

living without interfering with the standard of living, it would be a step in the right direction. I agree with Mr. Cornell that we should take a long view and should press ahead with the determination that we are going to surmount our difficulties. Only reproductive works should be undertaken. Regarding Government employees on the goldfields, I hope the Government will attend to the matter as speedily as possible. If the payment is made retrospective to the date when the party took office, the Government will make themselves very popular.

On motion by Hon. V. Hamersley debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [5.56]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn till Thursday, 27th July, at 2.45 p.m.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.57 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 26th July, 1933.

	PAGE
Questions: Primary products, marketing ...	106
Group and soldier settlements, as to dairying ...	106
Sitting hours ...	106
Address-in-Reply, fifth day ...	106
Adjournment, Special ...	136

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

QUESTION—PRIMARY PRODUCTS, MARKETING.

Mr. FERGUSON asked the Premier: Do the Government intend to introduce during this session a measure for the organisation of the marketing of primary products?

The PREMIER replied: It is not customary for the Government to announce their policy in answer to Parliamentary questions.

QUESTION—GROUP AND SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

As to Dairying.

Mr. BROCKMAN asked the Premier: Is it his intention to afford the House, during the current session, an opportunity to discuss thoroughly the whole position of group settlement and soldier settlement, particularly with respect to its effect on the dairying industry?

The PREMIER replied: Yes. The Standing Orders provide ample opportunity for the discussion of any subject which any member desires to bring forward.

QUESTION—SITTING HOURS.

Mr. HAWKE asked the Premier: Will he give favourable consideration to the question of commencing the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly at 2.30 p.m. each day, instead of at 4.30 p.m. as is now the rule?

The PREMIER replied: The hours of meeting have already been decided upon by Sessional Orders, but they are subject to alteration, if the House so desires, at any time.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. HAWKE (Northam) [4.35]: By this time, Mr. Speaker, you must be aware that your appointment has met not only with the approval of all members of this House but also with wide public approval throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia. After the exceedingly effective speeches delivered by those who have already taken part in this debate, it is with a good deal of doubt I proceed to contribute my quota of thought. Particularly have the speeches delivered by the new and, if I may say so, the young members been of a high character. One pleasing feature of the composition of this Parliament exists in the fact that there is a much greater proportion of young men than has been the

case, probably, in any previous Parliament. It is something of which we may well be proud. It indicates to me that the young men of Western Australia are at last taking a keen interest in public affairs, and that they have decided that the time has arrived when the young men should take a practical part in shaping the laws of this State and in ordering the future destiny of the people of Western Australia. It is a healthy sign indeed, and I feel sure that this Parliament will be greatly advantaged by virtue of the fact that it numbers in its membership a much greater proportion of youthful men than has previously been the case. And, by the way, I number myself among the youthful men. The Premier and all his Ministers, with the exception of the Minister for Employment (Hon. J. J. Kenneally), have had previous experience in controlling the departments and the affairs of State. Therefore it is not necessary to offer them any encouragement, nor is it necessary to tell them their business. Sufficient is it to rely upon them to show during this Parliament the same common sense, the same initiative, and the same wide outlook as they demonstrated during the years from 1924 to 1930. Although the Minister for Employment is, or at the time of assuming office was, unpractised in the art of administrative government, I have sufficient confidence in his general experience and in his ability to offer the prophecy that he will carry out his heavy task in a successful and a statesmanlike manner. Many people have offered the members of the Collier Ministry sympathy because of the difficult circumstances which face them, but I am courageous enough to offer congratulations, because in my opinion times of great difficulty are also times of great opportunity for those in charge of the powers of government in any State or country. The political commentator of the "West Australian", in an article contributed by him to that paper on Saturday last, laid upon my underserving shoulders the responsibility for the elevation of Sir James Mitchell to the position of Lieut.-Governor. I will deny the soft impeachment, if I may, and refer to the note in question as "the unkindest cut of all." While on this subject it will be expected, I suppose, that I should say something regarding the appointment. I feel that the circumstances are such as to warrant a statement not only from me but from every member of this Chamber. The cir-

cumstances of the appointment of the new Lieut.-Governor in my opinion almost border on the extraordinary. It appears that as soon as the general election was over and as soon as the defeat of Sir James Mitchell had been effected, the previous Lieut.-Governor at once found it impossible, or undesirable, for him to carry on the viceregal duties; and forthwith he resigned, and apparently at the same time recommended the appointment of Sir James Mitchell to the vacant position. When the appointment was first made public and a number of my supporters in Northam came to me demanding an explanation of the action taken, the statement I offered was that it was a highly chivalrous act on the part of a very benevolent Government; and most of those to whom I spoke were inclined to accept my summing-up of the situation. However, we have since found that not only were the present Government not responsible for that appointment, but, indeed, that they were not even paid the courtesy of being consulted in any way with regard to it. I understand that there is no legal or constitutional necessity for a State Government to be consulted in any shape or form on such a matter. Although we may agree that that is the constitutional position, we yet may also contend that the claims of common courtesy require that the Ministers of a State Government should at least be asked whether they had an objection at all to the appointment of the proposed appointee. There was this important point in addition; Sir James Mitchell had been decisively defeated in his own district at the general election. Furthermore, his party and policy had been overwhelmingly rejected by the great majority of the people of Western Australia. I have tried to imagine what would be the result had a Labour leader been appointed to the position in similar circumstances. I am inclined to think that protests would have rolled in, and would still be rolling in, from all parts of the State.

Member: Just as they are to-day.

Mr. HAWKE: In addition. I imagine, some at least of our newspapers would still be complaining about the danger and the wickedness of appointing a defeated party leader to a position demanding absolute independence of thought and of action. For my own part, I have no personal feeling whatever against Sir James Mitchell. I am sure he will carry out his easy and light

duties in a manner that will give offence to nobody but satisfaction to all. I am sure he will, in his new position, do what he has always tried to do in the public positions he has previously occupied—try to do his best for this State of Western Australia of which he is a native and which during his long years in State politics he has, according to his lights and his belief, done his best to serve to the highest possible advantage. I am sure, nevertheless, that Sir James Mitchell would feel much more comfortable in his new position if he had the knowledge that his appointment had been approved of by the present Ministers. All I have to add on this question is that I look forward to the time when in this State of Western Australia, and in the other States of the Commonwealth too, this very expensive undertaking of a Governor or a Lieut.-Governor will no longer be considered necessary and the taxpayers of the various States be saved, as a result of the abolition of the position, at least £5,000 every year. There can be no doubt the decision of the people of Western Australia as given at the recent elections was a very severe judgment indeed. If I might offer an opinion, I would say that that severe decision was entirely justified by the facts pertaining to the elections and the administrative and legislative efforts of the previous Government. Politics apart, however, I find it possible to shed a tear over the bodies of those who fell in the contest. Probably my sympathy is aroused because of the fact that six years ago in South Australia I myself suffered the disappointment of political defeat by the narrow margin of nine votes. Although I find it possible to sympathise with those who were defeated at the election in April, I cannot bring myself to hope that all of them will be returned to this Parliament in three years' time; but I can hope that each of them may be successful in finding suitable, permanent and profitable occupation in the civil life of the community, in which case Parliament's loss may possibly be the community's gain. I make the frank admission thus early in my political career in this State that I face the task of representing the people in this Parliament with much misgiving and with grave doubts as to the volume of beneficial work this Parliament may be able to do. It cannot be denied that every party comes into power on a wave of public anticipation which it is nearly always impossible

for the successful party adequately to fulfil. There is no doubt that in some of the statements made yesterday by the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) there was some truth; there is no doubt that large numbers of people in Western Australia have a tremendous faith in the change of Government that was effected in April last; there is no doubt many of them hope for, if not miracles, at least something approximating thereto. But when we look at the facts of the situation, when we search into the powers of this Parliament to deal with the problems confronting the State, we find those powers so restricted as to make it very difficult for any Government, no matter how well-intentioned it may be, no matter how capable its Ministers, no matter how enthusiastic its supporters, we find that the restriction of powers I have referred to render it intensely difficult for any great or rapid progress to be made. The members of this Parliament of Western Australia are not in any unique position in that respect, because this principle applies almost without exception to every State Government in Australia. We find that the Government of Western Australia, for instance, have no legal power or constitutional authority to deal with the money question. Yet this problem which confronts our State is the same as the problem confronting every nation in the world, which is undoubtedly at bottom a money crisis. In addition, there is the important fact that the Federal authority has first and in many instances complete power over the main sources of taxation in Australia. By virtue of that fact we find that they grab, if I may use the term, the whole of the Customs and excise revenue, the whole of the sales tax revenue and in addition take great sums of money from the people per medium of the income tax, the land tax, and numerous other taxation imposts which they are permitted to inflict upon the people of Australia. And despite the fact that the Federal authority is empowered to do these things, and despite the fact that it does collect a tremendous amount of taxation from the people annually, we find the services it carries on cannot measure in importance with the services which the various State Governments are expected to carry through. For instance, in Western Australia the Government, like most of the State Governments, are expected to undertake the tremendous responsibility of carrying through

and financing services in connection with health, education, unemployment, railways, land development, police and numerous other services which are both important and costly. And it does appear to me, as it must appear to every member of the House, that the time is long overdue when there should be a drastic rearrangement of the powers and responsibilities of the Federal and State Governments. I am not prepared to embrace the proposal which the people of Western Australia endorsed a few months ago as a solution of this problem. The member for Nedlands painted for us a wonderful picture regarding the tremendous liberty, freedom and prosperity that would be bestowed upon us if only we cut ourselves entirely adrift from the rest of Australia. In my opinion, that would be no release at all, but would be merely a movement out of the frying pan into the fire. Because secession is, first of all, impracticable; in my opinion it is a sham and was only brought forward in this State at the last election for the purpose of attempting the impossible task of saving some of the supporters of the previous Government from political defeat.

Mr. Latham: That is not a very generous statement.

Mr. HAWKE: It is not generous, but it is true, and it is necessary that truth should take precedence over generosity.

Mr. Latham: I say the statement is not true.

Mr. HAWKE: I say it is, and I point out that it failed miserably in its objective: because the only supporters of the previous Government which it saved were the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) and the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths). Conditions in this State are indeed in a parlous position. I am not here to make any alarmist statement, or to indulge in pessimism, but I do say from my experience in this State during the last four years that the business undertakings of Western Australia are faced with extreme difficulty, that our farming industries are struggling along somehow under the tremendous and twin burdens of low prices and heavy interest liabilities, that our workers are struggling under unemployment, either wholly or in part, and that our boys and girls have neither work nor any prospect of obtaining it. In face of these conditions, I think my previous statement, that I accept the responsibility of representing the people in

this Parliament with a good deal of misgiving, is entirely justified. Now, if the members of this Parliament have not the legislative power to deal with the existing problem as it should be dealt with, and if, through the operations of the Federal authority in the field of taxation this Government find it difficult to raise the taxation necessary to improve the conditions of the people generally, what can the members of this Parliament do to justify their existence? That, to my thinking, is a question that goes to the very root of the existing situation, and on present appearances it would seem that the members of this Parliament will find it almost as difficult to justify their existence as did the members of the previous Parliament. That is not an ungenerous statement, either, but merely a statement of self-evident truth. Although there are numerous and varied difficulties in the way of our Government legislatively, although we may be handcuffed to a great extent, although the taxation field may be closed against us, yet I feel that the members of this Parliament, if they co-operate if they bring their individual and collective experiences to bear upon the difficulties facing the State, they will be able to do something at any rate to bring about an improved condition in the affairs of the community and thus justify their existence and justify the influence they exert on the financial resources of the State as a whole. When the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Tonkin) suggested that we ought to consider our position more from the local aspect, that we should give less consideration to what was happening in other countries and more consideration to what was happening in our own, when he suggested that we should attempt the organisation of our own resources in such a way as to ensure better conditions for our own people, the Leader of the Opposition felt justified in mildly rebuking the hon. member for his suggestion, and the member for Nedlands felt justified in very severely rebuking him for the statements he had made in that regard. For my part, I congratulate the member for North-East Fremantle for having had the courage to declare that we might, by a reorganisation of the affairs of the State, do a great deal in the direction of bringing about an improvement in the general conditions.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: If we cannot, the position is hopeless.

