

are going around annoying people as I have indicated. Because they have no money to spend, they are eating into the rates and annoying the residents. I noticed a striking instance of what is going on throughout the State when I watched some men working last week. There were two municipal employees and a foreman—the foreman had his overcoat on. They were engaged in replanting some trees in place of some that had died. The two men were endeavouring to dig one hole, and the foreman was looking on. Someone else came along later to plant the trees. On the other side of the road there was a big motor lorry—controlled by private enterprise—manned by one man who was loading it with sand and was able to get away in about the time it took the two men and the foreman to dig a hole for a small tree. That is an indication of the extravagance that is going on from one end of the country to the other. The movement is led by members of the Government. We have heads of departments travelling round the country and spending money here, there and everywhere. Then they return to town and urge the office boy to chase around in an effort to economise in pins and nibs, paper and paste. We will never rid ourselves of our troubles until we face the task of reducing the cost of production of the articles we can produce to a level that will enable us to compete in the world's market. When we do that, we can talk about preference for our goods within the British Empire. I support the motion.

On motion by Hon. J. Nicholson, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 6.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 16th August, 1932.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Questions: State disabilities under Federation ... | 24 |
| Wheat carting bonus ... | 24 |
| Group settlers, Denmark ... | 25 |
| Question struck off Notice Paper ... | 25 |
| Sitting days and hours ... | 25 |
| Government business, precedence ... | 25 |
| Bill: Supply (No. 1), £2,225,000, Cont. of Supply ... | 25 |
| Temporary Chairman of Committees ... | 27 |

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

QUESTION—DISABILITIES UNDER FEDERATION.

State Committee's Report.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Premier: 1, Does the report of the State Committee on Western Australia's Disabilities under Federation (1932) show that the State would have benefited to the extent of £1,561,065 annually by being separated from the Eastern States? 2, Does he agree with Mr. H. K. Watson's review of the report when he states that the benefits should be increased by an additional amount of £603,000? 3, Does the State Committee agree with Mr. Watson in his contention that the State would benefit by at least £2,000,000 annually?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Committee estimated that Western Australia would have benefited by at least £1,561,065 during the financial year 1928-29 if the State had been free to impose the same rate of customs duties on goods imported from the Eastern States as is imposed by the Commonwealth Government on approximately similar goods imported from overseas. 2, I am awaiting a report from the State Committee on Mr. Watson's figures. 3, Mr. Watson's figures are being examined by the Committee.

QUESTION—WHEAT CARTING BONUS.

Mr. BROWN asked the Minister for Lands: Is it the intention of the Government to re-enact the wheat carting bonus for the forthcoming season?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: This will be considered at the proper time.

QUESTION—GROUP SETTLERS, DENMARK.

Agricultural Bank Policy.

Mr. WANSBROUGH asked the Premier: 1. Is it a fact that the Agricultural Bank has intercepted all incomes from settlers on swamp section Group No. 113, Denmark? 2. If so, what is the position of the merchants who supplied manure upon first lien, as agreed to by the bank? 3. What is the position of the general storekeeper who supplied the necessities of life during the production of such income? 4. Is it also a fact that the Agricultural Bank Trustees are demanding full current interest from (two) such settlers, while only 50 per cent. is being requested from others on this group? 5. If so, why the differential treatment? 6. Does the Agricultural Bank propose to supply seed and manure to such settlers for this coming season's cropping, together with sustenance?

The PREMIER replied: 1. The Agricultural Bank has claimed all potato proceeds, but no other revenue, under Section 37a, but portion has been released to each settler. 2. The merchant supplying manure was given a first preference for the amount advanced for the last crop, and this has been or will be honoured as proceeds are collected. 3. While the crop was growing, sustenance advances of £1 per week were available for each settler to earn, and part proceeds have been released to settlers. 4. One year's interest has been demanded from two settlers, six months' interest from three settlers, and one has abandoned. 5. Dispossession has been directed in regard to two settlers, from whom full year's interest is being demanded. 6. The Bank proposes to finance a further crop of potatoes for the remaining three settlers, seed and manure to be a first charge against the proceeds.

QUESTION STRUCK OFF NOTICE PAPER.

Mr. RAPHAEL: At the last sitting of the House I gave notice of a question, but I see this question has been omitted from the Notice Paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: I struck out the question from the Notice Paper, because I did not think it was a fair thing to ask any indivi-

dual member of the House his opinion upon the particular matter referred to by the hon. member.

SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

On motion by the Premier, ordered: That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRE- CEDENCE.

On motion by the Premier, ordered: That on Tuesdays and Thursdays Government business shall take precedence of all motions and orders of the day.

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1). £2,225,000.

Message.

Message from the Administrator received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

Standing Orders Suspension.

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER

(Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.48]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day, and to enable the business aforesaid to be entered upon and dealt with before the Address-in-reply is adopted.

Question put and passed.

In Committee of Supply.

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.50]: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending the 30th June, 1932, a sum not exceeding £2,225,000.

I should like to explain that I am to-day asking for Supply for three months. We

have met late this year, largely due to the fact that I have been attending Loan Council meetings in the Eastern States. As it is now near the end of August, I am asking for Supply to carry us on until the end of September. The amount asked for from Consolidated Fund is in accordance with the expenditure of last year. That is the usual procedure. The amount of the General Loan Fund is greater by £400,000. This is due to the fact that for these three months a special amount has been allocated. It will be remembered that there was an amount of £290,000 allocated for the relief of unemployment. Very little of that money was spent last year, but £290,000 will be spent during the next three months.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: How is the £290,000 made up?

The PREMIER: It is made up of £145,000 borrowed by the State, and £145,000 representing a grant from the Federal Government.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Did you borrow the £145,000?

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What interest do you pay?

The PREMIER: The interest is 4 per cent., plus $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. sinking fund.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It was, I take it, negotiated by the Loan Council.

The PREMIER: The money had to be borrowed from the bank by each State, each State making its own arrangement. That accounts for part of the £290,000 of excess over last year's expenditure. For the year a sum of £1,180,000 has been approved by the Loan Council. The sum of £500,000 is a special loan to assist unemployment, while the £290,000 has already been explained. The sum of £1,180,000 will be raised on short loan Treasury bills at a rate of interest at 4 per cent., carrying a $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. sinking fund. The £500,000 will probably be a short term loan with a heavy sinking fund. The sinking fund may be as high as 5 per cent. These amounts will be available if they can be raised. With respect to the three months of this financial year, provision has already been made for an expenditure, if deemed necessary, up to £600,000. It is difficult to get men who are out of work absorbed quickly into employment, but the £290,000 is now being spent in that direction. On the debit account, the amount fixed by the Loan Council is £765,000, and we shall have to live within that amount.

Much will depend upon when we can get men back to work as to what portion of the sustenance fund can be saved to revenue. There has not been very much saved as yet, because it takes some time to get men back into employment. The Annual Estimates are now in course of preparation, and it should be possible for me to present them before very long. The presentation of the Loan Estimates ought to be earlier. I am sorry I am not able yet to finalise the Estimates, and cannot give to members further information in regard to the probable expenditure and revenue for the coming year.

Hon. P. Collier: What was the amount fixed by the Loan Council for the deficit this year?

The PREMIER: It was £765,000. We expect to get £200,000 more by way of a grant.

Hon. P. Collier: Is that included in the £765,000?

The PREMIER: It has nothing to do with that. We hope to get £200,000 extra, but that will first have to be passed by the Federal Parliament.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: One will carry interest and the other is a grant.

The PREMIER: I am not talking about the grant. The £200,000 would go to revenue.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Will that make your deficit £1,200,000?

The PREMIER: No. The £765,000 is the deficit approved by the Loan Council.

Hon. P. Collier: I think I see what it means; the deficit includes the £200,000.

The PREMIER: The amount will have to be passed by the Federal Parliament.

Hon. P. Collier: It is only for one year.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. P. Collier: But the grant was for a period.

The PREMIER: For five years, and then for one year.

Hon. P. Collier: They keep us on a string from year to year.

The PREMIER: If the amounts were increased every year, it would be all right.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.0]: This Bill involves a fairly large sum, due to the fact that we are meeting later in the year than has been the custom. Therefore, as the Treasurer has explained, provision is made for Supply for three months instead of two, as has been the practice. I do not

feel quite clear about two or three of the points touched on by the Treasurer. One is as to the amount for the granting of relief of unemployment. Last winter the arrangement was on the fifty-fifty basis, that is to say, the State Government undertook to provide an amount equal to that which the Federal Government agreed to grant.

The Premier: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The total amount made available for relief of unemployment was £290,000, and £145,000 of that amount was a grant, not a loan, from the Commonwealth. Of course, the other States also had amounts granted, on a population basis. I believe. Several of the States, I understand, received larger grants than we received.

The Premier: The original sum proposed was £10,000,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Between all the States. That was subsequently reduced.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: The original sum was £10,000,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That was a proposal which was not adopted. As regards the expenditure of the £145,000 granted by the Commonwealth Government, a board has been appointed, but only as regards the Commonwealth expenditure, and not as regards any amount that this State borrows, not as regards our £145,000.

The Premier: As a matter of fact, the Federal Parliament passed a Bill rendering it necessary that the board approve of the expenditure of our £145,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Is that the position to-day, then?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Have the board to approve of the expenditure of the whole £290,000, or only of the expenditure of the Commonwealth half?

The Premier: Of the whole.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is most extraordinary.

The Premier: It is.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I shall have something to say later concerning that aspect. We have heard a good deal about State rights, secession, and other things; but the Commonwealth has drifted more towards absolute unification during the past six months than during the whole 30 odd years of its existence.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Is it drift, or is it design?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It has happened through the deliberate act of the Federal Parliament.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Positive design.

Hon. P. COLLIER: To me it seems monstrous that the Commonwealth should not be satisfied with the appointment of a board to approve, or to withhold approval, of the expenditure of money granted by the Federal Government, but should want the board also to approve or otherwise of the expenditure of our money, money that this State has borrowed, money for which we are liable, on which we have to pay interest, and which we shall subsequently have to repay. I fail to understand on what grounds the Commonwealth ask for control of the expenditure of our money.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: They cannot trust the State.

Mr. H. W. Mann: The control is applicable to all the States.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I take it, naturally, that we are not singled out for special treatment in this respect.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We are not the only incompetent!

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is most extraordinary that we should have money made available to us through the Loan Council and that thereupon there should be set up a sort of master in the form of a board to see that we spend the money in the approved direction, a direction to be approved by the board.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: By two men.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not questioning either the personnel or the qualifications of the board, but I am questioning the principle of the thing. It is the principle I complain about. I could understand the appointment of a board, perhaps, to approve of the expenditure of money which was a special grant by the Commonwealth Government; but to go beyond that and say that there must be approval of the expenditure of the whole of the amount appears to me most extraordinary. I should imagine that nothing but a desperate condition of things would be sufficient ground for any Government to accept money under such conditions. This is following somewhat on the lines of the grant for main roads. The principle was established when grants were made for the construction of main roads, and the Federal Government are going to continue and extend that principle.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Was not the principle approved at the Premiers' Conference?

The Premier: No.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It has been approved by all the Premiers concerned to the extent that they have accepted the money.

The Premier: No.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Premiers may have accepted the money under protest; but to the extent that the State Governments have accepted and expended the money, they have approved of the principle.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Do you suggest that this was done without its being submitted to the Premiers' Conference?

Hon. P. COLLIER: I take it that this is a decision of the Loan Council.

The Premier: It is not.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You were informed, surely, before the Act was submitted to the Federal Parliament?

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Federal Parliament passed an Act authorising the grant. I suppose that is the way it is done.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And then precautions were made applicable to the various States.

Mr. Raphael: The Commonwealth must have thought all the Premiers were Lungs.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Later I shall have something to say regarding the actions of the Commonwealth, and not only in this direction, but in others as well. I do not want to dwell upon the question of unification at the moment: but if the time has arrived when we should have unification, I consider that the people ought to have some say as to the terms and conditions of unification, rather than have it forced upon them, willy-nilly, by the acts of the Federal Parliament without reference to or consultation with the people of the States or their representatives in the State Parliaments. Now, the £600,000 from the General Loan Fund is, I take it, not based upon three months' expenditure.

The Premier: It is £290,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not expected that £2,400,000 will be available for the year?

The Premier: No.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That would be the amount if this £600,000 were a one-fourth proportion.

The Premier: Yes. The £290,000 brings that up.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We have been carrying in for six weeks without authority. Parliament has, of course, been in the habit of doing that to some extent; but the period this year is longer than in previous years. A scheme of new works has been embarked upon. Many of those new works have already been commenced, and a number of other works will, so far as we can learn, be commenced shortly. The money for which this Bill asks is to be expended on those works, and I think we ought to have some information to justify the House in passing the amount. I would remind hon. members that this is practically the only opportunity they will have of criticising the nature of the works already commenced, the works about to be started, and all the details involved. This is the only opportunity, in granting Supply.

