

Hon. W. J. Mann: There are two lambs we should have got rid of.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I think they were the sheep, and we were the lambs.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Rather were we the goats.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The principal problems that confront the civilised world to-day relate to the finding of markets for surplus goods, and to the proper disposal of surplus population. If we consider our position for one moment, we must arrive at the conclusion that, bearing in mind our small population, there is no other country in the world that produces as much as Australia does, or exports so much per capita as she does. Our problem is not so much that of feeding our people, but what to do with our surplus products. We must market our surplus goods so that we can meet our commitments to other countries. What earthly chance would we have of coping with that situation if it were not for the assistance of the Commonwealth in various directions? None whatever. We can make progress only as a united whole. If Australia were broken up into six separate parts, she could not possibly cope with the present situation. However, I am prepared to let bygones be bygones, but should anyone desire to talk secession to me in future, I shall feel inclined to insult him.

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

House adjourned at 6.13 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th August, 1935.

	Page
Temporary Chairmen of Committees	66
Questions: Bulk handling; 1, Additional leases; 2, Cost of Royal Commission	66
Hospitals Tax	66
Committees for the Session	67
Leave of absence	67
Address-in-Reply, Third day	67

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

TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER: I desire to announce that I have appointed Mr. Withers, Mr. Hegney and Mr. J. H. Smith to be temporary chairmen of committees for the session.

QUESTIONS (2)—BULK HANDLING.

Additional Leases.

Mr. FOX asked the Minister for Railways, -Will he refrain from granting more leases to Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., until the House has had an opportunity to discuss the Royal Commission's report?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: This whole matter is receiving the active consideration of the Government.

Cost of Royal Commission.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson asked the Premier: 1, What was the cost to 30th June, 1935, of the Royal Commission on Bulk Handling? 2, What is the estimated total cost of the Commission?

The PREMIER replied: 1, £724 10s. 9d. 2, Approximately £900, exclusive of cost of printing report and evidence.

QUESTION—HOSPITALS TAX

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health: 1, To what purpose is the present hospitals tax devoted? 2, What is the average annual expenditure on the Kalgoorlie Hospital? 3, What is the annual amount of hospitals tax collected in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder districts?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied:
 1, The first call on the fund is for the general maintenance of hospitals, and any balance available is utilised for extensions to hospitals and provision of new hospitals.
 2, The average annual expenditure over last three years, Kalgoorlie Hospital—£16,867.
 3, Impossible to state, as no records can be obtained of the amount of tax collected in separate districts.

COMMITTEES FOR THE SESSION.

On motion by the Premier, Sessional Committees were appointed as follows:—

Library.—Mr. Speaker, Miss Holman, and Mr. Patrick.

Standing Orders.—Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees, Mr. Doney, Hon. W. D. Johnson, and Mr. J. H. Smith.

House.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lambert, Mr. McLarty, Mr. Stubbs, and Mr. Wilson.

Printing.—Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. MacCallum Smith, and Mr. Withers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On motion by Mr. Doney, leave of absence for three weeks granted to Hon. C. G. Latham (York) on the ground of urgent public business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Third Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

MR. McLARTY (Murray-Wellington) [4.35]: First of all I should like to say how glad I am that the Premier is able to take his place amongst us again this session, having recovered from the ill health which overtook him during the latter part of last session. With all other members of the House, I hope the Premier's good health will for long continue. I join with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in expressing the deepest regret at the serious illness of the Minister for Works, and I can only express the hope that that hon. gentleman will soon be restored to his normal health. Also I take this opportunity to congratulate the Minister for Agriculture on his promotion to ministerial rank, and I join with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in ex-

tending my congratulations to the new members for Avon (Mr. Boyle) and South Fremantle (Mr. Fox). I cannot help thinking these by-elections must have given the Premier serious thought. It takes a good deal to upset the Premier, for he has had very long experience of political life, and knows all about its ups and downs. Yet I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the results of the two recent by-elections seem like coming events casting their shadows before. It is not to be wondered at that members on this side of the House are preparing to carry even greater responsibilities when the new Parliament meets next year. Unquestionably the member for Avon had a wonderful victory. Of course he is not entirely new to public life, for we have heard a good deal of him for some considerable time past. But he did have a very handsome majority, and that despite the fact that he was opposed by a strong and popular Government candidate, and had five Ministers working in his electorate, including the Premier himself. South Fremantle, of course, has always been one of the present Government's strongholds, but nevertheless, that we were able to reduce the hon. member's majority was most encouraging. I am afraid there is not very much in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech from which we can gather what the Government intentions are for the present session. The Speech deals mostly with statistics and with what has happened in the past. I am sorry the Government have not given us more information with regard to their future policy. I am afraid the Lieut.-Governor's Speeches are becoming rather a record of past happenings than an indication of what is to happen in the session. However, I hope this will be rectified in the near future. The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) in moving the motion on the opening day seemed to be very well satisfied with the Government's record; yet he did admit that the Government had been favoured with good luck. There are the goldmining boom and the record high price of gold, a demand for our timber for export, and a marked building activity.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: And a demand for labour.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, and a demand for labour. Loan money has been more easily obtained, and I think the return to power