Mr. HAWKE: If we find it impossible to reorganise the affairs of the community, if we find it impossible to establish a more solid basis for the productive industries of Western Australia, then it will be impossible for the members of this Parliament to justify their existence, and the sooner Parliament is shut down and the taxpayers saved the responsibility of providing for its upkeep, the better it will be for all concerned. It is useless for members of this Parliament to say that, although conditions are bad in this State, they are equally bad in every country in the world. That is merely a coward's way of dodging responsibility. It is useless also for some members to say as has been said, that as the World Conference did not succeed in finding a way out of the depressed conditions that confront us, it cannot be expected that we, the humble members of a small State Parliament, can solve those difficulties and overcome the problem. The only answer I can make to a contention of that kind is that the World Conference very appropriately conducted its deliberations in one of the museums in England. I know of no more appropriate place in which the deliberations could have been carried on, except it were a morgue or cemetery or some place of that kind. We have a situation in the world, including Australia and this State, that is full of terrible contradictions. It is unnecessary to say perhaps that never in the history of this State, never in the history of the Commonwealth and never in the history of the world were conditions more favourable from the point of view of the production of goods and the supplying of services for a higher standard of living for the people than is the case to-day. It is almost superfluous to point out that men, with the aid of machinery, during the last few years have produced an abundance of those commodities necessary for the material welfare and comfort of human beings. Yet despite the tremendous progress in the fields of production, never before in the history of the world has there been a worse set of conditions than now exists. May I be permitted to draw the attention of members of this House to some of the statements issued to the people here and in other parts of Australia not so many years ago. Even in my short existence, I can remember leaders of political thought, leaders of financial thought, and leaders of the various newspapers in Australia carrying on a

deliberate and widespread campaign to encourage the people to work harder, to work longer, and to produce more. About six or seven years ago Mr. Bruce, then Prime Minister of Australia, led a very vigorous campaign of that kind. When some of the leaders of the working-class organisations asked what benefit was likely to arise for working people from working harder and longer and producing more, they were told that obviously improved conditions would follow the increased production of goods. They were told that as production increased so the standard of living would automatically improve, and as a result everything in the garden of Australia would be lovely for the people of Australia. Not only the industrial workers but the farmers responded magnificently to the campaign carried on at that time, with the result that the production of goods of every variety increased at an amazing rate. At the same time similar campaigns were being carried on in every other country of the world. But instead of the social conditions of the people improving as an outcome of the increased production of wealth, instead of people receiving better wages, instead of their receiving better industrial conditions, instead of everything improving automatically with the increased production of goods, we found that after a few years the markets of the world began to be glutted, that prices began ruinously to fall, that the depression began its world-wide sweep, and that unemployment and misery were the reward that the people of the world reaped from the additional effort they provided in increasing the production of every conceivable class of commodity. The people were told that there was no need to worry about the money side of the situation. They were told it was a natural law that the increased production of goods would bring into existence an increased volume of money necessary for the regular and rapid distribution of the goods so produced. The people were led to believe it was a natural law that automatically operated. Since then the people have come to understand that no such thing has happened. They have seen the production of goods increasing tremendously and the volume of money in circulation decreasing with the result that the decreased volume of money throughout the world has been expected to carry on the distribution of a tremendously increased volume of goods. Inevitably such a contradiction as that was

impossible of achieving the promised results, and the whole capitalistic system seems to be crashing to its doom. Until the problem is tackled from that viewpoint, until the volume of money is given a reasonably accurate relationship to the volume of production carried on and the volume of services to be exchanged, it will be impossible to find a complete solution of the difficulty in any country. The Leader of the Opposition, in his speech a few afternoons ago, admitted the truth of this assertion, without actually realising that he was doing so. That is a very generous statement towards the Leader of the Opposition. In a somewhat despairing fashion he declared that this State was rich in real wealth but poor in money. That is the position. That is a very accurate and striking summing-up of the position. Yet, when it is suggested that steps be taken to bring about a relationship between real wealth and the volume of money, the Leader of the Opposition and others who think with him hold up their hands in holy horror and declare that, if anything of the kind is done, it will bring absolute ruin and chaos. The Leader of the Opposition proceeded to make another rather striking and valuable admission. He said the inflation practised in Australia during the last three years had assisted in the carrying on of the affairs of this country.

Mr. Latham: I said something else as well.

Mr. HAWKE: If the Leader of the Opposition will prompt me with what else he said, I will include it.

Mr. Latham: I said we had to pay our debts overseas with a deflated currency.

Mr. HAWKE: That is counterbalanced by the inflated prices which the producers of Australia receive for the products sent overseas, and so used for the payment of overseas debts. I would go further than the Leader of the Opposition and say that the policy of inflation, as very cautiously practised during the last three years, has not only assisted in the carrying-on of the affairs of this State, but it has saved the people and industries of this State and the people and industries of every other State of Australia. There can be no denial of that statement. If the volume of inflation practised during the last three years has been beneficial to that extent, if the artificial increase in money supplies and money circulation has achieved such great good for the people and for the industries of Aus-

tralia, what is wrong with a further development of that policy? Some of the more orthodox members of this Parliament might say that, if we pursued such a policy any further, it would lead to ruinous inflation, money would lose its value and it would be no longer possible to purchase with money goods of any description. On that point I have only this to say, that during the present financial year the Government of this State will have approximately $2\frac{3}{4}$ millions of loan money to provide employment and carry on other activities of the State. The question I wish to ask is what possible danger could arise if that sum were doubled? Is there any member who would suggest that, if this State had five or six millions this financial year, any danger of run-mad inflation would come to pass? Obviously the answer must be in the negative. I say the time has arrived in Australia when the people should become united in demanding a more scientific operation of this policy. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the Premier was only one man in six at Loan Council meetings and Premiers' Conferences, and therefore he could not achieve anything.

Mr. Latham: I did not say he could not achieve anything. I said his position was more difficult.

Mr. HAWKE: I shall be generous and allow the Leader of the Opposition to have his way. It has always been the one-man in six, or the one man in fifty or the one man in a thousand who has achieved the greatest good for any community. If we go back through history and study the tremendous changes and movements throughout the world we find it has been the courage and initiative of one man that has been mainly responsible for them. So it will be in the present stage of the world's history. So it will be, I believe, in all future periods of history. In the world to-day there is only one man genuinely and courageously attempting to overcome the tragedy of the present crisis. That man is the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. Whilst the World Conference was sitting I was amused to see how certain interested parties in England were manipulating the cables in such a way as to endeavour to place upon Mr. Roosevelt's shoulders all the discredit that might come about from the failure of the World Conference, which was certain to happen even at that stage. I compliment Mr. Roosevelt on being shrewd enough

not to be caught in the net of the leaders of the deflationist countries represented at the conference. There can be no doubt that several of the leaders of the World Conference wanted not only to continue the present deflation policy, which has done so much damage to the people of the world, but that they desired to intensify the progress of that policy. Because Mr. Roosevelt was courageous and shrewd enough to refuse to be caught by that method, he had heaped upon him all the abuse and vilification that these other leaders could possibly produce. Mr. Roosevelt has tackled the problem from the right angle. He takes the view that there is no hope for his country, or any other country, until a drastic alteration is made in the monetary policy of his country and others. The United States has always had the reputation of being an individualistic country, a country where any suggestion of Government control was impossible of achievement because the people would not stand it. But they had seen their individualistic policy hopelessly crushed into ruin. When Mr. Roosevelt came to deal with the crisis at its very worst stage, he saw that an absolute reversal of policy was essential. He did not hesitate to take the steps he believed to be necessary in order that the people and the industries of the United States might have a chance of escaping from the crisis. People may wonder why I emphasise this point. I do so because believe the President of the United States is giving a lead to the world, which in due course will have to be followed by every country before this dreadful depression is swept away. It was my hope that Australia would be the first country to get on the upward track of recovery. I believe that, by the application of a modernised monetary policy in Australia, we could have led the world in that respect. Unfortunately, the people of this nation two or three years ago were not educated to the extent they ought to have been in order to take the lead. Although the Premier of this State is one individual in six at the Premiers' conference and Loan Council meetings, he may be able to do a great deal to bring about the practice of a more liberal monetary policy in Australia. As a matter of fact, there will be two amongst six, because fortunately there is another Labour Premier represented at these meetings. In addition, there is behind the idea of a more liberal monetary

policy in Australia, a tremendous weight of influential opinion. The general manager of the Bank of New South Wales, which I understand is the biggest private bank in Australia, is behind such a policy. If one studies the monthly bulletins issued by that institution, one will be convinced that Mr. Davidson, the general manager, is favourable to a more liberal monetary policy. I admit that if we read the bulletins issued by that bank two or three years ago, and compare them with those issued now, we will find them entirely contradictory. Two or three years ago the bulletins were urging deflation. They were urging the same out-of-date policy that the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) advocated yesterday, namely, that the only hope for us was to drive down the production costs of this nation to such a level as would enable our primary products to be marketed profitably in other countries even at the low prices now existing. Mr. Davidson advocated that policy two or three years ago. The only difference between him and the member for Nedlands is that the general manager of the bank has made more progress with the passing of time. The Leader of the Opposition suggested that we could not create prosperity by artificial means. That statement requires a lot of explanation. It is one of those statements that the President of the Senate, Senator Lynch, would describe as "a heap of meaningless jargon." I do not know what the hon. member means by the expression, nor do I know whether he himself knows what it means. How was the depression created? Ninety-nine out of a hundred thinking men will say it was created artificially. If that is so, surely prosperity can be created by the same means. In every country natural conditions exist for prosperity to be brought about. There can be no denial of that statement. What are the essentials for prosperity? The essentials are that the people of a country shall be able to produce sufficient of the material needs of life for themselves, and meet whatever liabilities may fall upon them. Such conditions do exist. If the natural laws were to operate, if the volume of production had a definite relationship to the condition of the people, prosperity would exist to-day as it has never existed before. I say we would have prosperity to-day without question except for the fact

that there has been an artificial manipulation in order that the natural laws may be defeated. A member opposite wanted to know where the manipulation came in. Those who have followed the coming of the depression and its duration must know that there was a tremendous artificial manipulation of the monetary system, and that this was responsible for the depression. They must know that from 1925 onwards most of the nations of the world moved back on to the gold standard, with the result that there was a tremendous restriction of money supplies in every country. Whilst this deliberate policy of manipulation was going on, and money supplies were being drastically reduced, men, with the aid of machines, were producing an ever-increasing volume of goods. It was because the volume of goods was increasing, and the volume of money in circulation was decreasing, that the world depression took the acute form in which we find it to-day. I put it to hon. members that if it is possible for money supplies deliberately to be manipulated downwards, it is equally possible for money supplies to be manipulated upwards. If that, in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition, amounts to restoring prosperity by artificial means, I am in favour of prosperity being restored by that means at the earliest opportunity. I am very interested in the graphs which the Leader of the Opposition has presented to Parliament. Whenever I see a graph, my suspicions are aroused and the little anger that is in me is stirred up. Graphs can be made to prove anything, if one chooses the right things to compare. For instance, it would be possible for me to produce a graph, and donate it to the Speaker to be hung on the wall, to show that the salaries of members of Parliament ought to be reduced another 30 per cent.

Mr. Withers: Oh, shame!

Mr. Latham: Then put it up.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not propose to put it up. Graphs only tell half the story, and sometimes not even half. I could produce a graph to show that the price of farm products has fallen 80 per cent. I could produce another line on the graph to show that the salaries of members of Parliament have only fallen 20 per cent., and that logically these salaries should be forced down another 50 or 60 per cent. in order that the fall in parliamentary salaries may equal the fall in the price of primary products. The graph

presented by the Leader of the Opposition for our study shows that the price of farm products has fallen so much, and that the price of industrial commodities has risen so much. The graph is correct in what it shows, but it tells only half the story. Why has the price of farm products fallen to the extent it has, and why have the products of our factories risen to the extent they have? That is the vital question to determine. I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition can answer both these questions.

Mr. Latham: You answer them for me.

Mr. HAWKE: I will be generous and believe that he can. Everyone knows why the price of farm products has fallen. I have already indicated why that came to pass. I propose now to show why the price of manufactured commodities has risen. Probably my opinion will not coincide with that of members opposite.

Mr. Latham: Why anticipate that?

MR. HAWKE: I am trying to be generous to the Leader of the Opposition and those associated with him. The Governments of Australia, Federal and State, have raised in taxation about £160,000,000 a year. The amount of taxation raised has become heavier during recent years for reasons that are obvious and need not be stressed.

Mr. Latham: It will be still further increased if your policy is carried out.