The Premier: No. There will be an opportunity on the Loan Estimates.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I may remind the Treasurer that long before we reach the Loan Estimates, or even the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure, this money will have been expended. The Bill only asks for an amount to carry over three months. Therefore, I repeat, this money will have been expended before the House will have a further opportunity of dealing with the matter.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: We would have to deal with it within six weeks, because six weeks of the period have expired already.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and most of the jobs are comparatively small jobs. Some of them will last a month, some two or three months. Many of them are under way at present, and others will be commenced soon. Again, these works have not yet been approved by Parliament; this is the first opportunity we have had of discussing them. It may well be that many of us will consider that much of this money could be expended in a direction altogether different from that proposed, and with greater benefit to the State. That may be a matter of opinion, but still I think we ought to have justification for the works. I mention once again that this is the only opportunity available to members for criticism. I do not expect the Treasurer to supply detailed information regarding these works, as most of them are under the con-

trol of other Ministers. The money will be expended by departments controlled by other Ministers. We ought to be furnished with particulars of the works. Where are the works to be done? In the metropolitan area? If so, what is the amount to be expended in the metropolitan area, and what is the nature of the works proposed to be carried out there? Similarly with regard to works in the country. How much money is to be expended on road work?

The Minister for Works: None.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is all information we might be given. How much is to be expended on water supply, how much on drainage, irrigation, or other works of that nature? Surely hon. members will not merely sign a blank cheque to-day and say to the Government, "You can select whatever works you choose; whatever you decide is all right." Members ought to be informed, and I hope Ministers will be able to give the information required. I am concerned as to the amount of the money that is to be expended in the metropolitan area, the relative proportion of that as against the money to be expended in the country districts. I am also concerned as to the nature of the works to be done in both instances.

The Minister for Works: None will be spent on road work.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is one point cleared up. Thus the money will be spent on other works. I am glad to know that none of it will be spent on road work, because if some were to be spent in that direction closer scrutiny would be necessary. We might have another £20,000 or £30,000 spent on some road deviation, on some road through a national park, or to some cave. We should make sure that nothing of that description is intended.

The Premier: There was £150,000 spent on one road.

The Minister for Works: It was £140,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Which road was that?

The Premier: The road south of Perth.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is a highway.

The Minister for Lands: It was a very costly highway.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That road is one of the highways between Perth and Fremantle. It cannot be said that either the road through the National Park—except, perhaps, on Sundays—or the other to Yanchep Caves is a highway. The road the Premier mentions serves a good purpose, whatever it may

have cost. Then again I should like to know if any of this money is to be spent on the goldfields.

The Premier: The water supply scheme will take a tremendous lot of it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, on the mains. From the newspaper reports, I notice that what seemed to be a very large amount is to be spent on replacing portions of the main. I can understand that any money spent in that direction is absolutely necessary in order to preserve the main.

The Minister for Lands: It is essential to maintain that water supply.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Of course it is. There has been considerable expenditure in that direction, and from my own experience I know that engineers have never been given anything like the amount they required, and which they regarded as necessary to preserve the main in a safe condition to ensure the continuance of the water supply to the goldfields, either by the present Government or any previous Government. But there are other water supplies. I would like to know whether it is proposed to provide a water supply for Ora Banda from the expenditure covered by the Bill.

The Minister for Mines: No.

The Minister for Works: We are investigating that question. It is not work in view for the next three months.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have no doubt that when we get the details of the expenditure, I shall have no difficulty in pointing out many works to be undertaken that are not nearly so important as the provision of a water supply at Ora Banda.

The Premier: We were merely asked to have the matter investigated. Of course, it is necessary to investigate before making provision for a water supply.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Quite so.

The Minister for Mines: At any rate, the matter has been investigated, and we have filled the dam.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That will carry the centre on for a while, but considering the number of men who are prospecting and the tonnage that is going through the battery, the dam will not provide a water supply for any lengthy period.

The Minister for Mines: It will make provision for four months' supply.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That means that at the end of that period, the battery will be closed down and the prospectors will be idle.

The Minister for Works: At any rate, we have been making investigations, and reports have been received.

Hon. P. COLLIER: This is the time when provision should be made for a water supply for Ora Banda, because there is no certainty that any loan money will be available after the period of three months covered by the Bill. I think the Premier said that the loan position regarding the balance of the financial year was uncertain.

The Premier: That applies to all moneys.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Loan Council has provided for three months of the financial year only, and the question of further loan moneys will be considered at a meeting of the Council in two or three months' time.

The Premier: Before the end of September.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. I think that is the position. Having regard to the condition of mining, and the development that has taken place in the Ora Banda district, all of which is known to the Minister for Mines, I have no hesitation in saying that some of the money available at present should be utilised in the direction I have indicated.

The Premier: The water supply at Ora Banda has been required for a long time.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is quite true. It was required when I was in office, but at that time not a quarter of the number of men were employed there that are engaged on the field now, nor was there anything approaching the present tonnage going through the battery. The position there has entirely altered. Then again, I should like to know whether it is proposed to spend any of this money on the construction of railways that have been authorised. The Committee should have some information on that point. It has been suggested in the Press that the Government propose to commence the construction of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway. If that is so, what has happened to the Yarramony-Eastward railway? I can only assume that the statement regarding the construction of the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook railway is incorrect, and that it has been decided by Cabinet to start the Yarramony line. I must assume that, because the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) has not asked his customary questions about the line. This is the first time he has failed to do so, and possibly the explanation is that he possesses some inside information and

that the Yarramony line is to be commenced shortly.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Premier said it was to be one of the first lines constructed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If it is proposed to start the construction of the railway, I shall have something to say about it. I shall raise the question as to whether, at this stage, having regard to the position of our railways, the mileage per head of the population, which is the greatest in the world to-day, and the whole situation generally, and having regard also to the absolute uncertainty of the money market in the near future or for some years to come, this is the time when we should embark upon the construction of new railways.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then there is the question of modern methods of transportation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. There is the fact that railways, like tramways, are being superseded by motor transportation in many directions. The Committee should have an opportunity to discuss that phase before any new railways are commenced in Western Australia. We read also in the newspapers that a fair proportion of this money—I think the amount is £30,000—is to be expended on school buildings in the country districts. I have no doubt that that is a very desirable way of expending money. From my own experience, I know that in the country districts and in the metropolitan areas as well, there has been an insufficiency of school accommodation for years past. I am aware that the financial position has enforced economy in that direction during recent years, and that there is a fair proportion of belated building and repairs calling for attention. I should like to know—the reports in the newspapers did not clearly indicate the position—whether any other buildings, apart from school buildings in the country, are to be attended to. There is no section of the community that has suffered more during recent years than the men associated with the building trade. I refer to bricklayers, plasterers, plumbers, carpenters, and all the other workers interested in the building trade. Those men have been hit harder than anyone else, because building operations have almost completely ceased. As most of those men had been in receipt of fairly high wages, and had been able to retain some small reserve funds in

hand, which prevented them from securing the advantage of Government sustenance, they have not been able to secure even labouring work that has been available to others. Wherever possible, some of the money covered by the Bill might be expended with advantage in the metropolitan area to provide relief for men whose callings have been associated with the building trade.

The Premier: When some of the large buildings in course of construction are completed, the position will be worse.

Hon. P. COLLIER: When the Commonwealth Bank and one or two other large buildings are completed, it will make a big difference, and will put a large number of men out of employment. There has been a very small move in the building trade recently.

The Minister for Lands: The move has been considerably more extensive during the last half-year than during the previous six months.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But the movement was small.

The Minister for Lands: Three hotels are being constructed in the city area.

Hon. P. COLLIER: But, generally speaking, the building trade is stagnant.

The Minister for Lands: That is so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not expect that sufficient money is available now to finance the construction of a new hospital, but the necessity for that work was urged some years ago. I suppose we shall have to carry on with the accommodation available now for some considerable period before money can be found for a new hospital. I know the senior schools in the metropolitan area have been in a state of disrepair for some years. I do not know whether provision is made for any more bridges, apart from the Causeway.

The Minister for Works: The money for the Causeway will not be provided for under the Bill.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Then the necessary money must come from some other source. Perhaps the Minister will give us some information on the point.

The Minister for Works: The money will be derived from traffic fees.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If that is so, the Minister is anticipating Parliamentary approval, because the work has been commenced already, according to newspaper

reports. The Minister is taking a big risk in tinkering with the Causeway in anticipation of an amendment of the Act. There is a great difference between constructing an improved Causeway and merely tinkering with the existing structure by widening it by ten feet. I doubt if it will be possible to make to that old, ramshackle affair, which it has been for many decades, alterations that will be of any real value and that will not be a waste of money, seeing that the structure will have to be rebuilt in the near future. It is a matter for engineers, but to a mere layman, having regard to its age and appearance, the Causeway does not seem to be in a condition that will permit of it being effectively dealt with by merely widening it by constructing a 10-foot path over the pipelines. The Minister's action indicates what a sure grip the Government have over the members sitting on their side of the House, seeing that he can start such work in anticipation of Parliamentary authority. By the time that authority can be obtained, the work will be more than half finished. Then again, much of this work that is going on, or is to be commenced, is, or will be, carried on under sustenance conditions. That is to say, those who have been in receipt of sustenance in the past, some of whom have received larger amounts than others, according to the number in their respective families, will be employed on the works, and the expenditure of the money involved will be at sustenance rates, plus £1 a week.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That will not apply to work on the Causeway, surely!

Hon. A. McCallum: Yes, it will.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Those conditions will apply to all works. The hardship will fall on the men who will be forced to take work in the country, because the major portion of the work, I understand, will be in the country districts. While a number of men will be engaged locally—that is to say, if work is being done at Bunbury, Northam, or Geraldton, the men on sustenance in those districts will be employed and therefore might be able to live at home—a considerable number will be residents of the metropolitan area who will be forced to go to the country and consequently to maintain two homes on the extra £1 per week. The man who is engaged on work, more particularly in the country, will have to incur expendi-

ture for clothing and equipment that will be much heavier than in the case of a man living at home in the metropolitan area. If the amount of work is governed by the amount of money available, an injustice will be imposed upon the married men forced to go to the country if something more than is proposed is not provided for them. Let it be understood that whilst these works will absorb, we are given to understand, something like 12,000 men—

Hon. M. F. Troy: That is an exaggeration.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Assuming it to be correct, the men will all be on part-time.

Mr. Raphael: And there will still be 4,000 unemployed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I do not suppose work will be provided for all the unemployed. The point is that only part-time employment will be provided, and so the position of the men will be very little, if any, better than when drawing sustenance and not employed at all.

Mr. Panton: Not as good.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In some instances it will not be as good; in some instances it might be somewhat better.

Mr. Panton: They would require more clothes and boots and that sort of thing.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. When a man is engaged on laborious work, he needs clothing, that is not essential when he is unemployed. The Government are not finding work for 12,000 men; they are providing them with sufficient work to enable them to earn the money they were formerly drawing by way of sustenance, all on part-time employment. Another hardship that has operated all along is that a large number of men who have been unemployed for varying periods during the past two years—

The Premier: Some of them for four years.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The Premier may make it four years if he likes; that makes it all the worse. They have not drawn sustenance; they had a little money lodged in the savings bank and have been spending it economically and paying their way. I met a man at the Town Hall the other day. He said, "I am just going into the bank to draw £4, the last of £110 that I had in the bank when I first got out of work." He had made his savings go as far as they would. When men have not been drawing Government sus-

tenance, they are debarred from employment on relief works.

Mr. Hegney: The same thing applies to men whose children are keeping them.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. It is a real hardship, and is penalising the thrifty section of the community. I do not infer that all men who have drawn sustenance have not been thrifty, but there are some who, no matter how long they had been in work, in the first week their employment ceased, sought sustenance. There are other men who have been keeping themselves for periods of six months, 12 months and longer, and because they have not applied to the Government for sustenance, they are debarred from getting a job. It is enough to make men say, as some have remarked to me, "What incentive is there for a man to put a little away when he is treated as an outcast and debarred from getting employment unless he is absolutely without a shilling?"

Mr. H. W. Mann: I think your Government initiated that principle and it has been continued.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The member for Perth can always be relied upon to find an excuse for the Government. Even if the excuse has no relationship to the facts, he will advance it.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Perfectly unscrupulous!

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is or ought to be known that the maximum amount that any one man can earn, no matter how large the family, is £3 a week. If a man has a wife and no family, he receives 14s. sustenance plus £1 a week.

Mr. Panton: Less hospital tax.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes; and an additional 7s. is granted for every child. I think something better could be done. There is evidence that a proportion of the men are being placed on contract work in country districts.

Mr. Sleeman: Piecework.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, so much per yard, or so much per chain, as the case may be. Many of those men will work the whole five or six days a week and then not earn half wages.

Mr. Raphael: Some of them only 25s. a week.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have seen the results of the efforts of some of the men on piecework, not men accustomed to office

work, but men who have been accustomed to laborious work. As a result of five or six days' effort they have received less than wages. That is the effect of piecework, which is in operation wherever it is possible to adopt it. The Government have gone further. Not only are they imposing the condition that Government work must be given only to sustenance men, but they are stipulating that contractors tendering for Government contracts are to employ men on the same terms and to employ sustenance men.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: And pay sustenance rates.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes.

