of such places as Williams, Kondinin, and Kojonup. Williams is exactly 100 miles by road from Fremantle, but 192 miles by rail. If we are going to insist on wool travelling by rail from districts suffering from marked geographical disabilities, some special reduction in freight must fairly be made. I thank the Commissioner for allowing a further reduction of 5s. per ton.

Mr. Wansbrough: By that reduction you create centralisation.

Mr. DONEY: I do not agree with that. On several occasions I have had to draw the attention of the House to the very cramped, damp and ill-conditioned state of the building at Narrogin that is doing duty as a hospital. When the member for Hannans (Hon. S. W. Munsie) was Minister for Health, he made available a sum of money for building purposes, but on account of some local misunderstanding the amount was withdrawn. He was very helpful in this matter, and no blame attaches to him for the present position. Then came the depression, and the whole business was shelved. Recently the present Minister for Health expressed his willingness to help the local governing bodies by making available a sum of money on a fifty-fifty basis, so that one ward of the hospital might be erected, and the balance constructed as soon as better times returned. I hope that Narrogin will be able to find its half share of the money, and that this extremely urgent work will shortly be put in hand. I wish to refer briefly to the late Michael Brown of Narrogin. He was known as the grand old man of the southern districts. Practically every member of the House was acquainted with him and will agree that he earned that fine title. He was a pioneer of a really splendid type. He set a fine example of industry, of decency, and of helpfulness. He started, I believe, with nothing, on coming to this State; and on his upward journey he helped hundreds and hundreds of others to succeed with him.

He was a man of great vision. I know that by means of his splendid example he wielded great power—no man more so—in the southern part of the State. I felt that because so many hon. members knew Mr. Brown, and because he was such a very fine old gentleman indeed, the House would join with me in regretting his passing.

On motion by Mr. J. I. Mann, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 25th August, 1932.

	PAGE
Questions: Calyx Porcelain Works	227
Hospital tax	227
Railways—1, Loan for E Class engines; 2, Measures against fire	228
Red mite and lucerne flea	228
Factories legislation, enforcement... ..	228
State Trading Concerns, quarries and brickworks	228
Unemployment—1, Sustenance; 2, Frankland River workers; 3, Arrest of workers	228-9
Bill: Supply (No. 1) £2,225,000, returned	229
Address-in-reply, fourth day	229

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

QUESTION—CALYX PORCELAIN WORKS.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it a fact that the Calyx Porcelain Works have been leased or sold to a person named Vincent? 2, If so, will he inform the House of the terms of such sale or lease? 3, Is William Carcary still the liquidator? 4, If so, what remuneration is he receiving? 5, What was the total amount drawn by W. Carcary as liquidator and what were his specific duties? 6, What was the value of stock taken over by Vincent? 7, What was the value of raw material taken over? 8, Under what terms and conditions were such stock and raw material taken

over? 9, What was the total amount due to the Government when the company went into liquidation? 10, What was the amount advanced to the liquidator by the Government to carry on the business? 11, Will he make the file available to the House?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No lease or sale has been effected. An arrangement has been made with Mr. Vincent with a view to preserving the Government's assets, and in the hope of maintaining and placing the industry on a business footing, with the possibility of ultimate purchase by him. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Yes, nominally, as the collection of assets is still proceeding. 4, As may be fixed by the court. 5, Information is not available, but will be furnished by the liquidator in due course in the presentation of the final accounts to the court, who appointed the liquidator and fixed his remuneration. The duties of liquidator are defined in the Companies Act, 1893. 6 and 7, The book value of stock and raw material was £7,671. This value is distinct from realisable value. 8, For purpose of carrying on the industry. 9, The company went into liquidation in 1925, and the principal sum owing to the Government was £13,506. 10, In 1925, £1,200; 1926, £800; 1927, £4,720; 1929, £2,000; 1930, £2,290; 1931, £617; total £11,627. 11, This will be considered.

QUESTION—HOSPITAL TAX.

Deductions from Compensation Payments.

Mr. SLEEMAN asked the Attorney General: 1, Is he aware that, notwithstanding the ruling of the Crown Law Department, the Taxation Department are still collecting hospital tax from payments made to injured workers under the Workers' Compensation Act? 2, Does he intend to allow the Federal Crown Solicitor to dictate as to what is to be done regarding State taxes? 3, If not will he see that the practice is stopped, and all moneys refunded to those from whom hospital tax has been illegally collected?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Instructions to cease collection of this taxation have already been issued. 2, No such question is involved. 3, Refunds will be made on application to the Commissioner of Taxation.