Mr. HAWKE: The Leader of the Opposition does not, I am afraid, display a very clear conception of my policy. When the prices of farm products were high those engaged in the farming industries were able to pay a very large amount in taxation of one kind and another. As a matter of fact, I find that the member for Swan in the Federal Parliament, Mr. H. Gregory, is trying to make capital out of this matter in an entirely contrary direction. He is touring the country with a graph showing that during the last twelve months or two years, the farming industries of Australia have had a very small amount of assessable income for taxation purposes, while every other section has enjoyed an assessable income for taxation purposes of from fifty to a hundred times as much. I suggest one of the main reasons why the prices of those things that are produced in the factories of Australia have not fallen is because of the fact that the tremendous burden of taxation formerly borne by the producers of Australia has had to be transferred to the shoulders of the manufacturers

and business men and commercial undertakings of Australia. There can be no denial of that statement, and, therefore, we are greatly indebted to the Leader of the Opposition for having presented this graph to us, seeing that it does not tell more than half of the story.

Mr. Latham: It tells all the story.

Mr. HAWKE: It does not explain the position as it should be explained. Some may say that although my views may be correct, the farmers, in the long run, will pay the whole of the taxation. They may do so.

Mr. Latham: You said they did, on one occasion. I can produce the report of your statement.

Mr. HAWKE: Of course I would not deny having said so. At the moment I am saying that the farmers may pay it in the long run, but that does not disprove the fact that the main reason why the industrial products of Australia have not fallen in price is because of the transference of a tremendous amount of taxation, formerly paid direct by the farmers and primary industries, to business and commercial undertakings throughout Australia. There is only one way by which those in control of business and commercial undertakings can recover possession of what has been paid to Governments and that is by incorporating the taxation paid in the price of the goods they have to sell. Thus it comes about that the red line on the graph has not moved down correspondingly with the other line. We all regret the disparity, and realise that it hinders the successful operations of the farming industry. If anyone can show how the taxation can be transferred again to some other activity then, of course, to the extent that the load is transferred from the business and commercial enterprises of the nation, it may be possible for the red line, which shows the price for industrial products, to take a sudden drop down. I will next deal with the problem of tariffs. Although the State Parliament has no power to deal with the tariff problem, that question received considerable attention by members who have spoken during the course of this debate. It is a tremendously important matter and it has to be admitted that in many respects the control and administration of the tariff has been unscientific. On the other hand, some of the charges made against the tariff cannot, in my judgment, be substantiated. I find that members of

the parties sitting in opposition to the Labour Government have been traversing the country districts ascribing to the tariff all possible harmful effects. I have heard speakers even blame the tariff for physical ailments, let alone economic disabilities.

Mr. Latham: It can be blamed for our mental worries.

Mr. Lambert: That would not be urged in your case!

Mr. HAWKE: The tariff has been blamed for almost all our troubles. The most unjustifiable charge against the operations of the tariff is the assertion that it has been responsible for making it impossible for the primary products of Western Australia to be sold overseas. To those who have foolishly, even if earnestly and sincerely, made that assertion, I would ask: How much wheat did we have for sale overseas last year that we were unable to sell, and how much wool that was available for disposal overseas were we unable to sell in that way?

Mr. Latham: We had to sell those products at any price that was offered.

Mr. HAWKE: Those products were sold at the world's parity price, just as the producers in other parts of the world had to sell on that basis. Irrespective of whether the tariff operating was high or low, the prices of wheat and wool last year would have been just the same.

Mr. Stubbs: Will you deny that thirty years ago a harvester could be bought for £75 and today, for the same type of machine, £150 has to be paid.

Mr. HAWKE: The interjection is not relevant to the point I am stressing, but I will be generous and reply to it.

Mr. Griffiths: There is a lot of generosity about the hon. member.

Mr. HAWKE: Perhaps the hon. member will realise that in the year he mentioned, 1901 or thereabouts, the interest bill was about £2,000,000, whereas to-day it is £60,000,000. I put the point to him again that the incidence of taxation caused through the rising public indebtedness and interest bill has been responsible largely for the increases in price for the vehicle to which he made reference.

Mr. Latham: That is so.

Mr. HAWKE: Let me revert to the point I was making when I was diverted from it by the enthusiasm of the member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs). I claim that Australia did

not suffer at all with regard to the sale of its primary products overseas because of the operations of the tariff, and the fact that we were able to dispose each year of the whole of our surplus primary production furnishes absolute proof of my statement. When I speak of our surplus production, I must add that not only during the last three years have we exported our surplus production, but, to our discredit and disgrace, we have exported a fairly large volume of commodities that should have been retained in Australia for the purpose of properly feeding and clothing our own people.

Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. HAWKE: With regard to the tariff, it has been said that France, Italy and Germany have shut out Australian products. It is true that they have done so, but I submit that, to the extent that they shut out our products and took products from other countries, that made available for Australian products, markets that were formerly supplied by those countries from which France, Germany and Italy drew their supplies. Thus, in the final analysis, the transactions balanced themselves. There is also the point that France, Germany and Italy have imposed a high tariff not only against Australian wheat but against wheat from other countries of the world. I understand that France and Italy have placed what amounts practically to an embargo against the admission of any foreign-grown wheat.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: The same applies to Germany to a great extent.

Mr. HAWKE: It is much the same there. Why have those countries taken that action? Is it because other countries of the world have done the same as Australia regarding their tariffs, or is it because the War taught Germany, France and Italy that the best means of defence in times of war is for a country to be as self-contained as possible regarding her food supplies.

Mr. Latham: Nothing of the sort; it was because they formerly paid for the products with other goods and then they were forced to pay for it in gold.

Mr. HAWKE: I think France has sufficient gold to pay for all the wheat that country will require during the next million years.

Mr. Latham: France is not going to let it go.

Mr. HAWKE: France may be pleased to let it go one of these days and the sooner the better it will be for the world.

Mr. Latham: The same applies to America

Mr. HAWKE: That may be so, but I am emphasising the point that the policy of France, Germany and Italy with regard to the development of their own respective national wheat production has been inspired by the lessons learnt during the Great War. That experience taught the nations that the best means of defence in time of war is for a country engaged in hostilities to be in a position to produce as much of the food required by the nation from the soil by their nationals.

Mr. Latham: At 10s. a bushel.

Mr. HAWKE: Money does not matter in war time. It does not matter that 10s. or more has to be paid for a bushel of wheat because that money is paid to the nation's own farmers and is circulated among their own people, finally coming back to the Government.

Mr. Latham: You said that the Australian people could not pay for the primary products because they had not the money. You now suggest that they could pay three or four times the amount for the goods.

Mr. HAWKE: I do not say they could buy.

The Premier: The member for Northam was pointing out that the nations could produce the goods at the price.

Mr. HAWKE: The producers in France could produce wheat at 10s. a bushel provided the Government had a scheme in operation that enabled that amount to be paid, although 4s. or 5s. more per bushel might be paid for that wheat than would have to be paid by the Government for grain imported from foreign countries. That serves to indicate that in the final analysis it pays the countries I have mentioned to take such action, in order to have greater security respecting food supplies in time of war than they had during the progress of the last international conflict. I find it necessary with some regret to make reference to an incident that occurred in connection with the election in the Northam district. The Country Party endorsed a candidate for that election and a Country Party Minister in the previous Government came into the election contest on two occasions, and on both he barracked for the Nationalist candidate and against his own Country Party nominee.

Mr. Latham: What is your grievance about that?

Mr. HAWKE: I will be generous with the Leader of the Opposition by replying in this way, that if any leader of the Labour movement went into any district to barrack against a Labour candidate and in favour of the candidate of some other party, I would be the first to move for his immediate expulsion. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition should have asked that question because it shows me that principle is not very highly valued in the affairs of the party which he has the privilege temporarily to lead.

Mr. Latham: You know very well that I was not that Minister.

The Premier: It was the Country Party support of a Nationalist that put them where they are.

Mr. HAWKE: The interjection of the Leader of the Opposition brings to my mind the point that he may feel that the members of this Parliament believe that I am alluding to him.

Mr. Latham: You left that impression.

Mr. HAWKE: I did not mention the name of the Minister because I wanted to continue my policy of being generous.

Mr. Latham: I am afraid your generosity is wearing itself out.

Mr. HAWKE: I am afraid my friend's good humour is wearing itself out, too. In order that there may be no doubt at all as to who the person was, I shall mention that it was the honourable, the very honourable C. F. Baxter, a Legislative Council representative of, I think, the East Province. The question of overseas debts is of great importance. We have in our Agent-General in London a very distinguished person in Sir Hal Colebatch. I remember reading an article contributed to the "West Australian" newspaper by Sir Hal Colebatch some two years ago. The article dealt with the relationship of creditors and debtors, and the problem was handled in a brilliant way. It explained the difficulty between the individual debtor and the individual creditor, and the national debtor and the national creditor, and Sir Hal, in this article, pointed out that the debtor section of the community and the debtor nations were having their charges doubled upon them, that that was entirely against every sense of justice, and that every possible effort should be made to see that that injustice was rectified. I make the suggestion that the Premier might

well give consideration to taking up this question with our Agent-General so that the Agent-General, if he has not already done so, might carry on negotiations in London with those who represent our creditors. It is true that two years ago, when it was suggested that Australia should seek some relief in regard to its overseas indebtedness, there appeared inspired cables from England. I might say that in 99 cases out of a hundred all cables are inspired. Those particular cables set out that it was utterly impossible for any reduction to be brought about because of the fact that there were tens of thousands of people in that country holding Australian securities, and that it would be impossible to get them all together. Consequently, it was said, nothing could be done. It is not so long ago that the British Government showed how the thing could be achieved. I feel sure that if sufficient time is given to the problem, if sufficient pressure is brought to bear, if the undoubted ability of the Agent-General is brought into play in regard to this problem, we might secure what we desire and very much more quickly than by the slow methods being adopted at present by Mr. Bruce in London. The debtor section are the working men—the producer section—and it is indeed a crime against those people that they should have been forced to carry for so long the appalling burden of debt and interest liability that the deflation of prices has imposed upon them. As a representative of an electorate that is partly industrial and partly farming, it is right I should say something about the farming industry. Great efforts were made during the election campaign in my district to scare farmers into the belief that my election as the representative of that district would be a tragedy for them. A great deal of literature from the York electorate was spread throughout mine. It pointed out what a terrible man Mr. Collier was, and also exhorted the electors to give their number 1 vote to Mr. Latham, the Country Party candidate for York. This literature had no effect except to increase my vote in the farming areas, and so to that extent I am indebted to the Leader of the Opposition for his action; that is, if he was responsible.

Mr. Latham: I was not responsible.

Mr. HAWKE: If he was not responsible, I will have to withdraw my thanks to him. The farming industries in this State are

indeed in a difficult position. Whether they are in a more difficult position than the farming industries of the other States I am not in a position to say. I think they would be, because the farming areas of Western Australia are more recently developed than are those of the other States. In addition, a large percentage of the farmers of Western Australia did not have many years to get on their feet before the price crash came along. Indeed, a large number of our farmers in Western Australia only had their first crop in the first year of the depression, and so it may be, and probably is, that the farming industries of Western Australia are in a more precarious position than are the farming industries of the Eastern States. That is not another argument for secession; it is merely a point made so that members here may realise the situation. The member for Mt. Marshall (Mr. Warner) showed last night that the position is indeed desperate, and I think we all realise now, if we did not realise it before, that in this State the farming industries are indeed the basis of our existence. It has often been urged that members of the Labour Party are not concerned with the farming industry at all. Even if we were not, from the point of view of intelligently understanding the situation, I think we would, from a selfish viewpoint, be very much interested. It must be understood by all that unless the farming industries are able to carry on with some degree of success, every section of the community must suffer. The previous Government, in my opinion, did their best to preserve the farming industries as far as they could be preserved according to the outlook of those who constituted that Government, but the fact that they did their best is not to say that they did everything that was possible. Where I think the previous Government failed was in regard to the fact that they spent too much time and too much money in trying to commence new farming development schemes, and spent too little time and too little money in maintaining in production those farmers already on the land. The point I make is this: that during the last three years between 900 and 1,000 farmers were driven from their holdings, and at the same time a number of potential farmers were put upon new farms that were developed under the policy of the previous Gov-

ernment. It is futile to operate a policy that allows old-established farmers to be driven off and at the same time put a few new farmers on new properties. It does not profit the State to put one new farmer on the land and at the same time allow five or ten old-established farmers to be driven off. That is not only futile, but suicidal. This is not a time, in my judgment, for proceeding with a policy of new land development; this is a time when we should consolidate and strengthen the position of those men already established. The time for the development of new land and establishing new farmers will come when the marketing conditions of the world are improved to such an extent that they will allow of the more profitable disposal of primary products. I hope, therefore, that the members of the present Government will carry out the common-sense policy of consolidation along the lines I have indicated. Knowing the Government as I do, and having read some of the statements made by the Minister for Lands that have already been published, I feel confident in the belief that there will be a common-sense alteration in the land policy of the State in the near future, if it has not already been inaugurated. I am of opinion that this Parliament at the earliest possible opportunity should be given a chance of having a debate upon the question of unemployment. I believe that opportunity might be provided. The subject of unemployment merits a special discussion. The Ministry would not be doing anything for which it would not be given credit if it decided to set aside six sitting days for a special debate on this question. I am hopeful that in addition to a special discussion on this matter, there will be a special discussion on money and banking. I understand that the member for Claremont (Mr. North), who strangely enough is in the ranks of the Nationalist Party, will give members an opportunity, provided the Government are agreeable, to debate these questions later in the session. I should be very pleased to assist him. I desire to place before the House some suggestions, but because the hour is getting late I will merely mention them in a general way, and refrain from giving any elaborate details concerning them. First of all I desire to suggest that the Government should give early consideration to reorganising entirely the civil service as we find it in the

city. I understand that already something is being done in respect to a rearrangement of the Government offices. That is long overdue, and the Government are to be congratulated upon the steps they are taking. I hope that will assist in the direction I have indicated. It has often been stated by those opposed to Labour that the party does not believe in economy, that it believes rather in extravagance, and in the willy-nilly expenditure of public money without any consideration for the results that may be achieved by the outlay. That is an entirely erroneous statement. For my own part I favour all possible economies provided they are true and real economies in every sense of the word. I have the idea that if some special reorganisation of the public service in the city were attempted, many beneficial results would accrue to the people of the State as a whole. I am not suggesting a wholesale sacking campaign, nor am I suggesting that the services of anyone should necessarily be dispensed with. I do suggest, however, that much benefit would arise if some special investigating officer, preferably a reasonably young man with up-to-date ideas of organisation, were given authority to carry out a thorough and complete inquiry into all our public departments, in the hope that there might be brought about a greater measure of co-ordination and co-operation than have existed in the past.