Mr. Raphael: A general reduction of the standard of wages.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If a Labour Government had dared to interfere with private enterprise, or with the right of a private employer to engage whom he liked in the expenditure of his own money, there would have been a cry from one end of the State to the other about Government regulation and Government interference.

Hon. J. C. Willeoek: And big headlines in the Press.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. In the present circumstances, however, there is not a word said about it. How do the Government justify their attitude that if a contractor tenders for any work provided by the expenditure of this money, whether for cement or pipes or material of any kind, he shall not be free to employ whom he likes? What justification is there for interference of this kind with private enterprise? The contractor is not free to engage whom he pleases; he must take men who are on sustenance, and take them on sustenance conditions; that is, part-time employment. Surely the Government realise that this will mean increasing contract prices by at least 25 per cent.! What contractor is going to take the risk of putting on a body of new men quite unaccustomed to the work, men who will be allotted to him by the Government, not men of his own choice, and then, after having worked them for three days, put them off and take on a new staff, again men who know nothing of the work? Surely it is quite plain that such a policy must result in increasing contract prices by at least 25 per cent., which increase the Government will have to pay. Let me read this precious clause

in the conditions attached to the Government tender form—

Any additional labour to his regular employees which the contractor may require for the carrying out of the work under the contract shall be supplied by the Unemployment Board on application by the contractor, and the contractor shall obtain and shall, on demand, produce for the information of the engineer a certificate of the board that such labour has been obtained, and particulars of same. Such additional labour shall be employed part-time and paid according to the arrangement made by the board with the contractor.

What have the contractors to say to this regulation of their business by the Government?

Hon. S. W. Munsie: If a Labour Government did that, the Press would come out with big headlines every day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: If the Government find they have not sufficient money to employ men full time and of necessity have to resort to part-time employment, what justification is there for saying to every private employer or contractor who obtains a Government contract that he must employ his additional labour on part-time and under sustenance conditions? It may be that a number of men are available who were previously employed in some of the works for years. Those works have probably been closed for six months. A contract is obtained for the supply of material, and the works are restarted. The employers cannot re-engage their former employees, who had become accustomed to the work, men whom they knew and men whom they were reluctantly compelled to put off. The employers must take men who are on sustenance, men sent to them by the department in charge of sustenance. It is a most extraordinary interference with the rights of private employers. It means that because the Government are not able to employ men on full time—I do not say that they can in the present circumstances—they say to private employers, wherever they have the power to do so, that they too must bring wage earners down to part-time employment and payment under sustenance conditions. The gates of the private employer as well as the gates of the Government are to be closed to the workers. It is outrageous on the part of the Government, when letting contracts, to say to the private employer that he must employ the men that are sent to him and under terms and conditions stipulated by the

Government, in other words, part-time work and sustenance conditions. I can imagine what screams to high heaven there would have been inside and outside the House if our Government had inaugurated a policy of that kind, declaring to private employers the conditions under which men would have to be employed.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: The member for Perth is not saying now, "Your Government initiated that principle."

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not under any illusion as to what the member for Perth will say when he gets on the platform during the next elections. Before we can agree to grant Supply, the Government must give us some information about the various points I have raised. At the same time they must justify the entirely new principle as far as Western Australia is concerned, and indeed any other State of the Commonwealth. We cannot grant Supply to a Government that stands for a principle of saying to private employers, "You must employ whom we want you to employ and who suits us best." I hope there will be some information available in this respect. With regard to the Harvey drainage scheme, that has been going on for a good many months. I believe that 2,500 men have been employed there. I have no hesitation in saying that that work has cost and is costing about five times more than it should cost. It is being done by methods that are as antiquated as bullock-drays would be for transport to-day. Fancy 12 miles of drains of varying depths and of great width being excavated by men working with wheel barrows! In all work of excavation to-day machinery is employed which will do as much work in a day as it is possible for 100 men to carry out in the same period. There are travelling machines, erected on rails, scooping up the earth, raising it and dumping it out. Instead of this we find the earth is being laboriously wheeled away in barrows. I understand that the justification for the adoption of this antiquated method, is that if it had been carried out with the aid of a modern plant, comparatively few men would have been employed. As it is, there are 2,500 men engaged on the work and the extent of their wages is 25s. weekly. They were put on to carry out the work in an antiquated fashion so that they might be employed. I am not complaining about the men being employed, but are there not many other works about the State that require to be done? Are

there not hundreds of miles of roads that need to be constructed? There are dozens of undertakings in which labour could be employed, not merely for the sake of employment, and which need not be carried out in the most expensive manner it is possible to think of. Just imagine that in Government depots there are lying idle expensive machines that were specially purchased for work similar to that being undertaken at Harvey. I hope that at the earliest opportunity the Minister for Works will be able to let us know how much per cubic yard that drainage work is costing the State. I have some knowledge of that kind of work because I was once engaged in that class of undertaking myself, and I have a fair idea what it should cost per cubic yard to carry on such excavations. I have also a fair idea of what the cost should be if the latest machinery were employed. I am not far wrong when I say that the Harvey scheme is costing more shillings per yard by adopting the present methods than it would cost pence per yard by the more modern way. The present system represents utter waste of money and gross waste of labour. It is employing labour to no purpose whatever; it is a waste of human energy when there are many other works in the State on which the men could be engaged. There are other irrigation schemes, roads to be made, and railways to be constructed. Even if the railways were not constructed, the earth works could be carried out. I do not know when the Harvey scheme is to be completed; I understand that somewhere about Christmas we shall see the end of it.

Hon. A. McCallum: Why pick Christmas?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It was said that it would last 12 months. Even at this late hour the men employed there should be found useful work in other directions in the State, and the machines that are lying idle should be taken there and used. I hope the Minister will give us the information that we have asked for.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.55]: I should like to explain with regard to the £145,000 grant, that at the Loan Council it was arranged that the expenditure of that amount should be approved, by two representatives on a council appointed by the Federal Government, but later on when the Bill was submitted to the Federal Parliament it contained a clause which gave the Federal Government

the right to approve or disapprove to the extent of the £290,000. The principle is wrong, but it has been done. Of course they need not let us have any money.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Who are "they"?

The PREMIER: "They" are the Federal Government. It was a Federal Government that put the Bill through. The Federal Treasurer must raise the money under the Financial Agreement. The Loan Council may authorise the raising of money and after that the Federal Government raise it. The Leader of the Opposition knows that loan moneys authorised in his time have not been raised yet. Under the Financial Agreement the Federal Treasurer alone can raise money. We are spending it in anticipation of its being raised.

Hon. P. Collier: If the Loan Council says "you must raise the money," the Federal Government must raise it.

The PREMIER: The Federal Government does not raise money without the approval of the Loan Council.

Hon. P. Collier: But if the Loan Council says "you must raise the money," the Federal Government cannot refuse to do so.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition knows that money authorised to be raised in his time has not yet been raised.

Hon. P. Collier: That is so.

The PREMIER: The only person who can raise money is the Federal Treasurer. It is for the Loan Council to approve, and after that for the Federal Treasurer to raise the money. To-day it is impossible to raise money except by short-dated bills. That was not contemplated when the Financial Agreement was presented. The agreement applied only to loans, but in view of the financial position in Australia the Loan Council had to deal with all moneys, whether revenue shortages or loan. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that it would be wrong in principle for the Federal Government to interfere with the expenditure of money granted to a State, or of money raised by a State. The Federal Government should trust the State Governments of Australia to spend the money raised by them.

Mr. Sleeman: What about trusting the local authorities to spend their own money?

The PREMIER: We do that.

Mr. Sleeman: With a clause inserted such as that read out by the Leader of the Opposition!

The PREMIER: There is a certain amount of money available for the provision

of employment. It has to be made go as far as possible, and certainly the men on sustenance are better off earning an extra £1 per week. It applies only to the additional men put on to do this work, which of course has to be paid for from the State's loan funds.

Mr. Sleeman: In some cases it is nearly all they have got. They have been practically closed down, and this bit of work has allowed them to open up again.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: Some of the employers have given notice to men who have been working with them for years past.

The PREMIER: That, of course, was not desired.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: But you knew it must come if you insisted upon the other men being in.

The PREMIER: Many jobs, sewerage and drainage and other work, always must go on. Then there are the repairs to the Fremantle wharf, which must be carried out. And a great many men must be paid on the goldfields pipe track, which is long overdue for renewal. As a matter of fact, 300 miles of it is in a very bad state, necessitating a patrol ahead of night trains for fear of a washaway. It will take a great deal more money than is allotted now to restore the pipe line to a safe condition. That work was approved by this House, as were also the irrigation and drainage works. They have been going on under that approval. The clearing of railway lines was authorised by this House. It does not mean that the rails can be laid down, but it does mean, as the member for Geraldton said, that those lines when cleared can be used as roads until better times come and the increased traffic warrants the construction of the railway. The tramway work was authorised by this House at the request of our friends opposite. In the Geraldton district there are some works appertaining to the water scheme. Those works are approved by the member for Geraldton.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Yes, of course.

The PREMIER: It is something this House authorised to be done. There is a water supply there, and whenever you put in a water supply you provide for expenditure for the rest of time. Scarcely any of those works enumerated are not authorised by this House. There is the clearing of land which from time to time has been undertaken in periods of unemploy-

ment, whether by this Government or by the preceding Government. That is a good class of work for unemployed persons, and it is going on. It has not been authorised, it is true, but it represents a comparatively small sum of money. Of course we cannot talk of completing the railways; that cannot be done now. Every penny of available money must be spent on work within the State, and in furtherance of that policy we have cut out the importation of material from overseas as far as possible, until it has been reduced to a very small sum. Members will agree that it is a right policy. So there is no chance of laying rails at the present time.

Hon. P. Collier: We cannot buy rails just now.

The PREMIER: And we must keep within the State as much of the value of the money as possible.

Hon. P. Collier: You can do the clearing for railways.

The PREMIER: We are doing that on the Boyup-Cranbrook railway route. The Meekatharra-Wiluna line is not quite completed. Then there is the other railway in the South-West. Not a great deal of money is required to complete those two railways. So there is not very much work which has not been authorised. I realise that it is not usual to discuss these things at this juncture, but I know also that the times are unusual. I am sorry more wages cannot be paid to these men. If it be found possible to pay some of them more from the money available, more than we are able to pay them now, it certainly will be done. I am hopeful that with the return to better times positions will be found for the men in private employment.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But you dictate whom private enterprise shall employ.

The PREMIER: No, we say that all those paid from this fund shall work under the same conditions. That ought not to be objected to by the hon. member. It is our desire simply to be fair to all the men who draw from this fund.

Mr. Kenneally: You wish to get them all down to the same level.

The PREMIER: No, to get them all up to the same level, and to get them on to a better level when we can. If the money can be spent fairly for the whole of the people out of work it should be done. It would not be right to say to one half of

those unemployed, "You shall have full time work, but the others shall not have any work at all."

Mr. Marshall: You are not sorry they have to work for sustenance, are you?

The PREMIER: Yes, I am.

Mr. Marshall: Well why did you give authority to private employers to come down 20 per cent. below the basic wage?

The PREMIER: I wished that to be applied only to the hon. member.

Mr. Marshall: Fortunately you cannot do that.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is well paid now.

Mr. Marshall: And you are overpaid.

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition has raised this question about works authorised and unauthorised. There are some works which need expenditure and on which the expenditure must be made.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, sometimes that is necessary.

The PREMIER: The goldfields pipe line is in a very much worse condition than either the Leader of the Opposition or I was aware of, and the work of repair must be undertaken.

Hon. P. Collier: To some extent it has been going on for many years.

The PREMIER: Yes, and in consequence it is all more or less in the same state at the one time. It will take some years before we can complete the renewals. The lining of the pipes has been going on for some years, and it is very fortunate that the pipes can be lined and so given a longer life. But it is a very costly business. I do not think we ought to be criticised for doing that work or any of the works I have mentioned. If there be any work to which members might object, surely it would be some work which was not being done in continuance of an authorisation given during the past session. At such a time it is utterly impossible to think of spending on the Causeway the £500,000 which will be required for the complete work. If for the time being 10 feet can be added to the width of the Causeway for a sum less than one year's interest on the estimated cost of the complete scheme, then surely it is worth while. One would like to see a new Causeway built of cement, a structure everybody could be proud of. But such a work cannot be undertaken at a time like this.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Surely your estimate of the complete scheme is not correct.

half the capital expenditure was for reclamation work, outside the Causeway altogether.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER: I was pointing out that all the works we are undertaking have been discussed by Parliament and authorised by Parliament.

Hon. P. Collier: The reforestation work you are doing is not all pine planting.

The PREMIER: No; there is reforestation of jarrah.

Hon. P. Collier: I understand it is both—pine planting and regeneration of karri and jarrah forests.