Mr. Lambert: You will not do that with the Public Service Act as it is.

Mr. HAWKE: If after such an investigation has been made, and the report is presented to Parliament, and is regarded as sound and worthy of adoption, I submit that members of the House would not be justified in laying it aside simply because the Act would not permit it to be put into operation. If it can be shown to members that an amendment of the Act is necessary, in order that the public service may be modernised, and more scientific methods adopted in the conduct of public business, I am sure they would not hesitate to make whatever amendments to the Act were necessary. The Minister for Works told me the other day that his predecessor had boasted of the manner in which he had reorganised the Public Works Department. The opinion of the Minister, however, is that that gentleman reorganised it almost out of existence, with the result that when the present administration took it over he found it in a

hopeless situation bordering almost on chaos. We may, therefore, congratulate the new member for Mt. Marshall (Mr. Warner) upon having made it impossible for the previous occupant of the position to fill it any longer. I wish also to refer to the electoral rolls. Some members may think these are small matters, but taken in the aggregate they are very important. Even if only a small measure of economy can be effected here and there, members should not refuse to adopt it simply because it does not happen to involve the saving of a million or half a million pounds. If true and sensible economies can be practised, any proposal, if it means the saving of only £10, £20, or £100 a year, should be put into operation with the least possible delay. In this State we have the ridiculous position of a Commonwealth and State Electoral Department side by side, as well as a separate electoral roll for the State and the Commonwealth. This is a costly procedure for the taxpayers, and leads to a great deal of confusion on the part of the public generally. An attempt should be made, this session for preference, to bring about a complete amalgamation of the Federal and State Electoral Departments, as well as one of the State and Federal rolls. I would prefer the amalgamation to be effected in such a way as to give the State the control and management of the department. I understand the Collier Government four years ago endeavoured to effect this common-sense change.

The Premier: We tried it three times.

Mr. HAWKE: I understand that members of another place voted against the change, simply as a matter of habit, and that the Collier Government were unsuccessful in their efforts.

Mr. Latham: It had a nasty relation attached to it.

The Minister for Justice: It contained nothing else but an amalgamation of the rolls.

The Minister for Mines: There was nothing else in the Bill but that.

Mr. HAWKE: I suggest that whatever may have happened in the past, the Premier and his Ministers might seriously consider the question of reintroducing that proposal at the earliest possible moment. A great deal of economy could be achieved in respect to Parliamentary elections. In April of this year the general elections were held, and these cost the taxpayers upwards of £8,000.

Mr. Thorn: Do not have them so often.

Mr. HAWKE: I am prepared to confer with the hon. member on that question. In May of next year the Legislative Council elections will be held, and will probably cost the taxpayers about £5,000.

The Minister for Justice: More, nearly £6,000.

Mr. HAWKE: The time has arrived when common-sense should be applied to this procedure. What objection could there be to holding the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly elections on the same day? I should say no member of Parliament would be opposed to such a procedure and yet apparently nothing has been attempted to bring this about. Although in prosperous times this State may have been able to afford the luxury of separate elections for the two Houses, in these days, when the taxpayers are overburdened, there is no longer any justification for the continuance of that system.

Mr. Lambert: There is an opportunity to stand for one election if you miss in the case of another.

Mr. HAWKE: When the budding politician has had one opportunity and failed, he should never have the nerve to stand again.

Mr. Latham: The hon. member had better be careful.

Mr. HAWKE: That does not apply to me, because in my first attempt I was successful.

Mr. Latham: But on the second occasion your were unsuccessful.

Mr. HAWKE: Only just.

Mr. Latham: That was near enough.

Mr. HAWKE: Members of another place are elected for a term of six years, whereas in the case of this House the term is only three years. Why such a distinction has been made is difficult to understand, and I have never heard a satisfactory explanation offered. If the Government made some attempt to hold the elections on the same day they should also attempt to so alter the Constitution as to give members of this House and those of another place the same term of office. As a compromise I would suggest five years in both cases. There are many other questions I desired to deal with, but I think I have trespassed long enough on the patience and generosity of members. I feel that we will, irrespective of party, work together and earnestly strive to do the best we can for this State during the pre-

sent Parliament. Contentious questions are bound to arise, and there may be bitter differences of opinion between members on both sides; but generally speaking, in cases where measures are intended to safeguard the welfare of the State, and to do the best thing possible for all sections of the community, I feel sure that we can come together on a common ground each and every one of us, and give a fair measure of unselfish service so that the affairs of State may be safeguarded from further harm, and the people may look forward with some degree of hope to an improvement in the situation at large before this Parliament has run its course.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [7.33]: First I wish to offer to you, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations on your attaining your high office. Ever since entering this House I have looked upon you as an authority on parliamentary procedure; and, further, I am indeed glad to see the Chair of this Assembly occupied by one who rendered service to his country when that service was needed most urgently. I desire also to congratulate the Premier and his Ministers on again occupying the Treasury bench. I agree with the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke) that it is a good thing at a time like this to have Ministers with previous administrative experience. True, of course, the Minister for Employment has not had that previous experience, but he has had a lengthy parliamentary experience and has been a keen student of the political and economic affairs of Western Australia. I have always looked upon the Minister for Employment as one of the strongest party men known to me, and I trust that he will not allow party politics to cloud his vision. Certainly I wish him every success in his new sphere, and anything I can do to help him in that direction will gladly be done. Unquestionably the Government have a large majority behind them—just a little too large, I think. Amongst his majority the Premier has some young and highly enthusiastic supporters. They, I hope, will be guided by the Premier along the safe path of moderation. Naturally I regret that my own party suffered so severely at the general election. I do not think they suffered because they had not rendered good service to the people and to the country; I think they suffered merely

because the electors desired a change. That desire for change is a part of our make-up from which we do not seem able to get away. I have no doubt that another desire for change will come about, and that as a result the National Party will once more be the party in power. I regret that there is not a representative of the South-West in the Ministry. That great province, in which development is taking place so rapidly, in which such large sums of money have been spent, in which population is increasing and is likely to increase further, must be regarded as entitled to at least one representative in the Ministry. I hold, too, that the North-West would be all the better for Ministerial representation. I trust that when future Governments are formed the geographical aspect of the State will be taken into consideration, and that Ministerial representation will be distributed over as wide an area as is feasible. With other members, I am naturally pleased to hear that the unemployment position is improving; but I am bound to say that I do not observe any appreciable difference. However, the figures which have been quoted are doubtless correct. Even though there is only slight improvement, it is all to the good. I should like to congratulate the Minister for Mines on having launched the prospecting scheme. Every credit is due to the Government for that wise move, which will give encouragement or hope to a large body of men. To-day we want to foster hope. The scheme strikes me as one of the most practical means of giving encouragement and keeping up men's spirits. Again, I regard the formation of the Advisory Council as a wise move on the part of the Minister for Employment. Having in view the personnel of that council, I shall be greatly disappointed if they are not able to render material aid to the Minister. I am glad the Government have decided to proceed with comprehensive drainage schemes in the South-West. Wisely, the late Government started these schemes; and it would have been folly, to say the least, had they not been carried to completion. I observe that a sum of £55,000 has been made available for these drainage works, which will certainly prove reproductive. I listened with great interest to the member for Gaseoyne (Mr. Wise). I agree with the hon. member that it is time—if the time has not already passed—to give attention to the great and undeveloped North-West. I was indeed glad to note his keenness, and his practical know-

ledge should be of benefit to the House. Just at present the North of this continent is receiving a deal of publicity everywhere. Whilst I do not agree with the Dean of Westminster—I do not think any of us agree with him—I consider that we should be thankful to him for creating an interest in our North. The member for Gaseoyne referred to developments being made and money being spent in the South-West. It seemed to me that the hon. member spoke just a little disparagingly of the South-West. I would not blame the hon. member if he were somewhat envious of the Government expenditure in that part of the State, but I think I can prove to him that the expenditure has been fully justified. If he can spare a week-end to come with me to the South-West, I shall be glad to show him some of the development work which has taken place there and the results from that work. I can also assure the hon. member that the South-West has received ample criticism; in fact, I know of no part of the State which has received more.

Mr. Wise: My criticism was not hostile.

Mr. McLARTY: I did not regard it as hostile, but the hon. member seemed to think that the South-West had not received much criticism. It has received any amount, and much of it unjustified; but I am glad that most of the hostile criticism has now been silenced. Next I wish to refer briefly to the dairying industry and its rapid expansion. Undoubtedly the Minister for Agriculture will need to give a great deal of his close attention to that industry. At present this State is milking just on 100,000 cows. I have here some figures indicating the growth of the industry. In 1921 we were milking 53,000 cows; in 1925, 63,000; in 1930, 85,000; and at the end of June, 1932, 99,000 cows. Those figures in themselves indicate the phenomenal growth of the dairying industry here, and go to show that eventually it will be one of our greatest primary industries. Again, as regards permanent pasture, in 1917 we had 8,000 acres of permanent pasture, equal to one-third of an acre for every cow. In 1932 we had over 370,000 acres of permanent pasture, or approximately four acres for every cow. In 1929 our total butter production was 5,000,000 lbs.; in 1932 it was 10,000,000 lbs.; the production doubled itself in four years. Such a fact surely indicates the rapid growth of the dairying industry in

Western Australia. Further, some thousands of people are engaged in the industry. Despite the fact that 100,000 cows are being milked, the industry is still in its infancy, and is at a stage when it requires the closest supervision that the Government can give it. Unquestionably, in the near future we shall be butter exporters on a large scale. The new irrigation areas will soon be in full swing, and from these alone the production is bound to be enormous. It has been indeed pleasing to note during the last few weeks that the butter which we export has received a good name on the London market. I have noted that a London firm, in writing to a firm in this State, said they would be pleased to get as much of our butter as they could, having already handled some thousands of cases and found it excellent. To quote the firm's own words: "We have sold thousands of cases of this butter and we have good outlets for it. We would like to have the agency for this butter as it is really fine butter." It is essential that we should produce only the best quality article and the Minister will probably agree with me that to do this, the provisions of the Dairy Industry Act must be strictly enforced. I trust the Minister will see his way clear to appoint additional inspectors in order that they may tour the districts and advise the dairymen on the spot. The methods employed by the dairymen naturally have a deciding influence on whether our butter will be good or bad. It will pay the Government many times over to make the appointments I suggest, particularly in view of the fact that we are about to enter the exporting stage. I notice that Mr. Carroll, the Commonwealth Superintendent of Dairy Exports, who recently visited Western Australia, was subsequently interviewed in Sydney and during the course of his remarks he said that, in his opinion, the growth of the dairying industry in Western Australia was likely to be very rapid and that in no other State could dairy cattle be maintained at a lower capital cost than in this State. Mr. Carroll was deputed to make his inquiries by the Department of Commerce and his investigations were carried out thoroughly. I do not desire to dwell unduly on the dairying industry, which is the main activity in my electorate, but there are other phases

of it to which I shall refer. There is the manufacture of cheese. We still import something like £90,000 worth of cheese per annum, and there is one cheese factory only operating in Western Australia. It is located at Serpentine and is making very satisfactory progress. When he was in the State Mr. Carroll said that the cheeses produced there compared favourably with any manufactured in the Eastern States or New Zealand. The Serpentine factory is operating in a comparatively small way, but can take 3,000 gallons of milk daily. Last year the factory sold £4,600 worth of cheese and I have been told by the chairman of directors that no difficulty is experienced in selling every pound of cheese that can be manufactured there. We talk about keeping our money within the State and about patronising local industries; surely, in view of the fact that £90,000 goes out of the State annually for cheese alone, seeing there is an absolute certainty that we can produce as good an article as that imported, greater efforts should be made to produce all the cheese we require within our own borders. The member for Irwin-Moore (Mr. Ferguson), who was Minister for Agriculture in the Mitchell Government, should be very pleased with the results obtained from the application of the provisions of the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act passed by Parliament last year.

Mr. Raphael: He must be the only one.

Mr. McLARTY: I do not think so. That Act has proved of benefit to the whole community. Notwithstanding that, the Milk Board have had a most difficult task, which has been carried out very successfully. I hope the present Minister for Agriculture will amend the Act during the present session so as to give the board control over all the whole milk that is dealt with under the provisions of the measure. I do not desire to embark upon some wild scheme of price-fixing, nor do I wish to hamper any phase of the industry. At the same time, it would be of tremendous advantage to the board if it could control all the whole milk over which they have any jurisdiction, so that they would know where the milk was going and what was being done with it. The producing section of the industry, who suffered so much because of the low prices obtained for their

commodity, have certainly benefited as a result of the passing of that Act.

Mr. Raphael: It does not matter about the consuming portion of the public.

Mr. McLARTY: They have not been injured one iota.

Mr. Ferguson: Of course not. The member for Victoria Park does not understand the position.

Mr. Raphael interjected.

Mr. McLARTY: I did not catch the hon. member's interjection.

Mr. SPEAKER: Anyhow, it was distinctly out of order, and there was no occasion to catch it.

Mr. McLARTY: I shall not deal further with that question, for I will probably have another opportunity later in the session. There is another matter relating to the butter factories established in the State. At a recent conference held in Bunbury, Mr. C. L. Clarke, chairman of directors of the South-West District Co-operative Company, stated that one butter factory in New Zealand produced just about as much as all the factories in Western Australia put together. That suggests that we should decide whether or not the time has arrived when we should restrict the establishment of butter factories.

Mr. Wansbrough: Provided you put them under control, I would agree with you.

Mr. McLARTY: Of course they would have to be under control. If what I suggest were agreed to, it would give the Minister a better opportunity to control the industry and overhead charges would certainly be reduced. Leaving the dairying industry, I want to refer to the results that have been achieved under the irrigation scheme. In the near future there will be 60,000 acres that may be brought under irrigation, and it is anticipated that one-third of that total area will be irrigated annually. That means that many farmers in the areas concerned will have to learn new methods. I understand the Government are to be asked to establish an experimental farm in the irrigation areas, and I hope that will be done. At such a farm, plant breeding and other activities could be carried out, and I am sure that the establishment of such an experimental farm would obviate losses that must otherwise be incurred if the farmers have to battle along and find out things for themselves. I believe an offer of financial assistance has been made to the Gov-

ernment to enable the farm to be established, and I hope the work will be carried out in the near future. Speaking generally, I hope the Government will be careful in the expenditure of loan money. I do not wish to deny the metropolitan area any expenditure to which it is justly entitled. I realise that a great amount of money is required in the city for public buildings and other utilities, but it will be agreed by members generally that the wealth of the State is produced in the country areas and we should spend money where it is wealth-producing.

Mr. Raphael: You have had your cut during the last three years.

Mr. McLARTY: I am satisfied with our experience during the last three years and if the development of industry in the South-West during the next three years corresponds with what has been accomplished during the earlier period, I shall be more than satisfied. I know the difficulties of the Government regarding unemployment, and I am sorry that as time proceeds the problem does not seem to diminish to the extent we desire. I believe the Minister has agreed that men shall be employed as near to their own homes as possible, and I trust that policy will be adopted when work is undertaken in districts where there are men out of work. Regarding the prospecting scheme that is in operation, many men have gone from the country areas and I wish to draw the attention of the Minister for Mines to the fact that the wives of a number of those men have informed me that they cannot get any cash and are finding their position most inconvenient. I hope it will be possible for the Minister to make some arrangement whereby some money will be made available to the wives of those who are participating in the prospecting scheme. There are a number of local matters affecting my electorate that I will bring before the notice of the Government at a later stage. When I do so, I hope I shall meet with the same success as the member for Gascayne (Mr. Wise) and have all my requests granted. I trust the present Government will have an easier task than their predecessors. There is no doubt that the Mitchell Government had to face the most difficult task that has confronted any Administration in this State. On account of that, it is perhaps only natural that ex-Ministers should incur much criticism. For my part, I am proud of my

association with the Mitchell Government during their regime. We all hope that the world economic position, which is clouded at present, will improve. I do not agree with the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke) who delivered such an eloquent speech before tea, that the World Economic Conference has been useless. I cannot help feeling that some good, even though at present it appears to be a failure, will result from the proceedings. Already arrangements are being made for reassembling of the conference. While I do not profess to be an economist, I believe that the only way out of our present difficulties is by way of international co-operation. Evidently that must be the view held by Governments throughout the world, seeing that they were whole-hearted about the holding of the conference and, what is even more significant, they are prepared to attend a further conference. I feel that if this conference be resumed, even though at present it does look as if it had failed, good will result from it and it will be to the benefit, not only of Australia, but of the Government of this State.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [S.1]: First of all I should like to express my appreciation of the speech delivered by the member who has just sat down. He gave us a glowing account of the progress made by the dairying industry, and I am fully aware that his efforts and the efforts of all who have worked towards that end have been directly in the interests of the State. Also I should like to acknowledge the work of the Minister for Agriculture in the previous Government. I was surprised to hear from the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) that we are importing cheese to the value of £90,000 per annum. It shows how well justified was the earnestness and enthusiasm of the late Government in their task of developing the South-West. Also I join the hon. member in applauding the work of the late Government in respect of the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act. That measure is distinctly in the interests of all concerned, and, while there are difficulties in the way, as there always are in the way of new legislation, I hope the work will be persevered with, for I am sure the success already achieved is but an indication of that success which must follow. May I offer you, Sir, my congratulations on your elevation to the Chair. You follow a line of illus-

trious, capable men, who have acted with the utmost impartiality towards those sitting under them. I have now sat under three previous Speakers, namely the Hon. George Taylor, the late Hon. Thomas Walker, and the ex-Speaker, Mr. Sydney Stubbs. In each instance those gentlemen exercised the utmost fairness towards members, and I ~~was~~ always proud to realise that the proceedings of the House were in charge of men of unquestioned capacity.

Mr. Lambert: Can we assume that the honour is reciprocated?

Mr. SAMPSON: As I do not happen to be Speaker, I fail to follow the remark of the hon. member. Perhaps if he will make an interjection with a little more clarity than is customary with him, I shall be able to answer. Meanwhile, I will endeavour to proceed with my speech. I deeply regret the defeat of the late Premier.

Mr. Raphael: You are the first one to say it.

Mr. SAMPSON: Others have thought it without saying it. It is a sad reflection that after 27 years of hard, earnest and capable work for the welfare of the State, defeat should come. Of all the men that have filled public positions in Western Australia, perhaps none has been held in higher regard than the ex-Premier. No man who gives consideration to the words he utters would contradict that. Certainly the defeat of the ex-Premier is a matter for earnest regret. In saying that, I am not reflecting on his successor, for all members welcome the new member for Northam (Mr. Hawke), even while so many of us feel regret that the old stalwart who always strove so hard for the State is no longer in the House. However, Western Australia will for long remember his work, and appreciate his unselfish, untiring efforts in the interests of the people. I am pleased that to the Ministry there should have been added a Minister for Employment; because of all the work confronting Ministers to-day, none is of more importance or calls for greater earnestness than that which the Minister for Employment has to attend to. On a previous occasion it was said the Collier Government were lucky. At the moment there are indications that history will repeat itself. I hope it will. If the prices of wheat and wool and other primary products continue to improve, then of course the State will be very much the better for it. In this House it is always

difficult to avoid the partisan view. Some day perhaps a non-party Government will arise. Personally I doubt whether that will be in our time. Nevertheless, opinions along these lines have been voiced on many occasions. The late Mr. T. A. L. Davy and others have declared that in place of parties in this House expending time in useless opposition one to the other, there should be selected from the House the best possible Cabinet, whose duty it would be to attend to the advancement of everything for the benefit of the State.

Mr. Raphael: You would be a good candidate for that Government. You have changed your party often enough.

Mr. SAMPSON: Evidently the hon. member imagines that he is my special protégé. Well, God forbid! I admit I sometimes question the wisdom of the maternity bonus, for surely it is something in connection with that bonus which is responsible for his being here. Nevertheless, with that immodesty which is so infrequently the accompaniment of true greatness, the hon. member will persist.

Mr. Raphael: And he will persist all the more now.

Mr. SAMPSON: There are to-day evidences of economic improvement. The prices of primary products tend to rise. The problem of unemployment is incomparably the most important and the most difficult of all the problems we are facing. Right action in this matter must be preceded by right thinking. It is quite possible that Parliament may be misled into belief in a policy which will not stand up to analysis, and it is possible that an unconsidered eagerness to apply a cure for unemployment may even aggravate the disease. To illustrate my remarks and serve as a text, I desire to refer to the eloquent speech delivered by the member for North-East Fremantle (Mr. Tonkin) on the opening day. The hon. member said he expected but little as the result of the World Economic Conference. Also, in dealing with unemployment, he said the unemployed must be made their own employers. Most of us will readily agree with the hon. member in regard to the possible advantages which may arise from the holding of the World Economic Conference, and that in seeking a remedy we must depend upon ourselves. But the hon. member made a striking state-

ment to the effect that the problem is a domestic one, and so susceptible of cure by national action as against international action. I question the inference that proper national or State action is to supply all our own requirements from local production and to import none from beyond our borders. The implication is that unemployment is caused by the importation of goods, and can be cured by making our State self-contained and self-supporting. The hon. member is, I admit, far from being alone in this contention. It is a view which is generally popular. Indeed, the Minister for Employment apparently holds a similar view, as was evidenced on the occasion of the inauguration of the Economic Council, when the Minister said that if all goods consumed locally were produced locally, there would not be one unemployed man in the State. Reflection shows that it is impossible to produce all our requirements. It will be acknowledged that the sentiment expressed by the member for North-East Fremantle is a popular one.

Mr. Tonkin: The member for Nedlands said it was most original.

Mr. SAMPSON: But it is very important that we should be sure the argument is sound and will bear analysis; otherwise legislative and administrative results actually mischievous will follow. The idea that countries can better their conditions and increase employment by imposing restrictions on trade and commerce and, as far as possible, eliminating imports is now being realised by leading statesmen, bankers and economists as not merely fallacious, but injurious to individual nations, and destructive of world peace and general progress. For a millenium China was self-contained. She acted on the principle that she must produce everything required within her borders. She completely vetoed all imports, and for a thousand years China remained stagnant, a country devoid of progress and almost devoid of anything like prosperity. In recent years the United States of America has adopted the same attitude, and by tariffs and embargoes has reduced imports almost to zero. But in the United States to-day there is an army of unemployed numbering about 15 millions. Surely, then, there is sufficient to show that the attitude recommended so often—the attitude adopted by the Chinese for so long and also by the United States—is wrong. The Federal Government, too, have taken the

same attitude, and, as a direct result of it, diminution of trade has followed. No one can dispute that, following the closed-door policy of the Federal Government, there has been not only a diminution of prosperity but no diminution of unemployment. Rather has there been an increase of unemployment.

Mr. Raphael: But do not you think the tariff wall saved Australia when Mr. Scullin erected it?

Mr. SAMPSON: At a later stage I shall speak of the tariff wall. I begin to fear that the member for Victoria Park and myself will never have anything in common.

Mr. Lambert: I think you will as time goes on.