The PREMIER: Regeneration of jarrah forests. That is more important work with us than the planting of pines. Similar work has been done under the vote of the Forests Department for years, and usually there has been a small item on the Loan Estimates, about £10,000, but now more money is being spent than has ever been spent on such work. It is good work for the unemployed, and very useful work for the State. I would like the Committee to realise that this work will enable the department to release more timber when the demand occurs than would otherwise have been possible. The regrowth has been very much better than was anticipated, and certainly very much better than the results obtained under the old system of allowing the forests to re-establish themselves. No exception can be taken to work such as keeping the pipe-line in repair, work on railways or harbours or other undertakings that are established, or for the continuance of works that have been discussed and authorised by Parliament. The Committee might well make a close scrutiny of every work that has not been authorised or of works upon which we are not merely continuing expenditure. I hope the Leader of the Opposition will be satisfied with the explanation.

HON. A. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [7.34]: I hope the Premier is not under the impression that the Committee will be satisfied with the very scant amount of information he has given us. We are only asking for what we are entitled to have when we seek full information as to the way in which this money is to be spent. Surely we are entitled to have a list of works supplied setting forth the proposed expenditure opposite each

item, so that we may know the purpose for which we are voting the money.

The Minister for Lands: It has never been done before.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: In recent years it has been regarded as a formal matter that Supply would be granted, but an extraordinary situation has developed. There seems to have grown up as an excrescence on the Constitution a super-Parliament that dictates to the Parliaments of the States. It appears that not only the State Government but the State Parliament has no authority in the matter of how much money is to be spent each year, or how the money is to be expended. The Premiers' Conference is usurping the powers of the State Parliaments and is laying down the policy, and it is merely left to the State Parliaments to record what has been done at the Premiers' Conference.

The Premier: Oh no!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We are asked to relinquish our position as representatives of the people.

The Premier: That is as regards the amount to be raised.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Premier has admitted that it is not merely a question of the amount to be raised. The other Premiers are dictating to him and he is accepting their dictation to a far greater extent. If we are merely to record what has happened in the East, and if Premiers' Conferences are to determine just what is to be done, we shall have unification in practical form.

The Premier: We have unification in finance, practically.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Premier seems to be lending himself to that, and I want him to infuse a little energy into combating it. He seems to be handing over the power of this Parliament entirely. The Premiers are dictated to by the Commonwealth Government, and we are asked to allow the vote to go through without having any information at all. Will the Premier explain how it has come about that we are not entitled to determine in what direction the money provided by the people of this State is to be expended? The Premier was present at a conference in the East at which the Premiers were told by the Commonwealth Treasurer that unless they agreed to a certain decision they could pack their traps and go home.

The Premier: Never!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I will read the report to the Premier—

The Acting Treasurer, Mr. Bruce, said that unless the Governments were prepared to subscribe to this resolution, their representatives might as well pack up and go home.

The Premier attended that conference.

The Premier: From what are you reading?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: From the "West Australian" of the 19th April, 1932. The Premier sat there and took that sort of talk. He was treated like a naughty boy—told that unless he did something, he would be whipped and sent to bed without his tea. He was told that he might as well pack his traps and go home if he did not agree with what the Commonwealth Treasurer had proposed. He remained there and accepted that sort of dictation.

The Premier: Of course I did not.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Premier is always protesting his concern for the interests of the State and his jealousy for preserving State rights and has gone so far as to advocate secession. One would have expected him to enter a protest, but he let it go without a protest of any description.

The Premier: Nonsense! The newspaper was not represented and you do not know what occurred.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If the Premier wishes to disarm criticism, he should from his place in Parliament fully explain his attitude.

The Premier: My attitude!

Hon. A. McCALLUM: He should not leave us to judge by the only information available to us and the public, namely, the report in the columns of the Press. The Premier has not contradicted the report and has not given any information in the House or outside it. Consequently we can arrive at no other conclusion than that the Premier accepted the position. The Premier has allowed the position of the State Parliaments to be undermined, and has raised no protest. It may have suited the Premier to pass over the matter on this occasion, because of the political colouring, but I warn him that if in future the same principle be again applied, it may be used with damning effect against him.

The Premier: What principle?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Recently we had the experience of the Commonwealth Parliament passing a law to intervene between the

Government and the taxpayers of a State. The object was to step in and prevent the Parliament of the State from collecting the taxation it had levied. If that was not overriding the authority of the State Parliament, I do not know what is. Where will action of that kind lead? I know what would have happened had it been done by a Federal Labour Government. I am not defending the action of the New South Wales Government in defying the Commonwealth and failing to meet its responsibilities to the other States of the Commonwealth. I am not here to support the attitude of the New South Wales Parliament, but I protest against the Commonwealth being allowed to undermine the authority of State Parliaments, defying them, and placing them at naught.

The Premier: To what are you referring?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: To the action of the Commonwealth Parliament in passing a law that the proceeds of taxation from incomes, amusements and horse-racing must be paid into the Commonwealth Treasury, and that that would release taxpayers from their obligations to the State. We may be unanimous in the opinion that the happenings in New South Wales were undesirable, but if the principle upon which the Commonwealth acted is admitted as constitutional, it might be used with deadly effect, particularly against a State like Western Australia.

The Premier: I think every State protested.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Possibly some disability may be heaped upon us that we as a Parliament, as well as the people, might unanimously agree is beyond the ability of the State to bear, and the Commonwealth might pass a law and seize all the income taxation to which the State Government were entitled.

The Premier: I think every State protested.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If the Premier entered a protest, I should like to see it.

The Premier: I tell you we did.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Premier should have protested from the floor of the House. Had he done so, he would have had the backing of Parliament. If he has entered a protest he has been very silent about it. Not one single item has been published showing that by word or deed the Premier entered any protest.

The Premier: Every Government protested.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Let the Premier tell us how he did protest. He has not mentioned the matter, but passes it by without any reference.

The Premier: We cannot prevent the passing of Federal legislation.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: He could have prevented this from being accepted by this State Parliament.

The Premier: We did protest.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It is a startling authority for the Commonwealth Government to take to themselves. If that is to be accepted we are wasting our time and the people's money. If a Labour Government had attempted to do this there would have been an outcry from one end of Australia to the other. It would have been said that in defiance of the Constitution and without the authority of the people, the Government were stepping in and enforcing unification.

The Premier: It was a Labour Government which first sued New South Wales.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Labour Government followed the constitutional course through the courts of the land. They did not attempt anything like this. The New South Wales Parliament passed an Act to levy a tax on mortgages, and the present Commonwealth Parliament passed another Act to say that it should not apply. If the Commonwealth Parliament can say to one State that it is not to tax mortgages, or that taxes have to be reduced, or that only a nominal tax may be imposed, is there anything to stop them from doing the same sort of thing with regard to any class of taxation?

The Premier: The courts would not allow it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The hon. member could have taken the opportunity to challenge this action through the courts.

The Minister for Lands: Is it not the fault of the constitution? It was challenged and the High Court upheld it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: This tax was not challenged.

The Minister for Lands: The other one was.

Hon. P. Collier: The Mortgage Act was not challenged.

The Minister for Lands: It was not put into operation.

Hon. P. Collier: The New South Wales Government went out shortly afterwards.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: The Commonwealth Parliament passed their Act saying that the State law, which had not received the assent of the Governor, should not come into operation. The same principle could apply with regard to taxation on land, income tax, amusement tax or any other tax, and the authority of the State Parliament would no longer exist. This great secession Premier of ours allows this sort of thing to go unchallenged. He is the great State's righter who is going to protect our rights against this sort of thing, but he allows it to go without protest, and he meets this House without even mentioning it. Even in the Governor's Speech we find no reference to it, nor has there been any reference to it by the Premier during this debate. The Premier protests that he is a State's righter, but his actions point to the contrary. He does not seem to care how much the Commonwealth authorities take from him.

The Premier: They did not take anything from us.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: They established a precedent which will shatter the authority of State Parliaments, if it is allowed to stand. Are the Federal authorities to be allowed to dictate to us to the extent of saying that unless we agree to a certain proposal we can pack up and go? How is it the States have not done anything to curb the activities of the Federal Government in this direction? The Commonwealth Government are the most extravagant Government in the continent, and are still carrying on their extravagant ways. Are they to dictate to us and say how we are to increase our taxation, how much money we are to have, and how we are to spend our money? Are they to be allowed to go on in their own way without any interference from us? The Premier has frequently voiced his opinion regarding the extravagances of the Commonwealth Government.

The Premier: So have you.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: And I am here to repeat what I said. The Leader of the Opposition has voiced his opinion and told the Premier where he stood. The latter need not have the least doubt but that he would have had both sides of the House with him if he had stood up to these several extravagances.

The Premier: You had six years in which to do it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We had nothing like the interference with us that has gone on in the case of the Premier. We were not told to pack up and go home.

The Premier: They did not tell us to do that.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: They did not tell us to increase our taxation or to do this or that particular thing. That kind of dictation was not hinted at. It is not enough for the Commonwealth Government to say they are balancing their budget. That is not enough in view of the economic situation of the country. They have invaded fields of taxation belonging to the States. They have heaped up costs upon the people to the extent that the State has been prevented from giving social services and gaining in revenue, because of the inroads that have been made by the Commonwealth. Is it not fair, in view of the financial position of the States, that they should insist upon the Commonwealth Government getting out of certain activities they now control, thus giving the States an opportunity to get round the corner, which they cannot do in ordinary circumstances? Why should the Commonwealth say we must do this or that before we are allowed any money? Why do not the six States reply, "You get out of the new departments you have created and forego all this extra taxation you are imposing"? In these new Commonwealth Departments salaries ranging from £1,000 to £2,000 a year are being paid. These amounts are common in the Federal service. The States have been prevented from doing necessary social services because of the extravagance of the Commonwealth authorities. We know well how many duplications there are between the Federal and State departments. Why should the Federal Government raise money from the people in order to maintain a Forests Department, when they have no forest territory to administer?

Hon. J. C. Willcock: There is a little at Canberra.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Many of the people in the country have larger orchards than the Federal Government have forest areas. There are bigger cabbage gardens in my electorate than there are areas in the Federal forest country.

Hon. P. Collier: And they have a school of forestry.

The Premier: But no trees.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: There is a small patch of pine trees under their control.

Hon. P. Collier: They are paying about £2,000 a year to the officer in charge, and he has no forest to control.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That department costs the country a good deal, as does also the Commonwealth Health Department, which supervenes on our Health Department. The Federal Public Works Department was established to create jobs for highly salaried officers. I travelled on the Great Southern line in the same carriage with a State architect and a Commonwealth architect who were going to inspect buildings in Albany. The State Government sent their official to inspect the schools and the police station there, and a Commonwealth officer was sent to inspect the post office.

The Minister for Works: Negotiations are afoot for us to take over that work.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: What excuse was there for setting it up in the beginning?

The Minister for Lands: The arrangement has been in operation for six or seven years.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It has not been in operation for four years. I brought the matter up in Parliament myself.

The Minister for Lands: Why did you not stop it?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: We did our best. Here is an opportunity for our representative at these conferences to secure economy. The Federal people tell us our expenditure must come down and our taxation must go up. We should reply "You must effect these economies in order to help us to meet our obligations." That is the stand the State should take up. What do the Federal authorities want with a railway department? Could not our department run the Transcontinental line as far as the border, and the South Australian railway department take it over in their territory? The work would be done far more efficiently than it is being done to-day from a centre situated in Melbourne.

The Minister for Lands: They would want us to make good the deficit.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: This is only a question of control, a question of doing away with a highly expensive staff and huge travelling expenses.

The Minister for Railways: The management is in Melbourne. They never see the railway.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: In the newspaper the other morning I saw an article written by Sir Hal Colebatch dealing with the Department of Patents. He pointed out that prior to Federation the aggregate cost of the departments in all the six States was only £700 a year, but that under Commonwealth rule the cost was now £54,000. The Federal authorities want £50,000 to shift everything from Melbourne to Canberra.

Hon. P. Collier: And when they get there they will want to enlarge the golf house.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Here is the Premier's opportunity. Instead of accepting so much dictation at the hands of the Federal Government, he should say to them, "The people cannot afford to meet these obligations, to carry these frills and flounces surrounding your Government departments. We insist upon their abolition, and upon these functions being left where they were before you entered the field." By that means a huge sum of money would be saved.

The Attorney General: You will never stop them from doing these things, while you leave to them the powers they now have.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I know that both sides of Federal politics have had a desire in that direction. The outstanding man who has forced the pace is Mr. Bruce himself. Each time he has been in office he has extended the principle.

The Minister for Railways: It has been common with all Federal politicians.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Mr. Bruce outdid everyone else. The Premier should take up this stand at the next Premier's conference. This would give the States an opportunity to get into fields from which they could expect help in their financial position.

The Premier: The Governments did protest, and an officer was appointed to go into the question of duplication and overlapping.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I was amazed to hear from the Premier that the two nominees of the Commonwealth Government on the unemployment board have to approve of all works that are carried on, not only out of the money the Federal Government may grant, but also out of money that belongs to the State. That information was gained only as the result of a direct question put by the Leader of the Opposition to the Premier. One would have thought that such an outrage upon State authority would have been mentioned by the Premier in introducing the Bill. The hon. gentleman did not men-

tion it; and, so far as the public know, he has made no protest to the Commonwealth.

The Premier: Of course I have.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That does not go very far. We want the Premier to produce his protest. He should have protested again when introducing the Bill this afternoon.

The Premier: How could I leave the Loan Council to come here and protest?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I am not talking stupid nonsense. The expenditure under this Bill has to receive the approval of two outsiders, two nominees of an outside Government. It was left to the Leader of the Opposition to obtain that information from the Premier. In this country's history there is no precedent for the exercise of such an outside authority. What is the use of our discussing this expenditure and authorising it if outsiders have to approve the expenditure and may nullify our decisions? The position is that this Parliament may be over-ridden by two outsiders. Where has Western Australian responsible government drifted to? When does the Premier propose to make a full stop? According to the Commonwealth, I believe, the works must be "urgent, necessary and reproductive;" and two representatives have been appointed by the Commonwealth to ensure that. When it comes to Commonwealth expenditure, however, the Federal Government spend £2,000 on a golf house in Canberra. What does our Premier have to say to that? Moreover, the Commonwealth Government and Parliament are not impartial in this regard. If State politics suit them, they give certain concessions. They pour out Federal money if it means winning an election. An instance is the way in which the Commonwealth Government handed over to the Stevens Government, who were holding office in a minority and had not received the endorsement of the people, money to be spent indiscriminately. According to the "Bulletin" and other Sydney papers, the money was spent on building cricket pitches and sports grounds. Anything to help Mr. Stevens win the election! There were no Commonwealth representatives to supervise that expenditure in New South Wales.

Hon. P. Collier: The Commonwealth Government gave public funds for a political purpose. No other State had any money made available to it at that time.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Up to that time our Premier had not received a penny from the Commonwealth.

The Premier: No.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Yet money was being poured into New South Wales. The Federal Government allowed themselves to be made a football in the New South Wales State elections. They distinctly took sides in those elections. That kind of thing should not be permitted. Apart from outside control over our expenditure, there have been complaints for years past that this Parliament is losing control over the money it votes. That complaint was frequently made when we were in office. However, I do not think we were ever guilty of starting works without Parliamentary authority. The work in hand on the Causeway, according to the Minister for Works, is being financed from money which this Parliament had decided should be spent in other directions. Such conduct in a private business would result in drastic action being taken. The Minister for Works proposes to spend £22,000 on the Causeway. The Premier said just now that the authority over expenditure for unemployment relief was the same as the authority over expenditure by the Main Roads Board.

The Premier: I did not mention the Main Roads Board.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It was said. The Commonwealth has to approve of the programme of work to be done. At every conference we protested; and the hon. gentleman himself joined with Mr. Collier, who was then Premier, in a telegram to the Commonwealth Government saying that if we were relieved of the Commonwealth restrictions we could make better use of the money. We kept on protesting, and at the last conference attended by our leader we succeeded in having the restriction removed. The Scullin Government removed it, whereas we could not induce the Bruce-Page Government to do so. However, the political colour of the Commonwealth Government has changed since then, and the principle of Federal control over State expenditure has been re-introduced since we left office. This Parliament has not approved of the work on the Causeway. The money being spent on that work belongs to the traffic pool. I was rung up by the secretaries of two local governing bodies in my district

and told that the Minister for Works had said the local governing bodies approved of his proposal to take the money for the building of the bridges out of the traffic fees. The two secretaries said that their boards had protested against this being done. The Minister is defying Parliament. Money that Parliament voted for use in one direction is being used in another direction by the Minister for Works without any authority whatever, without Parliament or those who subscribed the money even being consulted. This Parliament is being undermined and belittled. Everything is being done to thwart the authority of this Parliament over the expenditure of money paid in taxation. I did hope that the Premier in his speech this afternoon would give some information as to the Government's policy for helping Western Australia and this Continent—the State cannot go alone—out of the troubles they are in. But we have heard nothing on that aspect. Is it in the mind of the Government that the people are to settle down perpetually to part-time work at £1 a week over sustenance rates? Have the Government no policy beyond that? Has the problem been discussed by the super Parliament which the Premier attends so regularly? Has that super Parliament offered any suggestion as to what should be done? Is there no policy except to cut down wages and abolish social services? What is in the Premier's mind? What has become of all the electioneering promises made by the Government 2½ years ago? I do not think my memory is deceiving me when I say I remember having either read or heard of the present Premier making a promise that if returned to power he would find work for all.

Mr. Marshall: Happiness and prosperity for all.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I object strongly to the principle that before anyone can get work he must prove that he is absolutely destitute; must prove that neither he nor his family is possessed of a shilling. The other day there called at my house a man over 60 years of age, one of the early pioneers of our goldfields. He cried in relating the inquisitorial examination to which he had had to submit from an underling, a petty clerk. This old pioneer had been compelled to lay bare all his domestic affairs and responsibilities, what money he possessed, what property, what clothes, in order to collect a paltry shilling a day. What a humiliation is that to impose upon

citizens of this State! That is the basis of the scheme of work provided by the Government, for which we are asked to vote money this evening. The Government ask us to agree to the degradation of men and women who have to prove themselves paupers before they can get a job. What effect does the Premier think that sort of treatment will have on the morale of the people? Yet that is the sort of indignity our people have to submit to every day. A little while ago we went to the Premier and asked that, in the event of a man having to leave his home in the metropolitan area and take work in the country, such a man should receive a little more than £1 per week over ordinary sustenance rates. No one will argue that £1 a week will recompense a man who has to keep two homes going. If a man is at his own home, there are any number of little jobs that he can do, such as collecting firewood and so forth. He can also get an odd day's work here and there. It is impossible for him to do that sort of thing in the country. But the Premier will not listen to anything apart from the £1 a week above sustenance basis. He produces figures compiled by the department establishing that at the Myalup Camp a man cannot be fed at under 15s. a week. Surely if a married man has to leave his home, he cannot expect to feed himself in the country at less than it costs a single man! In those circumstances, surely a little more than £1 a week above sustenance rates should be made available.

[*Mr. Angelo took the Chair.*]

The Minister for Lands: If such a man has a home in the city, he can go back there in his spare time.

Hon. A. McALLUM: I know that, but such men are away for a considerable proportion of their time. We have also put before the Premier the position of men who, working under awards or agreements, have, in past days, been paid penalty rates for certain classes of work. For instance, at the Fremantle harbour there are certain jobs in which men have to work in salt water reaching up to their knees. Everyone knows the effect salt water has on clothes and boots. Because of that, the Arbitration Court award provided penalty rates for such jobs. Under the scheme now in force, so far from men getting any additional payment to replace boots and clothing destroyed in such a

manner, they have to take their time off, and cut it out. Standing idle will not buy boots and clothing. Moreover, these men are working part-time only.

Mr. Withers: If the men ask for any extra money from contractors, they are put off.

Hon. A. McALLUM: But the men I am referring to are employed by the Government and not by contractors. That is a distinct disability under which the men are labouring. We also asked the Premier that on certain jobs a start should be made with full-time employment in order to show a willingness and a better spirit. Such a system would certainly have the effect of reducing costs. As the Leader of the Opposition indicated, the cost of much of this work has been phenomenal, and it could not be expected to be otherwise. If men on many of these jobs were given full-time, it would not only reduce the cost but would help the men to replenish their clothing and domestic requirements in their homes. Some of these men have been out of work for two or three years. They have exhausted all their reserves and are now destitute. If they were given a little full-time, they would have an opportunity to replenish their supplies. Instead of the position having improved, as the Premier keeps on saying it has, the fact is that it has been continually getting worse. The figures for unemployment for the last quarter show an increase in Western Australia from 28.6 for the previous quarter to 30.3 per cent. When the Premier took office from the Labour Government, Western Australia had the second lowest percentage of unemployment in Australia. To-day it has the second highest percentage. The other States have had the same problems confronting them, and in the Labour Government's time the percentage of unemployment was 8.5. Now the Mitchell Government are in power and the percentage is second only to that of New South Wales, which has 33.2 per cent. That is what the present Government have achieved. I would remind the Premier that last session he took advantage of some figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition regarding unemployment. I want to point out to him that those figures did not include part-time workers, but merely those who were absolutely unemployed.

The Premier: What figures were they?

Hon. A. McALLUM: The Commonwealth Statistician's figures for the 30th

June last. Western Australia has more part-time workers than any other State in the Commonwealth. Ours is the only Government that has made part-time work uniform throughout industry. Ours is the only Arbitration Court that has made part-time work uniform, and our trade unions are the only ones that have almost wholly adopted that system. Thus, proportionately, part-time workers in this State are more numerous than in any other part of Australia. In respect of fully employed men, the Premier is second only to the awful Lang! Lang is the only man that can beat the hon. member.

Hon. M. F. Troy: They have a similar make-up.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That is the position. The Premier is always boasting that he makes available sustenance rates above those provided in any other State. He is paying 1s. a day. All I can say is that that amount is too little to live on and too much to die on. It just about keeps a man existing. The figures I refer to show that approximately one-third of the workers of Western Australia are totally unemployed. The position has been going on year after year, and the Premier must know the position of the great majority of our people, particularly of the younger men. Their parents have exhausted all their reserves. A number of families are compelled to live in the one home now. The standards we were able to boast about a few years ago, have gone. Notwithstanding that, the Premier, in statements made here and in the Eastern States, classes the men who receive £1 a week above sustenance rates as being employed. All the figures he has published since then, have included such men among the employed. I have an instance I can quote. I received a letter during the last day or two, and the position it discloses is typical of a large number of married men. Here is a man who has four children. He has two of his sons working, and because of that fact he has been denied sustenance. Being denied that, he is also denied work. No man can get a Government job unless he is on sustenance. As a result, these two boys have to keep a family of six. One is quite a young lad and is getting 15s. a week. Those two boys have to keep their parents and the two younger members of the family. Despite that, we read the Premier's homily the other day when he lectured some young men and asked why they did not get married! The

position under the scheme is amazing. For some days past we have had the papers publishing big headlines over statements about the thousands of additional men that are to be employed. During the last 12 months we have read statements of that description and lately we have read that 12,000 men, or 10,000 men, or 8,000 men are to be employed by the Government. The other morning the "West Australian" published a statement that £33,600 had been set aside for reforestation work, which would provide for 1,100 men for a period of four months. That means that during that period 1,100 men will be working for £7 a month. That is the level to which the Premier is sentencing those men! Yet he boasts under big headlines of finding work for 1,100 men at £7 a month—a blackfellow's wage. The figures I have quoted are under the Premier's own scheme. Then there is the clause relating to contracts to which the Leader of the Opposition has already referred, but the Premier has gone further than that. A new subclause has been added as follows:—

The Minister reserves the right to deduct from any moneys due or to become due under this contract, any amount that may be owing by the contractor to any State trading concern for any material or requisites purchased for use on this contract.

What would have happened had a Labour Government done that? What would have happened if we had included a clause in Government contracts setting out that preference of employment had to be given to unionists? Had we attempted to dictate even to that extent, what would have been said? But the present Government say that not only are they to insist that every man they employ must first of all prove to officials that he is destitute and absolutely poverty-stricken, but they are determined to see that that applies to everyone employed by private enterprise as well as by the Government. That is the level to which the Government are forcing the community. Men must be forced to the point of destitution before they are permitted to get work.

The Attorney General: Is it wrong to prefer to give work to the destitute rather than to a person who is not destitute?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: It is absolutely wrong that a man who was careful when he was in receipt of a fair wage and was able to save and keep his family in decent comfort, should be denied the right to get work until he had proved that he had spent every

penny he possessed. It is wrong, degrading, callous, contemptible; there is nothing too bad I can say about it. The Attorney General should be ashamed to be a member of the Government that does these things.

The Attorney General: And you should be ashamed to talk such drivelling rubbish.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I am ashamed of what your Government are doing, denying a man employment until he can prove that he is quite destitute.

Mr. Kenneally: The Minister is glorying in it.