Mr. SAMPSON: I hope we shall. In my view the attitude of the Federal Government indicates a misconception of the nature of trade. When I refer to the viewpoint of the Federal Government, I include also other nations to which I have referred, and I include also the argument of the member for North-East Fremantle. Trade is the exchange of commodities. I know that is a platitude, but we are apt to overlook its significance. Trade means, in effect, to barter. Unless we buy we cannot sell. A one-way trade is impossible physically and financially. When we close our doors to other countries, we breed ill-will. What we must do is to breed international friendships.

Mr. Raphael: Such as bringing Maltese into this country.

Mr. SAMPSON: Another act that would be of great advantage to this country if it were in my power to do it—

Mr. Raphael: Would be to export you.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not interrupt.

Mr. SAMPSON: We have attempted to exercise a policy of insularity but we cannot live to ourselves. We must trade with other countries. Every cargo of goods arriving in a country must eventually be paid for by a cargo of exports. Imports, therefore, need not displace local trade, for they stimulate employment in producing the corresponding exports. I do not suggest that trade between two particular countries should be on an exact equality. For instance, we supply more than double in value to Japan of what we buy from Japan. Regarding the idea that we send money overseas to buy goods, instead of keeping it to employ labour, I need scarcely point out that money is not sent out at all. Other countries would not

accept our bank notes, and we do not export our gold to foreign countries.

Mr. Tonkin: We have exported almost all our gold.

Mr. SAMPSON: But not to foreign countries. International commerce is a complicated process. Our debts are paid by exports of wheat, wool, fruit, butter, and other primary products, but those products are not necessarily despatched to the particular country with which we deal. The debit or credit is ultimately struck in London. It is a truism that trade is a mutual thing. We cannot continue to export without importing. If we ceased buying external goods, what would be the result? Ninety-five per cent. of our wheat would be unsold because 95 per cent. or more of our wheat is not consumable in this country. It is essential that a foreign market be found for it. If we refused to trade with the outer world, then 95 per cent. or more of our wool would remain on the sheep's backs.

Mr. Ferguson: Ninety-nine and a half per cent.

Mr. SAMPSON: That shows how essential it is for us to cultivate international friendships. The stupidity of the Federal Government in virtually closing the doors of certain continental countries against the produce of the Commonwealth is bringing about very bad results. It is a dangerous delusion that we can solve our problems, and particularly the problem of unemployment, by excluding the trade and commerce of sister nations. With reservations, many of the requirements purchased elsewhere should be produced locally. That is admitted, but to adopt the attitude that the whole of our requirements must be produced in this country is bad morals and worse economics. We must spare no effort to advocate interchange of trade and endeavour to keep open the doors of international commerce. When this is done, we shall have achieved something to bring the ship of State into the harbour of prosperity, and unemployment in those circumstances will have been reduced to a minimum. The member for North-East Fremantle was probably referring to our association with the Eastern States. I acknowledge that, with the Eastern States, there is no opportunity of balancing trade. I am pleased to note that the Government propose to endeavour to

give effect to the people's decision on the question of secession. Apart from the relief from the tremendous burden of the tariff, secession would effect a transformation in Western Australia. I have no doubt that secession can be achieved. Apart from the legal and constitutional questions involved, I believe the will of the overwhelming majority to secede will be approved by the Imperial authorities. Numerous illustrations are provided of the agreeableness of the Imperial authorities to make such concessions. There were the division of Ireland, the grant of virtual independence to Egypt, and the willingness to grant home rule to India when that country is ripe for it. Under the altered conditions which would be brought about by secession, Commonwealth taxation would be eliminated, and the taxation which would be payable locally would probably not exceed one half of the total now paid. Again, there would be the huge sum of indirect taxation which is at present paid on the inflated price of Australian manufactured goods.

Mr. Lambert: Are you assuming that we would become a free-trade country?

Mr. SAMPSON: No; we would require a revenue tariff, but we would not seek to manufacture harvesters or other farm machinery and compel the farmer to pay 100 per cent. advance because it was manufactured here. As a matter of fact, that money does not go into the coffers of the Federal Government; it is a bonus to the millionaire manufacturers of the Eastern States.

Mr. Lambert: It is a bonus to the money-mongers who have lent us money to the tune of £1,200,000,000.

Mr. SAMPSON: I shall be glad when secession is finalised. The people are grateful that the Government are taking up the matter so wholeheartedly. I earnestly hope that it will be brought to a successful issue. It is certain that the State will be millions better off per year than it is at present.

Mr. Raphael: Are you speaking with your tongue in your cheek?

Mr. SAMPSON: I feel that secession and employment are bound up together. The securing of secession would bring about such a change that unemployment would be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. Tonkin: Is New Zealand any better off?

Mr. SAMPSON: One matter regarding local governing bodies I must briefly refer to. During the regime of the previous Government much consideration was given to the question of establishing a Public Works Board. I am firmly convinced that the establishment of a Public Works Board for the metropolitan area would be in the best interests of all concerned. It would bring relief to the Government, and the board would be able to borrow money. It is impossible for the Government to borrow money except with the permission of the Loan Council. When, as is the case in this country, the needs of our public works call for loan money, it means that the whole of the metropolitan districts suffer. I am inclined to think that consideration should be given to the question of generating all electric current at the pit's mouth, namely, at Collie. If that were done, it would overcome the difficulty of generating current at East Perth. I understand the difficulty there is insuperable; it is impossible to do much more on that site. Consequently the matter of generating current at Collie should receive consideration. I hope to hear a few words from the member for Collie (Mr. Wilson) on the question. I trust that the economic conditions, which appear to be improving, will continue to improve, that the Government will have a successful three years of office, that the progress of the country will be maintained, and that unemployment will, as a result of the efforts that are being put forth, be minimised.

MR. McDONALD (West Perth) [8.30]: I should like to associate myself, Sir, with those members who have extended to you their congratulations upon your elevation to the high office of Speaker. I do not intend to spend any time in discussing at length questions which have been raised by various speakers who preceded me. The question of the stabilisation of currency, and various other matters of currency control, have been the subject of experiment in many countries. We know the experiments which have taken place in Germany, France and Russia, and we know, according to a recent report of the Birmingham University Institute of Research, that flour to-day in some parts of Russia costs

a hundred times more than in pre-war days. I assure the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke) that on this side of the House, as well as on his side, any proposal regarding currency control of a feasible nature will be received with an open mind. I feel, and I think many other members will feel, that if other countries are prepared to experiment on this dangerous subject we should consider ourselves happy to be able to sit back and learn the result of their experiments. I think the whole world to-day is watching with great interest and sympathy, as well as with an open mind, the radical proposals brought forward by the President of the United States. It appears to-day he is meeting with grave problems in implementing the proposals he has advanced. While the world devoutly hopes that the American experiments will be a great success, and will relieve the whole world, I still venture to think that we are to some extent fortunate that this experiment is being tried in some other country than Australia, and that possibly we can benefit by the results of that experiment and the experience it teaches. About the beginning of 1930 conditions in this State could have been described as normal, or comparatively normal. The whole world was in the same position. In those days Government represented no extraordinary difficulty, and proceeded along traditional lines. The expenditure for the year could be estimated with comparative certainty, and the raising of the taxation could be assured also with comparative certainty. After three years of a world crisis we are faced with new and unprecedented difficulties. We realise that the hopes we entertained of speedy results from the efforts we made to get out of our difficulties have passed, and we are compelled to face the prospect of a slow, painful, and difficult return to more prosperous times. In the circumstances I was somewhat disappointed that there was no indication of the policy of the Government in the Speech of the Lieut.-Governor. I fully appreciate that in the past it has not been usual to convey the policy of the Government in any detail through that means. I realise it is not the most convenient way in which the full policy of a Government can be advanced. Conditions are different to-day, and it is

our duty now to examine the traditional functions of Government and ascertain if they meet the times. I intend to confine my remarks this evening to suggesting to the Government that in times like these the Speech of His Excellency might well be implemented by an explicit statement of their views upon the economic situation of the State. It appears to me, and I am not alone in that view, as it is the view of business men, that, faced with great difficulties and anxious times as regards finance, the Government might well make a survey of the chief problems now affecting this State. They might study the various proposals that have been brought forward by different people and different bodies to meet these problems, and might indicate their views as to what steps they propose to ask this House to take to meet the issues with which the State is confronted. I am aware that such a scheme presents difficulties. It is in one sense a national or State stocktaking. I am also well aware that we have no control over external conditions, and that there are many factors in the Federal sphere over which the Government have no command. I think the House will agree, however, that there are a number of domestic problems, for which there are a number of domestic remedies, and we can attempt to apply those remedies to alleviate the difficulties with which the State is faced. I do not suggest that this could have been done before, because the preparation of a plan is a matter demanding considerable thought. At the start of a new Parliament and at the commencement of the career of a new Government, however, it appears to me that the Administration might well consider the advisability of making a categorical statement concerning the chief problems confronting us, with the idea of providing a solution for us. It has been suggested that secession provides a way out of our difficulties. I was one of those who opposed secession when the referendum was submitted to the people, but in view of the mandate which has been given by the people to Parliament, I will unequivocally support every proper Government method that may be adopted to bring about secession which has been demanded by so overwhelming a majority of voters. Secession is not a matter of a week, a month or a year, and in the meantime we have to keep the machinery of the State going in the best way we can. We

are not altogether inexperienced in plans. Australia has had the Premiers' Plan. This Plan may not have met with the approval of everyone, but I think it did meet with the approval of the vast majority of the people of Australia. The Premiers' Plan, in a time of grave national crisis, set out clearly two objectives; one being the way in which we could meet our commitments overseas, and the other being the balancing of budgets inside three years. It then proceeded to set out also very shortly the means by which these objectives could be attained, namely, by the restriction of imports, by reducing the interest payable on Government loans, and by reducing Governmental expenditure on salaries and wages and expenditure generally. Whether that Plan was perfect or not does not matter very much from the present point of view, but it had an extraordinary psychological effect. It told the people of Australia at a time of great doubt what the Governments of Australia had in view, and it told them how they proposed to set about gaining these objectives. Not merely had it a great effect upon the people of Australia but it had repercussions throughout the world, and in particular throughout the British Empire. I think I am justified in saying that the Premiers' Plan has played a great part in the stability of Australia, in the fortitude of Australians, and in their confidence in their ability to emerge from their difficulties. Partly this is so because it lays down what is perhaps the only sensible thing to do, and partly because it tells the people definitely what their rulers propose to do and how they propose to go about doing those things. The Premiers' Plan is not by any means singular. I read only this afternoon that the Japanese Government have formulated a plan covering a period of five years for increasing the wheat yield by 15,000,000 bushels. That is organised long distance or long range governmental planning regarding one industry alone. Germany, since the Weimar convention of 1919, has paid considerable attention to what is called long range planning. An economic council was set up, and if their deliberations and activities had not been interrupted by the disturbed political state of the country during the last few years possibly there would have emerged some plan of great value to the world as to how a State can be systematically ordered

on economic lines. France and Germany have both set up economic councils with the object, I take it, of enabling the Government of the day to obtain advice as to the future regulation of the economic affairs of those countries. Any plan of a categorical nature would deal with our chief primary and secondary industries, the problem of unemployment, our indebtedness, the expenditure of loan moneys, and many other things that will readily occur to members. Take our primary industries. I want to supplement the chart of the Leader of the Opposition, and draw a parallel between the year 1911 and February, 1933. Wheat, for which the farmer obtained £1 in 1911, he received only 15s. 6d. for last February, a fall of 23 per cent. in the price of that commodity. On the other hand, commodities for which he paid £1 in 1911 he paid 35s. for in February last. When, therefore, he sold he received 15s. 6d. for his pound, and when he bought non-rural commodities he paid 35s. for what usually cost him £1. If the relationship of costs was fair and equitable in 1911 it must follow that there is or was in February of this year, a serious dis-equilibrium between what the farmer gets and what the farmer has to pay. I am not suggesting that this problem does not represent an extremely difficult one to solve, but I am suggesting that something has to be done in order that these primary industries, which supply two-thirds of our national wealth and which represent 97 per cent. of the goods we send overseas, may be preserved to the State; otherwise we are going to abandon our present outlook and revert to a highly different basis, in which our primary industries will be no outstanding feature of our national life. Any inquiry should set out the various means proposed to remedy these difficulties, or at all events alleviate them; and if one particular means will not solve the difficulty—and it is not likely to do so—then this State can adopt two or three, or more, means to enable the industries to survive until world conditions enable better prices to be received and the industries to stand on their own feet without any particular help. There is also the problem of our State indebtedness. In the course of a highly instructive speech to which I listened with pleasure, the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke) asked, "Why not borrow six millions instead of three millions?" Our State revenue for