The Attorney General: I say it is right to give a job to a destitute person before giving jobs to those who are not destitute.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: You mean that you will force everyone to that level before you hand out jobs. That is what you are standing for, and you seem proud of it. The three years during which this Government will have been in office will be a record for all time of the reduction in the standard of living which the people in this country have suffered. This Government have been hoarding money. We have it on the evidence of the Minister for Works. At a deputation that waited on him the other day he confessed that he had £24,000 available for expenditure out of the 22½ per cent. for main road repairs, £24,000 that he had not spent, but had hoarded up while men and women in this country had gone hungry. He boasts of it, and says he is going to put the £22,000 which he will get out of the same source this year apart for some other work. But the 12 months that have gone by for hungry men and women do not count with him. The Minister boasts that he has reorganised the Public Works Department. He says he has not been able to spend this money. He has so reorganised the Works Department, that he has reorganised it out of activity, and he cannot spend the money. Men and women have gone hungry while he has hoarded up £24,000. That is according to his own statement. No one knew that until the year was up. But what does he think of himself, when he has had deputation after deputation clamouring for work, and he has sat down on that £24,000, saying that he did not have the money. He has held on to that and refused to spend it in the provision of work so as to allow men to earn food and clothing for their families. I hope that when other Ministers speak we shall be given

more information. Very little information has been vouchsafed to us about these works. We are entitled to have it. I should like to hear a good deal more about the financial position generally. We are entitled to have from the Premier some declaration of policy, and to have from him the views of the Premiers' Conference as to how Australia is to get out of her present difficulties. I want to put this to the Premier: We passed the emergency legislation that cast obligations on certain people, reduced wages and certain interest rates, but the banks would not have the law applied to them. In the end the Government accepted an amendment by the Leader of the Opposition that placed in their hands the power to compel the banks to fall into line with the reduction of interest that had been agreed to in the emergency legislation. But the banks have not fallen into line. Instead they have made hundreds of thousands of pounds out of the emergency legislation. They have reduced the rate of interest on money paid on fixed deposit to them, on the money they have borrowed, but on the money they lend to the public they have not reduced the rate of interest. So they are making a huge profit out of the financial emergency legislation. Although the Government would not agree to go to the lengths to which we urged them, they accepted the amendment that if the banks did not fall into line they, the Government, would have power to make them do so. But the Government have refused to exercise that power. Everybody in the Commonwealth is complaining that the banks are the only people allowed to escape the emergency legislation. I should like to know what the Government are doing in this regard. All the Governments have been defied by the banks, and have not had the courage to apply the power vested in them. I hope the Premier will give us a declaration as to what he thinks should be the policy for this country in order to get out of her present trouble. I know that the member for Nedlands (Mr. Keenan) when he broke away from the Cabinet, had no misgivings. I listened to the speech he delivered in Nedlands when he said that if the Premier had a policy he kept it strictly secret to himself, that no member of Cabinet enjoyed his confidence, and no one knew whether the Premier had a policy. If the Premier has not a policy, surely the Premiers' Conference should lay down one.

I ask the Premier whether it is accepted by the Premiers of the various States that the only Australian creditors not to be called upon to make a sacrifice in the interests of Australia are those who live overseas. With the exception of the banks, every Australian creditor inside Australia has had to make sacrifices, but those overseas have not had to make any sacrifices. A couple of years ago I delivered a speech in the House drawing attention to the difference in the way England had treated Australia and the way she had treated her other allies in respect of war debts. Some of the figures I used were questioned. Since then they have been given by Mr. Chamberlain, the present Chancellor, in the House of Commons. He used the figures a few weeks ago and so proved that the figures I used were correct. They were as follows:—That England has remitted the war indebtedness of France to the extent of 62 per cent., of Italy 86 per cent., of Roumania 63¼ per cent., of Greece 68 per cent., and of Jugo Slavia 67¾ per cent. In all she has written off a thousand millions of money to those allies, while Australia has been called upon to pay 20s. in the pound. And again, while we have been prepared to pay with our goods, England now demands that we should pay in our gold.

The Premier: We are not paying interest.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: That is a mere quibble; it is only because of the Hoover moratorium that that is so. And that has been only during the last year. The point is that while we have to pay 20s. in the pound, this huge amount has been written off for the allies. And in respect of Russia even, Russia that confiscated all English investments and repudiated her war debt, England has been purchasing Russia's wheat and timber and fruit in preference to Australia's fruit and timber and wheat, merely because she can get those things cheaper from Russia. The war cost Australia £744,000,000, of which we have paid £371,000,000 out of revenue. It is not easy to estimate what the war is costing Australia to-day, because a great deal of our difficulty is due to what we paid out for the war. During the last few weeks Germany has been forgiven her war debts, but Australia is still staggering under the huge war expenditure we were put to.

The Premier: I am afraid Germany has not yet been released.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Well, that is the proposal England has agreed to. And the

Germans are still divided amongst themselves as to whether they will pay anything at all, even their private debts. Germany is talking of repudiating, not only her war debts, but her private debts. However, the allies know that they cannot get any more reparations from Germany, and so they have virtually forgiven her her war debts. Whenever this position as between England and Australia is mentioned, it is always said to be impossible to negotiate with the scores of thousands of bondholders interested. But as I have said in this House before, there is a precedent in history where two Governments have negotiated and come to an agreement, and have passed legislation binding their nationalists. So there is nothing to prevent the Government of this continent approaching the Home Government with a view to securing some relief for Australia. But what are we hearing from those that are controlling us and dictating to us? All they seem to say is "Cut down certain social services." Now they are even arguing about a further cut in old-age and invalid pensions and in the maternity allowance. They have cut wages everywhere and reduced the standard of everybody in this community, but of our huge indebtedness overseas we do not hear a word. Is Mr. Bruce at Ottawa speaking with the authority of the Premiers' Conference?

The Premier: We had nothing to do with Ottawa.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: If this Premiers' Conference, this super-Parliament that has imposed itself on the Parliaments of this country, have not got a policy, does the Premier tell us they have not discussed it with a view to lifting Australia out of its present difficulties? Are we to understand that the Premiers' Conference never discussed Ottawa, that the Premier himself does not know what Mr. Bruce is advocating at Ottawa? Are we to understand that all they had to promise was that from now on the workers of this country would have to submit for all time to this sustenance system? We have responsibilities to the people here, just as the Commonwealth Government have. They look to the Premier as well as to Mr. Lyons, and the Premier owes a responsibility to them. I am very much disappointed indeed, and although in the years gone by, and even in the immediate past, it may have been customary for a Supply Bill to be allowed to

go through as a matter of form, in the existing circumstances Parliament should insist upon a thorough investigation before passing it. We should bring to bear the combined wisdom of Parliament, and not accept this dictation from outside; we should insist upon the rights of Parliament being observed, and exercise full control over the expenditure we are asked to sanction.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [8.45]: The Supply Bill affords the only opportunity we have to rediscuss works before they are undertaken. The Annual Estimates do not give us that opportunity. By the Supply Bill we authorise the Government to proceed, and when the Estimates are produced, the works, in a number of instances, are actually proceeding, and Parliament has no opportunity to reform the foundations upon which such works are being constructed. Therefore I feel that owing to the critical position of the State and the condition of the unemployed, we must take this opportunity to discuss works actually in progress and works contemplated as a result of the money made available by the Loan Council. I do not wish to repeat what has been emphasised regarding the growth of unemployment. The member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum) has given figures from the publications of the Government Statistician indicating that unemployment is on the increase. I do not deny that the Government have made some effort to cope with unemployment. True the Premier has failed to fulfil his undertaking given at the last election, but though he has failed in that respect, the Government have done something to endeavour to cope with the problem. The Government must appreciate at this time that their efforts have failed, and that although they have expended much money, the number of unemployed has increased. I appeal to the Government to mend their way, to profit from experience, to realise that they have failed, and to appreciate that the present system of employing sustenance labour has not improved the position of the State, has not reduced the number of unemployed, and is actually making the position worse day by day. One has only briefly to analyse the existing position to see the unfairness of it. As has been pointed out, it is quite wrong to

say to a worker in the metropolitan area, "You shall receive £1 over sustenance and may maintain yourself and your family in the one home," and then to say to another worker, "Your family shall be divided; your wife and children shall remain in the home in the metropolitan area and you shall go to the country." There is no justice in requiring one worker to maintain one home in the metropolitan area while another worker is required to maintain one home in the metropolitan area and create and maintain another in the country. I do not say that the £1 extra is a reasonable amount; I am discussing the point of injustice. Why should one man get £1 and have only one home to maintain while another receives £1 and has two homes to maintain?

Mr. Raphael: The Government do not want the living wage; that is the trouble.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A man's clothing does not last as long in the country as in town. The man in town has his clothing looked after and maintained by experts at home, whereas the clothing of the man in the country is neglected and it is impossible to make it last as long as it would if he were living at home. How can we expect men to accept employment in the country under such conditions? The other day 12 men were called for by the Town Clerk of Guildford for railway maintenance or reconstruction work at Latham on the Wongan line. The unemployed were told of the number required and it was suggested that 12 should volunteer for the work. The Town Clerk could not get one volunteer. He then prevailed on the men to discuss the matter with the officer who had to make the final selection. After the matter had been thus discussed, only three would undertake the work. The nine men who refused the work returned to Guildford and I got into touch with them immediately to ascertain their objection to accepting the work in the country. After discussing the matter with them, I could appreciate their objection. They pointed out that it was better for them to remain in the metropolitan area on the sustenance pay than to accept the extra £1 per week. Some of the men had tried it and had found that work under such conditions resulted in an economic loss; they would really have lost money by responding to the Government's

call. I want the Government to appreciate that difficulty, and realise that it is useless to attempt to continue along the lines they have adopted. It has been suggested that there should be associated with the call for volunteers for country work a measure of compulsion, that men who refuse to accept work in the country should be denied sustenance; in other words, that the women and children should be penalised because the men recognise the economic impossibility of the conditions laid down by the Government.

Mr. Raphael: Driving the women to prostitution!

[Mr. Richardson took the Chair.]

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think the nine Guildford men who refused the work are likely to be denied sustenance. If the sustenance payments were withheld because of their refusal, it would be a downright public scandal. I do not believe that the Government are likely to attempt anything of that kind. I suggest that the Government try to introduce some other method. I do not advocate and I do not think the workers expect that one section of men should be given all the work available. The work should be distributed as far as possible and should be done on a basis that will help economic recovery, and the way to do it is to send men to country work, pay them the full basic wage for a stated period, and not limit them to £3 per week.

The Minister for Works: That is what is being done.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No.

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Two weeks on and one week off.

Hon. S. W. Munsie: You limit the men to £3 per week just the same.

The Minister for Works: You are a bit late. That has been adopted.

Mr. Kenneally: Not so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If it is as the Minister states, it is news to me. The incident of the 12 men at Guildford occurred only 48 hours ago. They said they had been told that they could remain until they had accumulated sufficient money at £3 a week to return home and take a period off.

The Minister for Works: Those men would work five weeks out of six.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister evidently appreciates the wisdom of my

suggestion and says it is already in practice. But there is a little catch in it and I want him to remove the catch. I want him to employ the men for a stipulated period.

The Minister for Works: We are doing so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister limits the men to earning £3 per week, and immediately a man has accumulated a certain amount known as kitty, he must stand down until kitty is exhausted.

The Minister for Works: Such a man would do five or six weeks' work.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not care about that; it is not panning out in a way that meets with the approval of the men, and the increase in the number of unemployed shows that it is not assisting the State. It is of no use the Minister inferring that the men can earn what I want them to be able to earn. I do not want certain men to monopolise the work, but I want the work regulated, not according to earnings, but according to a period. Let the men work for a given period at the basic wage.

The Minister for Works: That is what they are doing.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Then I take it that the Minister approves of men being employed for a period of, say, three months.

The Minister for Works: No.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: What is the use of sending men to Latham to work for five weeks? It is ridiculous in the extreme. There is no advantage to the State; it is not improving the spending power of the workers. Because of the limitation on the spending power of the workers, the State is getting no advantage from the expenditure of the money. The Government should try out a new system. They should employ men for say three months at the basic wage, let them live up to that income, allow the family to purchase some clothing, and then by the distribution of the money in trade and industry there will be quite a brighter outlook in a short space of time. I submit that we have experimented long enough to realise that a change is necessary. We should allow the men to go into the country and work for a given period at the basic wage. This would be a means of resuscitating industry and making it possible for the workers to buy the necessaries of life. It would help the storekeepers, and circulate money in a way that would do the maximum amount of good.

Mr. Piessé: Where would you get the money?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The money is here, but it is of no advantage to the community. It is being distributed in a way that causes it to do the least amount of good for the State generally. The fact that men have tried out this system in the country, and are not prepared to undertake it any further, is sufficient indication that something is wrong. Some of the finest men in my electorate, men who were never out of work but have been unemployed for 18 months, have discussed this matter with me within the last 48 hours. They have never dodged work, but they pointed out that this system was of no advantage to them. Why cannot the Government discuss it with them, and try to arrive at a basis that will appeal to them and give better results than have been achieved up to now? I endorse the views of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to Harvey. It is scandalous that we should be attempting to do work under such conditions. If we want the work done, let us have it done in the right way.

The Premier: Do you favour the bulk handling of wheat?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

The Premier: I thought you objected to machinery.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I have never objected to machinery, but I have objected to the control of machinery under our existing social system. I do not object to the utilisation of machinery for the improvement of the conditions of industry or the conditions of mankind. It is wrong that men should have to push barrows up grades in the excavation of drains, and follow obsolete methods when up-to-date machinery is available in the possession of the Government, but is allowed to lie idle. The Supply Bill gives us our only opportunity to discuss works that are in progress. I, therefore, wish to discuss the reconstruction of the Causeway. The Minister for Works would lead us to believe that this work is being done from some trust fund. The Government have no authority to use trust money on such an undertaking, particularly when such funds are definitely earmarked for a specific purpose. There is an Act of Parliament directing what shall be done with traffic fees. The Minister would have us believe that this work is being done from that source. That, how-

ever, cannot be so. He must be doing it out of money made available under the Supply Bill.

The Minister for Works: The traffic fees. I repeat the statement.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The work is actually in progress. If the Minister could utilise the fund for this purpose, I should be out of order in drawing attention to the fact that this work is now going on.

The Minister for Lands: Then you are out of order.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am not. The Minister has no authority to do the work unless he is authorised under this Bill to do it.

The Minister for Lands: You know that 22½ per cent. of the traffic fees are set apart for special works.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It is definitely stated that the money must not be spent within the metropolitan area. If the Minister is spending this trust money, he is penalising every country district. He said he had consulted the local governing bodies. The member for South Fremantle states that some of the authorities were never consulted.

The Minister for Works: I only consulted those out your way.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: You did not consult them all.

The Minister for Works: The member for Middle Swan can tell you all about it.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister is diverting country money into the metropolitan area. The Act was amended by him.

The Attorney General: The Minister did not amend the Act.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: He amended it to tighten things up.

The Attorney General: It was passed by Parliament.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: He brought down a Bill to provide for the disposal of this 22½ per cent.

The Minister for Works: I did not introduce that Bill.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: He brought down a Bill arranging for the disposal of that money.

The Minister for Works: I object. I did not do so.

Mr. Kenneally: He was a member of a select committee which recommended how the money should be expended.

The Minister for Works: It was passed in 1929.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I know the country districts did not fulfil the conditions. The Minister then brought down another Bill which was to be administered in a certain way. He said that 22½ per cent. of the collections in the metropolitan area would be spent in the country districts in the maintenance of main roads.

The Minister for Works: That happened in the year before.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That trust fund is made up of 22½ per cent. of the collections made in the metropolitan area, and is earmarked for the maintenance of main roads in the country. Certain amounts have to be provided by country districts ranging from 10 to 22½ per cent., which amounts are added to the other 22½ per cent. The Minister now suggests that this is the money that is being used on the Causeway. He has no authority to use that money in the way proposed. If it is true that he did consult certain metropolitan authorities, it is natural that they should agree to the money being taken from the country and spent within the metropolitan area.

The Minister for Works: I also consulted the road board conference.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The only statement from the Minister that I have read is in connection with the conference of metropolitan local authorities. I do not know that any country districts were represented. I assume that the metropolitan bodies would grasp the proposal to have this money spent within their own area. It does not stand to the credit of the Minister or the Government that a trust fund should be spent in this direction. The fund was created by a tax upon the users of the roads. We have said to certain people that they must make specific contributions to the revenue, and that the money would be used for a specific purpose. We said that if they would find the money we would maintain the roads for them.

The Minister for Railways: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: That is what the Act says.

The Minister for Works: The Main Roads Act has nothing to do with traffic fees.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The 22½ per cent. has everything to do with the Act. The trust fund created under the Main Roads Act represents money the Minister says he is now using on the Causeway.

The Minister for Works: Traffic fees are collected under the Traffic Act.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The money is earmarked for a specific purpose. He should have utilised the undistributed portion from last year on the maintenance of main roads outside the metropolitan area. He has the money in hand, but proposes to let the roads go.

The Minister for Works: Oh no!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: How are the roads to be maintained?

The Minister for Works: They are being maintained.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Government are taking this money from the country districts, and we have no guarantee that any other sum will be forthcoming in place of that which is being expended. Not only are the country districts being penalised, but those who have put up the cash for the maintenance of the roads. We conveyed by statute the statement that certain conditions shall prevail with respect to the expenditure of that money. Not only are the country districts being robbed of the capital expenditure, but we are robbing the workers of their proportion of the cash that is available. The trust fund is being diverted from district to district, and is being used to undermine the industrial standards. This House surely will not tolerate that kind of action by a Government. Parliament must approve of any interference with the fund. What right have the Government to use trust funds for a standard of employment below the recognised standard in the metropolitan area? Why should men work part-time so that trust funds may be utilised? I enter the strongest protest against such administration as that of the Minister for Works. Governments have no right to ignore Acts of Parliament. Members now on the Government benches have little of that respect for law and order which they professed when on this side of the Chamber. As regards the 13-mile siding which has been mentioned, I broke no Act of Parliament. Governments often do things in anticipation of Parliamentary approval, but no such anticipation would justify the breach of a statute; especially such a breach as this, involving standards of work and wages. The statute I have in mind is comparatively recent, and was amended very recently, so that the Minister has no ex-

cuse for ignoring it. I join with other members in protesting against dictation to private employers by the form of Government contract which has been mentioned. I want the Government to realise the injustice they are doing to thrifty men who saved money in the days when they were earning, and who are now refused employment. It was bad enough to confine the possibility of getting Government work to men on sustenance. I protested against that. But now the Government are saying to the private employer, "You shall employ sustenance labour only." The man with a few pounds, or a son or two earning a little, formerly had no opportunity of getting Government work, but could get private work. Now his opportunity of securing the latter is reduced by the condition recently introduced into Government contracts. The result is that every man is being reduced to the lowest possible standard. Those who were thrifty are now told, in effect, that they were foolish to save money. The industrial standard now being created is knocking the spirit out of men and making women despondent, and Heaven knows what the effect on the children will be. Why should not the Government profit from failure? They should realise that, having new money for new works, they should establish the new industrial system which is needed in order to obtain satisfaction for the workers and a maximum result in stabilising the affairs of State. Workers on sustenance have no encouragement under existing conditions to go to the country. The man who has saved has little inducement to go into the country districts, where there is but slight opportunity of private employment. The slight chance there was in the metropolitan area is being taken from him. All such men are being reduced to the basis of the sustenance worker. There is no reason in the world why the Government should dictate to private employers, or take over from them debts owing to the State trading concerns. There has never been a word of protest regarding this matter from the Employers' Federation. Have the Government discussed the matter with the Employers' Federation and arrived at an understanding?

The Minister for Works: No, not at all.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Trades Hall discovered the new form of contract by accident.

The Minister for Railways: It was adopted months ago.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The exposure is a good thing for country members. However, since public attention has been drawn to the matter, there has been a significant silence on the part of the Press. The Press has little to say on the action of the Government in dictating to private employers what men they shall employ, and for what hours and at what wages. That condition of things, unique in the history of Western Australia, is not exposed by the Press; and the Employers' Federation, whose function is to watch affairs of this kind and to safeguard the interests of the employing class, have nothing to say on the subject. Why this marked silence?

The Minister for Works: The employers are most concerned for the interests of the State just now.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: This is playing right into the hands of those who are desirous of undermining the basic wage and industrial standards. There is collusion between the Government and the private employers to bring the latter into line with the Government. The Government have had a run for a year or two in employing men under disgraceful conditions. Not satisfied with bringing some men down to the level of sustenance workers, they are now dictating to private employers, or working with them, to bring the general standard down to that level. If Government contracts for Government work can dictate to private employers what shall be paid to men or women employed, where is the thing to stop? Is it limited now to two or three firms, or is it general in the metropolitan area? If it is limited to-day, where will the limit be to-morrow? If the system is tolerated at all, where will it stop? I want hon. members sitting behind the Government to appreciate the danger of introducing a practice of this kind; and I trust that as a result of the debate the Government will reconsider the matter and withdraw those conditions of contract, so that the general standard can be maintained by the private employer. One would assume that the private employer was anxious to maintain a reasonable, recognised standard of wages and of living. It is to his advantage that his employees should enjoy a reasonable standard of comfort. Yet we find the Government reducing enormously the earning capacity of the employees of

private employers, and private employers never entering a protest. There must be some collusion between some organised bodies and the Government to break down the industrial standards existing to-day. The member for South Fremantle and the Leader of the Opposition have emphasised what has been done to reduce the standard of living of the workers of Western Australia. If we tolerate these conditions of contract, a general reduction of standards throughout the State will ensue. I ask the Government to consider whether they cannot grant more favourable conditions to the workers employed on the new works.

The Minister for Lands: We can only do that so far as the money will permit.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The money can be utilised on a different basis.

The Minister for Lands: By letting some of the unemployed starve?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No. I am firmly of the opinion it would be far better to put a given number of men to work for a certain period—I suggest three months—on the basic wage. Let the standard rates apply, and thus secure the return of spending capacity to normal.

The Minister for Lands: And what would you do with them afterwards?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The men would have to stand down for a given period and then start again.

The Minister for Lands: Then they would be in the same position.

The Minister for Mines: In a worse position.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No.

Mr. Panton: They could not be worse off than they are to-day.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: A certain period could be determined, and then the men would have to stand down. If it were said that a man could work for three months and then would have to stand down for a similar period, possibly his position would be worse than it is to-day. I recognise that there must be a break between the time a man finishes work and when he starts again, but that interim should be reduced to an absolute minimum. If men are to work, let them earn the recognised wage for a given period. Let the Government give that system a try-out and I am confident that the State will benefit. By that means more contentment would be evident in the community and the Government would not be guilty of flouting

industrial standards and awards to the extent to which they are flouted to-day. I know the Government will say that they are recognising awards where they exist. On the other hand the Government have introduced a system that defeats industrial awards. The Leader of the Opposition has already pointed out the extent to which piece-work is operating to-day. That system does not permit a worker to enjoy the basic wage in return for his labour. All he can do is to earn what the price of the piece-work will return to him. Something of the sort has happened in the Premier's own electorate, within some miles of his own home. Men were employed there on road work for rates as low as 25s. a week. The Premier will reply to that by saying that the position was rectified. Some of the men were working for 25s. to 30s. a week. Then the engineer, or ganger, in charge realised that the rate was too low, and that the men were not earning what the Government permitted. So he increased the wages by a shilling or two. When, from experience, the actual value of the work was determined, and the proper wage was fixed, the work was practically completed. When the actual value of the work was discovered, rates of pay were not made retrospective as they should have been. The men enjoyed perhaps a week only at the proper rate of pay; then the work was completed. I submit to the Government that if they cannot make retrospective the rates of pay when the proper payment has been ascertained, then they should abandon piece-work under which system they are robbing the workers. One would almost think it had been done deliberately, because the ganger who fixed the price must admit that he erred in his judgment in particular instances. On the work I refer to in the Premier's electorate, some of the workers received as little as 25s. a week, while others received £2 10s.

Mr. Kenneally: And they were men accustomed to such work all their lives.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: They were men who had been taken from the pipe track, and were skilled in that particular class of employment. Yet we find the Government are extending this system. The workers cannot be expected to go on indefinitely under such conditions. They responded to the call of the Government and undertook road work, anticipating that they would receive the standard rates of pay. Then they found that piece-work conditions had been intro-

duced with the results I have indicated. I ask the Government to give this matter consideration with a view to ascertaining whether an improvement cannot be effected. I realise that under existing conditions of sustenance labour the results are not beneficial to the workers or to the State. There is a better way of attaining our objective. I urge the Government to appreciate the lessons of experience, and effect an alteration so that better work may be achieved, that more contentment may be in evidence among the women and children, who will be better fed and clothed, and that the workers may be placed in an improved position that will not penalise the State to any extent. This course may make the Government a little poorer but the general community will be the richer. It will give the worker increased spending power and ultimately will prove of benefit to the State. We are getting nowhere under existing conditions, and I enter my most emphatic protest against them.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Kalgoorlie) [9.37]: The unemployed on the goldfields are entitled to some consideration. In other parts of the State the Government are providing not only sustenance but work as well. In my electorate, people who are out of work cannot secure even sustenance, while work is out of the question. What does the Premier propose to do with the money he has in hand for work in the Eastern Goldfields areas?

Mr. Pantou: Put it in a jam tin.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It is all right for the member for Leederville to talk about jam tins, because single men in his electorate receive 7s. a week, whereas the single men in my electorate can get nothing. The same thing applies to the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson).

Hon. W. D. Johnson: We do not get anything in Guildford.

Mr. Pantou: Nor do we in Leederville.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: There are a few destitute people in my electorate, but it is not the Government's policy to provide sustenance for married men, let alone for single men. What do the Government intend to do?

The Minister for Mines: You do not want us to send coals to Newcastle?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Premier is spending money in the South-West.

Miss Holman: He is not.

Mr. Withers: That would be a wise procedure.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Notwithstanding what the Government have done, they are not giving satisfaction to the representatives of South-West constituencies. There are upwards of 500 unemployed men in the Eastern Goldfields district, particularly in Kalgoorlie.

Mr. Wilson: Is that all?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: How many are there in your electorate?

Mr. Wilson: There are 5,000.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Your people receive sustenance; mine get nothing. What do the Government intend to do regarding the 500 unemployed in Kalgoorlie? Certainly bare sustenance was provided through the municipal councils and other authorities, but even sustenance has been cut out for the unemployed on the goldfields. The Government have no policy for furthering the gold-mining industry. I know the Minister for Mines will say that he has no money at his disposal, and apparently the Premier will not make any available. As the value of gold is £7 13s. 10d. per oz., the Minister is quite happy. But in his capacity as Minister controlling the people, I ask him what he intends to do with regard to the unemployed at Kalgoorlie who to-day are living on the charity of the local people? It is not right that the Government should provide sustenance for people in the metropolitan area and not make money available to give the unemployed on the goldfields the right to live. I do not doubt the sincerity of the Minister, but I do not think he has made sufficient effort to secure money to assist the goldfields unemployed. I do not want sustenance for the people in my electorate, but I want them to receive a little assistance to enable them to go out and prospect for gold, to liquidate their accounts weekly and to enable them to discover means that will return revenue to the State. The Minister is not prepared to do that, and will probably say that he is waiting on the doorstep of the Treasurer, who is not prepared to provide money to enable the industry to carry on.