1931-32 was some £8,000,000, and our interest bill for the same year some £3,500,000. This means that for every £16 of revenue received the State paid out £7 in interest. In those circumstances we are compelled to admit that the State's business, which bears a close resemblance to any other business, is very near the danger line. It is not too much to say that a survey of the position, and where we are getting to, becomes more and more necessary, because if we borrow £3,000,000 or £6,000,000 year by year, then, if we keep on long enough, it would eventually take the whole of the revenue of the State, on present figures, to pay the interest on our loans. Of course we would never get to that stage. Another question requiring examination, and concerning which the public would probably welcome a specific statement, is the expenditure of loan moneys. I am mainly in agreement with the member for Northam in his advocating that loan moneys should be expended not so much on extension of farming but on those farms which are now in existence—to bring them to a state of greater productivity. It appears to me that an avenue for the expenditure of loan money could well be our existing industries, primary and secondary. Recently I read a survey made by a number of Sydney business men, who voluntarily set themselves to consider the question of the employment of young people. The conclusion they arrived at was that a huge sphere of employment lay on the north coast of New South Wales, *not in new farms but in farms already existing, and in industries already there*—in bringing those farms and those industries to a higher state of productivity. We read in the Press from time to time of companies which have reconstructed, or reduced their capital, or made other internal changes of that nature; and as business men we recognise this to be merely an indication that the companies were feeling the times and were taking stock of their position and determining what means they must adopt to keep their expenditure within their income—taking the steps necessary for the maintenance of solvency and continuity. I am optimistic about this State, especially at the present time. I think that with the rising prices of some of our chief commodities we have more reason to be optimistic to-day than we have had for a considerable time. In suggesting that we might spend time in making a survey of our position and inquiring as to the best means of meeting our diffi-

culties, I am speaking not from a feeling of pessimism but because I think such a course will accelerate our recovery and afford us still greater security. Even if the full objectives of a scheme or policy were not achieved, it would at all events show us where we propose to go. It would raise the issues which are before this State, and would focus upon those issues the guidance of public opinion, which would be for the information and benefit of this Chamber. I do not suggest restrictive legislation, because I am one of those who hold that the sooner we can relax the restrictions on trade and contract, the sooner shall we get back to more prosperous conditions. In my opinion the people of our State, in common with the people of the other Australian States, have met past difficult times with great courage; but I hold also that to-day they look for leadership, for guidance, and for a more explicit statement of what this Parliament intends to do for the direction of their future destinies. For that reason I am respectfully suggesting to members of the Ministry and members of this Chamber that something more needs to be done in the way of expression of policy than is to be found in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. I suggest that a more detailed statement of policy, an indication of a planned government extending perhaps over a year or two or three years, upon which the public could offer their criticism, would inspire greater confidence, and would give the people the fortitude to meet burdens placed upon them, from the knowledge that they had been given some indication of the direction in which it was proposed they should go and the means proposed to be adopted to restore them to some measure of prosperity.

MR. CROSS (Canning) [8.56]: I desire to add my congratulations to those already tendered to you, Sir, upon your elevation to the high office of Speaker. I have every confidence that you will ably discharge the duties of the position in your accustomed fair and fearless manner. I desire also to congratulate the member for West Perth (Mr. McDonald) on his most interesting contribution to the debate. I have listened carefully to the various speeches delivered, especially to those of Opposition members making post-mortem examinations of their party's defeat at the general election. Generally as regards the Opposition's

contributions to the debate, it might be said, as was said on one occasion a long time ago, "They have saved the good wine until the last." The Opposition's unenviable position and greatly reduced numbers can, in my opinion, be described as due mainly to the late incompetent Administration and to the unfair and inequitable legislation introduced during their term of office. To realise this one has only to examine the operation of the Financial Emergency Act, or analyse the incidence of financial emergency taxation. I believe that those two measures will go down in history as samples of the most inequitable and iniquitous legislation ever placed on the statute-book of Western Australia. The provisions of the Financial Emergency Act override some contracts and make others impossible of fulfilment, interfere with the relationship of buyer and seller, intensify stagnation in business, particularly in the building trade, and leave in their train a trail of poverty, distress, and even ruin in a large number of Western Australian homes. The previous Government did not hesitate to override sacred contracts or to repudiate awards of the Industrial Arbitration Court and industrial agreements. Nevertheless, no attention was given to the plight of persons adversely affected through long-term contracts. As a result, large numbers of thrifty people who had entered into contracts to purchase homes on the time-payment system were most injuriously affected. Incidentally, the same Act applied to the large army of Western Australian producers who are also subject to long-term contracts. Wages and salaries were mandatorily reduced by from 18 to 20 per cent., but no attempt was made to reduce the figures under long-term contracts by any such percentage, or even to reduce them at all. This naturally had the effect of enriching the sellers at the expense of the unfortunate buyers. I believe that unwarranted interference of any sort with contracts can end only in disaster in most instances, for the simple reason that it is an attempt to alter the certain effect of a given cause. During every war of note throughout history, large sums of money have been borrowed and spent, and inflation has taken place as an inevitable result. In almost every post-war era, attempts have been made by financial interests to get back the lost purchasing power of money by means of deflation

or by appreciating the currency. History repeats itself after every war of note, but on the latest occasion far greater expense was involved, and deflation has been attempted on a scale larger than ever before. Success for such a process can result only in making the rich richer and the poor poorer. It is interesting to note in passing that in almost every instance these attempts at deflation have failed. The result has been enormously increased interest and sinking fund charges that the people could not carry and at the same time pay their debts at the old rate of income. For example, Australia in pre-war days owed, comparatively speaking, a mere bagatelle, but the interest bill has now reached the staggering total of nearly £60,000,000 per annum, of which £35,000,000 is represented by overseas indebtedness. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) said a few minutes ago that unless we imported from outside countries, we could not export our commodities. The fact remains that before we can import anything at all, we must have at least £35,000,000 worth of goods with which to pay our interest bill overseas. The Leader of the Opposition bemoaned the sad plight of our producers and the low prices prevailing at present. He informed the House that the cost of production must still further be reduced. Then the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) spoke in the same strain, but, in reply to an interjection, he agreed that the present standard of living should be maintained. I listened most carefully, but I failed to ascertain the method by which those hon. members intended to proceed in order further to reduce the cost of production and at the same time maintain the present standard of living. How can the consumers be expected to pay higher prices with lower incomes? In my opinion, it was disastrous for the Mitchell Government to attempt to reduce the purchasing power of the people by passing the legislation they did. I believe that the present depression is a passing phase, engineered by international financial interests for the sole purpose of deflation, and represents an attempt to get the pre-war purchasing value restored to money. Conditions will not improve until either wages all over the world are restored to the 1928 level and increased purchasing power thus given to the people, or the interest rates on our enormous public debt are considerably reduced. There-

fore I was gratified to notice the following reference in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech—

It is the considered view of my Ministers that further conversion of overseas loans to a lower rate of interest is essential in the immediate future if Australia is to continue to meet her obligations.

That is indeed true. Prior to 1913, the average rate of interest paid on all Government debts in Australia was slightly over 3 per cent. Interest rates rose considerably from the commencement of the recent war. Present-day finance is little more than an intricate system of bookkeeping, and financiers are to-day exacting from the people more than a fair return for the services they have rendered to the community in making available soluble credit. Interest rates are far too high, and must revert to pre-war levels. If the high interest charges were lowered, not only would it make the position easier for Government finance, but it would be easier for the producers of the State to carry their burdens. If Western Australia's interest bill—naturally, I include municipal and private interest charges as well—were suddenly reduced to the rates that operated in 1913, I believe that would prove a considerable factor in driving away depression. To-day, 27 foreign countries have already given serious consideration to the burden of public debts, and those countries have definitely repudiated their indebtedness. Loans made by Great Britain to those countries and affected by their decision, total more than £1,200,000,000. Our Government will never agree to repudiate, but we do consider that reasonable interest rates are essential, not only to enable the present Government but any other Government successfully to function. I am pleased that the recent loan conversion was satisfactory, and believe that an early attempt should be made to convert all our overseas loans to a lower rate of interest, aiming at not more than 3 per cent. Even that rate is 1 per cent. higher than that at which the British debt was financed prior to 1913. The State's biggest problem to-day is that of unemployment, and the task must be tackled. A lowering of interest charges would considerably assist in the solution of the problem. It should be obvious to members, particularly those representing country constituencies, that if a definite attempt were made to have the whole of our public debt converted at a

very low rate of interest, special consideration could be given to the man on the land. Like the member for Northam (Mr. Hawke), I am not surprised that little has come from the World Economic Conference. I believe more would have been accomplished had Britain and the Dominions conferred to find some way of funding the whole of the public debt of the Empire at a rate of interest as low as 2 per cent., if possible. If they succeeded in doing that and the interest bill were cut down by one-half, not only Western Australia but the whole of the British Empire would be in a much better position to compete with those countries that have scarcely any debt at all. It is essential that work be found for the large army of unemployed, even though we may be compelled to exceed the amount of the deficit so graciously laid down for us by the Loan Council. Over a long period, our people have suffered, and the satisfaction of their reasonable requirements will bring content, whereas hunger, poverty and unsatisfied wants will produce mutiny. I am pleased to know that the Government have displayed considerable initiative in formulating the new prospectors' scheme, which contains great possibilities. Every assistance should be given to the mining industry at present when gold is at a higher price than ever before, and every advantage must be taken of present-day opportunities. I congratulate the Minister for Mines on his boldness in introducing the scheme, and hope that it will prove successful. There are many useful works that should be put into operation to create employment. Cheap homes are essential to solve the rent problem, particularly for the unemployed. Land can be found equally accessible as is St. James's Park, and this at less than one-tenth the price. I hope at a later date to induce the Government to re-open the provisions of the Workers' Homes Act, with a view to constructing a limited number of cheap homes near the city. I believe it is possible to build a fairly suitable home at a complete cost of £150, and in a few days I shall be able to show any member interested a couple of samples of the class of home I refer to. These will be homes on a somewhat better scale than those constructed under the McNess scheme. The erection of those houses would provide a certain amount of work, and as a result

cheap homes would be available to those who to-day are unable to pay the high rents demanded in the metropolitan area. The Canning electorate requires considerable attention at the hands of the Government. Many works are needed, some of an extremely urgent nature. Even the Leader of the Opposition will agree that the Canning Bridge is overdue for an overhaul. It is totally inadequate for the traffic it has to carry, and it is imperative that at no distant date a new bridge should be built at that point, for the present one has entirely outlived its usefulness. Also in my electorate there is the Riverton bridge, constructed many years ago by the Government and the local road board, with financial assistance from certain private individuals. This bridge has been condemned as unsafe for traffic, and it bears a couple of large notices warning the public that they cross it at their own risk. I am hopeful at a later date to persuade the Government and the local road board to co-operate in seeing if some improvement cannot be made, and the structure at least rendered safe for traffic. Again, immediate attention should be given to the provision of preventive measures against the erosion on the foreshore along Melville-terrace in South Perth. In order successfully to cope with that position, it will eventually be imperative that a retaining wall be constructed for about 70 chains, terminating at Mill Point. Considerable damage has been done along the river front in that locality during the last few years. Where, 20 years ago, there was a fair stretch of dry land carrying trees, it has now all gone, and unless immediate action be taken a tremendous amount of damage will be done to property in that locality. While I know that three or four thousand pounds may be involved in this work, I am hopeful that no opposition will be offered from any part of the House to the carrying out of that work, because some £50,000 worth of property is at stake. The loss of £50,000 worth of property, even private property, would be an indirect loss to the State, and so I urge the Minister to take the matter in hand. There are in my electorate many other requirements such, for instance, as the provision of a secondary school south of the river, and I am hopeful that during the life of this Administration I will have opportunity

pointedly to draw attention to that. I might add that during the next three years the electors of Canning are not likely to regret having changed their representative.

MR. LAMBERT (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [9.21]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. F. C. L. SMITH (Brown Hill-Ivanhoe) [9.22]: The difficulties confronting us as an integral part of a nation, and arising out of the world-wide depression from the evil effects of which we are suffering, are not necessarily minimised or modified by a change of Government. We know that much of the evil effects of the depression are of a world-wide character, and that they have their root causes in the very low price levels obtaining to-day for our primary commodities. In other words, I submit that a change of Government does not necessarily mean a change in the economic conditions of the country, however much that change of Government is desired by the people and justified by the record of the previous Government. Any consideration of the record of the previous Government will show that the change was amply justified, that they did not do the best that could have been done in the circumstances in which they found themselves and in which the country was situated. I believe that in a change of Government it is possible that we might get a Government that will have a better conception of the necessities of the situation, a Government that will apply more effective remedies to the problems with which they are confronted, a Government that will have greater sympathy with and therefore greater consideration for those who are suffering real hardships as a result of the depression, a Government that will preserve a better balance between the interests of the haves and those of the have-nots in the community, and a Government that will apply themselves with greater industry to the solution of the problems for which they must find a remedy if possible. I believe that in the present Government we have a Government that will live up to the standards I have indicated. They have already shown a better conception of the interests of the situation by appointing a full-time Minister to deal with unemployment, and also in the formation of the

Economic Council. I believe they will preserve a better balance between the various interests throughout the State by relieving those who are on the lower levels of income, such as sustenance and part-time workers, of some of the taxation that was imposed upon them by the previous Government. I believe they will bring comforts to many of those who are suffering real physical hardship as a result of the depression, because they have indicated that they intend to formulate a scheme under which they will give a measure of full-time work to those now ranged amongst the unemployed. I believe they will apply themselves with greater industry to the problems arising from unemployment, because they are representative of the particular class more directly affected by unemployment. But I trust that notwithstanding these opinions I hold of the present Government and the opinion I have expressed of their earnestness, sincerity and desire to relieve the problems of unemployment more effectively than did the late Government, I trust that the members of the Opposition and the people of the State generally will have due recognition of the fact that the difficulties with which this Government will be confronted will be found to be just as formidable as those which confronted the previous Government. I compliment the Minister for Mines upon the inauguration of his prospecting scheme. By adopting it the Government have shown a better conception of the necessities of the situation than did the previous Government. The scheme offers wonderful possibilities for the profitable employment of the labour of many men who, during the past three or four years, have been unable to find regular work in any other capacity. But the possibilities it offers to-day are no greater than the possibilities that offered during the regime of the late Government. They, however, failed to take advantage of the opportunity. Several members of the Opposition, during the Address-in-reply debate, have seen fit to compliment the Minister for Mines upon the inauguration and success of the scheme and yet none of them brought the matter before the late Government or supported proposals made for the extension of sustenance to those who desired to engage in prospecting our auriferous areas. The large number of men who have taken advantage of the scheme and applied for as-

sistance proves that for a considerable time there has been this potential demand from men desirous, subject to their receiving a small measure of assistance, to investigate the possibilities of our auriferous country. I am satisfied that a large number of the men who have gone out will prove successful in their search. I believe that the scheme will justify itself and that many of the men will find profitable labour for themselves and incidentally will assist the State by increasing its gold production. It is gratifying that the gold mining industry is in such a sound economic position. Of the yield of 700,000 odd ounces of gold in Australia last year, over 600,000 ounces were produced in this State. The total was augmented by the efforts of many men who were out prospecting under conditions similar to those embodied in the Minister's scheme. I have no doubt that, given adequate crushing facilities, the quantity of gold to be produced in the current year will exceed that produced last year. This possibility arises from the improvements that have been effected to the plants on the Golden Mile. The Lake View, with perhaps one of the most up-to-date plants in the world, is now in a position to crush 40,000 tons of ore per month, and, as a result of underground development and organisation, the mine mills can be supplied constantly with that quantity of ore. The mine has the most up-to-date flotation process in the world. The flotation unit, which has recently been altered to conform to the plans of one of the mine engineers—a plan which is a product of his brain—is absolutely the last word in flotation processes, and it is considered by those in a position to know, that the maximum extraction by the flotation method has now been secured. The stability of the industry is indicated by the fact that the Perseverance mine, which recently constructed a new plant capable of dealing with about 7,000 tons per month now proposes to increase its capacity to 15,000 tons per month. The Great Boulder mine also intends to erect new treatment plant. These proposed new installations indicate the stability of the industry and the faith of the managers in the mines, not only because of the high price of gold ruling at the moment, but because of the development made possible through the high price of gold and the discoveries of new and valuable lodes.

A gratifying feature of the industry in and around Kalgoorlie is the success attending the efforts of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company at the north end of the field. The whole of the tonnage treated there until quite recently—it amounts to several thousand tons and is treated by the decantation process—has resulted in an average return of $1\frac{1}{2}$ dwts. over the corduroys, not counting the quantity left in the sands. Consequently, there is every prospect of that mine at the north end of the field proving a very profitable venture. While it is profitable, the company will be able to continue the development work upon which they are now engaged by sinking winzes and diamond drilling and proving the possibilities of that end of the field. I have no doubt that ultimately it will prove at depth to be as valuable as the mines at the southern end of the field. The result of the grouping of mines under the Lake View management has brought about local changes in respect to where the men have to assemble to go down the mine and to change. On the Lake View group the men have to leave the tram which at the nearest spot is at least one mile from the place where they report for work. The matter of re-introducing transport facilities for those men has been brought under the notice of the Minister and I know it is receiving consideration. I trust that consideration of the question of transporting the men along the mile of road from the tram stop to their work, or providing railway facilities as before to take them right to the seat of their operations, will have a satisfactory result. I have suggested that inquiry be made into the possibility of employing on that road the petrol and steam rail motor coaches now in the possession of the Railway Department. The petrol coaches have not been very successful from a profit-making point of view. They were introduced with a great flourish of trumpets and were claimed to possess many advantages, but the reports of the Commissioner of Railways show that he has come to the conclusion that they are not the most suitable type of petrol coach procurable. Possibly his opinion was influenced by the fact that they were used on country lines in the Denmark district and were run at a loss. I understand there are now a couple of them lying idle in a railway yard. Having regard to the argument of the Minister for Works the other evening, when he said that

the dredge might as well be working at the Causeway, because whether it was working or not the interest on capital cost would have to be paid, I suggest the same argument might apply to the petrol-driven coaches, and that they might as well be running where they can get a fair amount of traffic in carrying the men backwards and forwards from Kalgoorlie to the mines, and might thus earn the interest which has to be paid on their original cost. There is another question in which goldfields members are particularly interested, namely, the anomaly associated with Government employees on the goldfields as a result of the incidence of the Financial Emergency Act. Since that Act came into operation in 1930, the cost of living on the goldfields has remained practically the same as it was then. The mining companies did not reduce the wages of their employees either as a result of that Act or because of the reduction in the basic wage of 8s. a week, which took place on the goldfields subsequent to that Act. Government employees and employees generally on the fields are buying in a market that is in proportion to the average wage that is being received in that particular district. They find themselves, as a result of the Financial Emergency Act, receiving wages in the vicinity of 8s., or 9s., below the basic wage that is declared for that district. It is a very serious anomaly, and one which calls for speedy rectification. I am sure the Government will ultimately deal with this matter in a sympathetic manner, and will give due consideration to the claims of these employees. I appreciate the fact that since their accession to office they have had all their time taken up in framing a policy to deal with the major problems of the State, and that they have not yet had time to apply themselves to local problems such as I have indicated. I am sure this matter will be sympathetically dealt with in the near future, and that these men will receive the treatment they deserve. I was pleased to see in the Speech that it is the intention of the Government to amend the Mine Workers' Relief Act. When that Act came forward last session I expressed myself pretty strongly upon it. The Minister at the time said it would not be a party measure, and suggested that I was the only member speaking to the Bill who had introduced political bias into my remarks. My

feelings with regard to that measure were not the outcome of any political bias. I felt that the men who were to benefit by the legislation deserved all the consideration and compensation they had been getting under the parent Act. I also felt that these benefits should be retained for those men, notwithstanding that the intention of the Minister in seeking to amend the Act was to enable the Government to make use of that vast sum of money which was accumulating in the coffers of the State Insurance Department. We were not successful in the objects we sought to achieve. The Minister admitted that the Act might have some defects which could be remedied afterwards, but we found ultimately that it contained even more defects than we anticipated. Compared with the previous Act, the benefits are very much reduced. The first case dealt with under the new legislation is that of a man who has been prohibited from working in the mines as a result of having contracted miners' phthisis. Under the old Act he would have received half wages and £1 a week for his wife, or a total income for the family of £3 11s. 4d. Under the new Act he will receive only half wages, without any compensation for his wife. He is prohibited from working in the mines because he is suffering from miners' phthisis, and has been told by the doctors he has not long to live, but he now has to eke out an existence on the miserable sum of £2 11s. 4d. a week, including the maintenance of his wife. That aspect of the Mine Workers' Relief Act should be considered by the Minister in any amendments he proposes to bring down. I am also pleased to see in the Speech that the Government propose to do their best to give effect to the decision of the people on the secession issue. I am not in favour of secession, nor do I think people have very much hope of inducing the Imperial Government to agree to it. I feel the people of the State would be in a worse position than they are in to-day if they obtained a fulfilment of their desires. I listened with great interest to the remarks of the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) with regard to tariffs. I feel as he feels, that this State is greatly disadvantaged through the incidence of the tariff, and that States in Eastern Australia are greatly advantaged by the same means. It is almost unavoidable in any federation that, as a re-

sult of tariffs, one State shall be advantaged at the expense of another. It would be very difficult to get a collection of States in proximity to one another for the purpose of federation that would all be in the same stage of development. I know the hon. member is very sincere in his views and opinions on this subject. There was a time when I felt exactly as he did, and that it was necessary to effect a reduction in the tariff duties as they existed. Agitations of that character, however, not only in this country but in every other country, are tantamount to flogging a dead horse. The people of most countries have been converted to what they believe to be the desirability of imposing high tariff duties in order to protect so called infant industries. I believe they have been converted to the idea by those who are interested in the Governments of those countries, irrespective of the complexions of those governments, and that high tariff walls find their support from statesmen, not as a result of the protection they may afford to infant industries, but because they provide a means of taxing the people without making them cry.

Mr. Lambert: That is not applicable to our State.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: Of course not. The people of this State are just as heavily taxed through the Customs and excise duties as are the people in any other part of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Lambert: Much more so.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: But there is less opposition on their part to the high taxes they pay through Customs and excise duties than there is to the 4½d. tax they pay on incomes, imposed by the previous Government.

Mr. Lambert: We pay £3 more per head of the population in this State as compared with the other States.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I do not know that we do.

Mr. Lambert: That is the approximate figure.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I should be surprised to learn that this State pays more per head through Customs and excise duties than is the case in any other State.

Mr. Lambert: You can accept that as accurate.

The Minister for Mines: The greater percentage of our people are adults; that is the reason.

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: If that is so, it is a recent development. I read an article in 1926 on the question of federation and finance by Professor Giblin, in a collection of addresses given at the Institute of Science in the Modern School, Perth, wherein he stated it was not so, and that the amount we were paying per head of the population was 25s. per head of the population at that time, through Customs and excise duties.

Mr. Lambert: Are you speaking of the per capita payments or the amount of duties we pay per head of the population?

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: I am talking about the money which goes into the Federal coffers from this State through the payment of Customs and excise duties. I was discussing secession and the proposals of the Government to give effect to the will of the people as expressed in the recent referendum. However, I merely wish to give expression to my approval of the Government's attitude on this subject, and to my pleasure in perusing the reference to the matter in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I add my congratulations to those which have already been extended to you upon your elevation to the Chair.

On motion by Mr. Brockman, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [10.1]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 2.45 p.m. to-morrow (Thursday).

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 10.2 p.m.

JOINT SITTING.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 27th July, 1933.

					PAGE
Federal Senate vacancy	136

In accordance with the Standing Orders passed by both Houses of Parliament and approved by Executive Council, the members of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly met in joint sitting in the Legislative Council Chamber, to fill the vacancy in the representation of Western Australia in the Senate of the Federal Parliament, caused by the resignation of Sir Hal Colebatch.

The **PRESIDENT** of the Legislative Council (Sir John Kirwan) took the Chair at 3 p.m., in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Election.

The **PRESIDENT**: I am ready to receive nominations for the vacancy in the representation of Western Australia in the Senate of the Australian Commonwealth.

Mr. LATHAM (M.L.A., York): I propose:

That Colonel Herbert Brayley Collett, Librarian, of 75 Guildford-road, Mt. Lawley, be elected to fill the vacancy in the Federal Senate, due to the resignation of Sir Hal Colebatch.

I have Colonel Collett's assurance that, if elected, he is prepared to act.

Hon. N. KEENAN (M.L.A., Nedlands): I beg to second the nomination of Colonel Herbert Brayley Collett.

The **PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier, M.L.A., Boulder): I propose:

That Mr. Reginald Frederick Bourke, Secretary, of 58 Norfolk-street, North Perth, be elected to fill the vacancy in the Federal Senate, due to the resignation of Sir Hal Colebatch.

I have Mr. Bourke's assurance that, if elected, he is prepared to act.

The **MINISTER FOR WORKS** (Hon. A. McCallum, M.L.A., South Fremantle): I second Mr. Bourke's nomination.