The Attorney General: Is the gold-mining industry in trouble?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: It is the most flourishing industry in the State at present.

At the same time, there are a number of experienced men who are prepared to go out as prospectors, but they require a certain amount of financial assistance. Last year's Loan Estimates contained provision for £410,000 to enable the Government to make a channel to carry water out to sea from the Harvey district in order to allow men to grow swede turnips. I can grow turnips successfully on fallow land at Mullewa.

Mr. Parker: Why don't you do it?

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I do it while the hon. member merely thinks it over. The Premier and the Minister for Mines are most anxious about the cultivation of cauliflowers. What I want to impress upon those gentlemen is that there are opportunities for the production of wealth by the assistance the Government should give to prospectors. But the Government are not prepared to do that. The other day the Premier went to Busselton for the week end. He wanted to have a look at the swede turnips on Group 38 or 39. I fancy the Premier has had an anxious time over the turnips and cabbages down there, but I want him to visit the goldfields and have a look at those men winning gold worth £7 13s. 5d. per ounce. Two or three years ago there was an agitation on the goldfields for a gold bounty of £1 per ounce. Gold was then worth £4 4s. 11d. per fine ounce. To-day it is worth £7 13s. 5d., and the Minister for Mines is not prepared to make available money to help those prepared to swell the revenue of the country by winning additional gold. The Minister for Mines realises that there are opportunities for boring in respect of deep alluvial on the Eastern goldfields. I have repeatedly asked that money be made available for a survey that would enable us to determine the position of those channels in which gold may be won. The Minister has said that when money is available he will be prepared to assist those who will assist themselves. But he has made no move in that direction. Apparently he does not realise that his department should take the lead and create initiative amongst those who are prepared to win additional gold. I want the Government to do something for the industry which means so much to Western Australia, but apparently the Premier thinks more of growing swede turnips in the South-West than of producing gold on the goldfields. Another matter: Recently I have found the

railway rolling stock, not only at Fremantle but at nearly every siding in the State, almost blocked with machines that have been rendered useless. I am concerned about the shifting of the next harvest. What is going to be done? I know that if I appeal to the Minister for Works he will tell me that he has under consideration a bulk handling scheme. But there are all those people who are intimately concerned about the shifting of the next harvest. At Midland Junction there is any amount of rolling stock, but it has been returned to be reconditioned. But the Government have no policy. There is no money available, and apparently they are not concerned as to how the next harvest is to be shifted. Yet money is to be made available for the reconditioning and maintenance of roads that will not be used because people have not the money to run their motor cars and motor trucks.

The Premier: Yet 32,000,000 gallons of petrol were used last year.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: How much did you, as Treasurer, get out of it? Through your Minister you are re-conditioning roads running parallel to railways, and in addition you have to meet a deficit on railway construction and the construction of rolling stock. I advise the Premier to cut out the expenditure on roads parallel to railways and to undertake the reconditioning of rolling stock.

The Minister for Works: It is rather late in the day to do that.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Why, have you spent all your money?

The Minister for Works: No, but the money we are using comes out of the petrol tax, and must be spent on roads.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Then apparently there is no money for the reconditioning of rolling stock. At Midland Junction, at almost every siding and at all terminal points the Minister will find rolling stock hung up. Yet we are told by the Premier that we are going to have a record harvest. How are we to cope with it, since the rolling stock is worn out and needs reconditioning? There are out of employment men who could do the job, but the Government are putting artisans, painters and the like on road work—men who are quite unfitted for the job. The Premier is spending money making roads. The Minister for Works when speaking on bulk handling will show the farmers

that the system will save money for them. But afterwards the Treasurer will bring down a tax to take away the savings of the people so as to provide sustenance for those whom bulk handling will throw out of employment. I asked the Premier to recondition the road from Coolgardie to Kalgoorlie, but he told me he had not the money available, and that as a matter of fact the road was unnecessary as we have the railway running alongside of it. It would cost £11,000, but the Premier said he had not the money.

[Mr. Stubbs took the Chair.]

The Minister for Works: We gave you £500.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Which was only enough to make a diversion round a rut. Now we find the Premier most anxious to carry out this road construction work so as to absorb an additional 3,000 men. And all these roads are running parallel to railways.

The Premier: Yet you want one from Coolgardie to Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I do not want it. I put up the proposition to you, and you sensibly declined it. I want to see the money expended where it will do the greatest good for the greatest number. I am not asking the Premier to spend £11,000 on that work, but I do ask him to recondition that road sufficiently to make it passable.

The Minister for Works: That £500 should be sufficient.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: You are thinking about Wyalcatchem, and those roads running into bulk handling silos that have not yet been built, whereas I want something tangible. I want the Premier to make available money for the assistance of willing prospectors. They offer our people looking for gold up there about 7s. per week. I ask the Minister for Mines how is a man to get on with 7s. a week and two rabbit traps, which is about the limit available for prospectors looking for gold? The Minister himself is prepared to do his best, but he cannot get the money from the Premier. He has not told me that, but I know it, just the same. Are the Government prepared to do something to absorb 500 people now out of work but prepared to carry on the gold mining industry? If I go to the Premier, there is no 7s. a week for my men, not a bob a day for them. In the metropolitan

area a man and his wife may receive 14s. a week; on the goldfields a married couple get nothing, unless they are absolutely destitute, when they are paid out of a certain fund. It would be interesting to know how much money has been paid by way of sustenance on the eastern goldfields during the last 12 months. The Minister will say that single men should be able to look after themselves. A number of people arrive by the Trans line, having jumped the train; a number of people blow into the goldfields from the metropolitan area, and from the farming districts, but we cannot get any money to help them. I advise those people who are out of work in Kalgoorlie to come to Perth and register in order to get sustenance. The Minister knows that the people of the goldfields are charitable and generously disposed; they levy themselves to make money available that the unemployed might be fed, and thus the Government are relieved to that extent. That, however, is not right. If the unemployed come to Perth and register, they can obtain sustenance. I expect the Minister to do something, but evidently he is not prepared to do anything. Has the Minister exhausted his vote? Is money no longer available? Are not the applications from the goldfields valid? Are not those people honest and entitled to assistance? Is it because those people do not come to the metropolitan area and demonstrate their hostility, but remain quiet that they are allowed to suffer and are given nothing? Years before the present Premier took office he made a statement that people out of work were entitled to sustenance, and employment must be found for them. What is he doing? When a single man comes to the metropolitan area the Premier is eager to shanghai him to Harvey, to Moora, or to New Norcia to work on road construction. The roads must be reconditioned. But when it comes to re-productive work, the Premier is not prepared to make money available. Previous to 1923 we had an industry in sandalwood. In that year, restrictive legislation was passed requiring pullers to obtain a license, pay £9 per ton royalty and sell the wood to approved firms. At that time the State commanded 90 per cent. of the world's market for sandalwood, China being the chief customer. The royalty was increased from 5s. to £9 per ton. The price to the public was fixed at £16 per ton, less rail

freight. What is the position to-day? As a result of the enactment of that legislation, Western Australia has lost at least 45 per cent. of the business. At least 7,000 tons of wood is stacked at Fremantle. I should like to know the amount of royalty paid on the wood since the passing of that legislation.

The Minister for Railways: You should have found out in the six years you were here during which the Act operated.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I should like to know what amount of royalty at £9 per ton is outstanding on the wood pulled and stacked at Fremantle.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The Minister made a point at the last election that the Government had guaranteed for large amounts, the companies handling sandalwood.

The Minister for Railways: The guarantee still stands, unfortunately.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I should also like to know what financial backing the State Treasury has given to the firms operating as monopolists in the industry. Perhaps the Minister will make that information available.

The Minister for Railways: I do not think it is worth while.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I think it is. I am not blaming the Minister for having introduced the legislation, because Parliament absolved him by passing it. How is it that South Australia has been able to enter the market? How is it that Queensland is now operating in the market? How is it that our trade has fallen from 90 per cent. to 45 per cent.? If the Minister had the industry at heart, he would reduce the royalty from £9 to £3 per ton. That would facilitate sales, and give the pullers an opportunity to supply sandalwood for the overseas market.

The Minister for Railways: The royalty is now on a sliding scale.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Minister has deprived this State of at least 45 per cent. of the value of the industry. We used to supply 90 per cent. of the world's requirements, but as a result of the restrictive legislation brought down by the Minister, South Australia now demands 50 per cent. of it, and Queensland has between 7½ per cent. and 10 per cent. of the industry. Is the Minister prepared to reduce the royalty?

The Minister for Railways: I have considered the matter since you first mentioned it, and decided not to do so.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: That is what one would expect. He has lost the industry for Western Australia and allowed two other States to come into it. Has he no desire to remedy the evils for which he is responsible?

The Minister for Railways: I do not admit they are evils, and secondly I do not propose to repeal the legislation.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: He has been the stumbling block in the industry ever since he had anything to do with it. I should like to know how much sandalwood had been exported from South Australia prior to the introduction of the legislation in question.

The Premier: South Australia did not know she had any sandalwood then.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: How does the Minister propose to provide a livelihood for sandalwood pullers who can no longer follow that occupation? I should like him to lay on the Table of the House a return showing the sales of sandalwood oversea for the last ten years. That would show that the industry declined from the time when the legislation was passed.

The Premier: You kept it going for six years.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Premier made the contracts and of course is now looking for the £9 royalty.

The Minister for Railways: Which you got.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: All we had to do was to guarantee the companies to the extent of £150,000. What does the Premier propose to do regarding the numerous men out of work on the goldfields? Is he prepared to treat them as unemployed men are treated in the metropolitan area? Is he prepared to make available to unemployed single men on the goldfields the 7s. per week that is available to unemployed single men in the metropolitan area? Is he prepared to extend to married unemployed on the goldfields treatment similar to that given in such cases in the metropolitan area? What is he prepared to do in order to aid the goldmining industry?

The Minister for Mines: There are 600 men out prospecting with Government assistance.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The assistance so far granted for prospecting purposes is ridiculously inadequate. Single men unemployed on the goldfields who are prepared to edge a ticket to Perth and to hang around here for a few days become eligible for sustenance. Do the Government wish to impose on the goldfields community the additional burden of maintaining the unemployed there? The Premier's policy amounts to "Work for all, money for no one." There is also the matter of reconstructing the railways. Are the railways to be allowed to fall into such a state of disrepair as to be beyond redemption? When loans are floated, the Government guarantee in the prospectus to carry out certain works with the proceeds, and to maintain those works in a proper state of repair. We know that some works are not being kept in a proper state of repair. There is the railway to Northam, for instance; and there is the Eastern Goldfields railway.

The Premier: We have lots of men on those lines ballasting.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Only about 120 men. The sleepers turn up and look at the passengers. Those sleepers are at least 18 years old. There is no cohesion between the dogspikes and the sleepers. It is not my place to say that the lines are unsafe to travel over, but the Government should investigate the position, especially on the Bowgada-Mullewa section of the Wongan Hills railway. I specially request the Minister for Labour to give consideration to the numerous men who are unemployed on the goldfields, and who need sustenance because they cannot obtain work.

Progress reported.

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform hon. members that I have nominated the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), the member for Leederville (Mr. Pantou), and the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) to be temporary Chairmen of Committees.

House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 17th August, 1932.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Questions: Dog owners, protection | 57 |
| Unemployment, works schedule | 57 |
| Pastoral leases, rent adjustment | 57 |
| Committees for the Session | 58 |
| Leave of absence | 58 |
| Address-in-reply, third day | 58 |
| Ministerial Statement, Supply Bill | 70 |

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

QUESTION—DOG OWNERS, PROTECTION.

Hon. G. FRASER asked the Chief Secretary: As the notice, "Beware of the Dog," does not protect from prosecution owners whose dogs attack trespassers, will the Government introduce amending legislation to give the required protection to householders who display such notices.

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: The Dog Act is administered by the local authorities. If these authorities submit a request for an amendment of the Act on the lines indicated, the matter will receive full consideration.

QUESTION—UNEMPLOYMENT, WORKS SCHEDULE.

Hon. G. FRASER asked the Chief Secretary: 1, As no provision was made in the schedule of works recently published in the daily Press for relief works in the areas covered by the North Fremantle Municipality, Buckland Hill, Fremantle, and Melville Road Boards, is it the intention of the Government to draw up a further schedule covering those areas? 2, If not, will a quota of unemployed from each of those districts be picked up for work in the metropolitan area?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: 1. No. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—PASTORAL LEASES. RENT ADJUSTMENT.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: 1, As the Land Act Amendment Act, 1931, provides for an adjustment of rents of pastoral leases in certain districts,