of the present Federal Government has been a considerable factor in helping our State Government. The return of the Lyons Government had the effect of creating a feeling of confidence, not only in Western Australia, but throughout the Commonwealth. The hon. member also paid a tribute to the organising abilities of the present State Government. He could well have paid a tribute to the organising abilities of the late Government. When the late Government took office unemployment was rife, finance was hard to obtain, confidence was at its lowest, and the Government were faced with difficulties in all directions. Yet they did get to work; they organised the unemployed.

Mr. Withers: Which had never been organised before.

Mr. McLARTY: The Government were not able to put the unemployed on full-time work, but they did put them on to public works. As the result of that organisation and those public works, confidence was restored amongst the people, and I maintain that the present Government have gained an advantage from that confidence.

The Minister for Justice: You do not always back the lucky horse when you go to the races.

Mr. McLARTY: The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe also referred to the substantial reduction of the deficit, but I think the figures given us by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition last night dealt pretty effectively with the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe's claim. I do not propose to go over all those figures again, but no doubt the Premier will give us his side of the transaction when he replies later on.

The Premier: My word I will!

Mr. McLARTY: We are hoping to hear it.

The Premier: You will hear it all right.

Mr. McLARTY: The member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe did not refer to the fact that we are still continuing to borrow approximately £3,000,000 a year, and that our load of debt is increasing. It is that phase which is so interesting to the country generally, yet the hon. member did not deal with it at all. The great problem to-day is to decide how this borrowed money should be spent. It is generally agreed that under present conditions we have to borrow, but the question of how the money should be spent is vital to all concerned. I shall have

something to say about that as I proceed. There is in the Speech a mention of the rural rehabilitation. No doubt the great thing in this country to-day is the restoration of confidence amongst primary producers and others engaged in primary industry. I am afraid this much-needed confidence is being rather long delayed. The uncertainty that exists amongst many farmers is having a detrimental effect upon the country. Unless steps are taken to restore confidence, I feel we shall have greater difficulties to face in the future than we have had in the past. In my own part of the State I have never known such uncertainty to exist in the farming community as is found to-day, particularly amongst hundreds of group settlers in the South-West. I am told that more than 25 per cent. of the groups are vacant, and that settlers are vacating their homes daily. Large numbers of group settlers are very undecided whether to remain on their holdings or walk off them. I have no desire to attack the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank. Those gentlemen are confronted with a tremendous task, and all the energy and ability they have will be needed to deal with the problem. I very much regret that up to the present they have not agreed to meet the representatives of the group settlers. Repeated attempts have been made by these settlers to induce the commissioners to meet their representatives. As members know, many public meetings have been held on this question. The commissioners, however, have refused to meet any of the representatives of the persons concerned. These people keep on appealing to their Parliamentary representatives. We have been told by the chairman of the commissioners that he does not want to see any politicians, nor will he take any notice of public meetings. The representatives of the settlers know what the trouble is, and I believe could give advice to the commissioners that would be exceedingly helpful to them. I do not think any political influence, that would be in any way detrimental, would be brought to bear upon the bank officials. I cannot imagine the chairman of the commissioners allowing political influence to affect him. The decision not to meet politicians or allow them to enter the bank is not justified. It is getting into the danger zone when those who are elected by the people, such as members of Parliament are, are denied access to important officials. Political influence is not all

bad. Members opposite will agree that most of the great things they have been able to accomplish have been brought about through political influence. It is natural that when men and women are in danger of losing their homes they should look to someone for help and advice. They have accordingly appealed to those they have elected to represent them in Parliament. As things are, we are not able to give the advice and help that are required. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition pointed out that many of these settlers cannot come to Perth either for financial or family reasons, and therefore are staying on their holdings. If they could put their case before the commissioners, no doubt in many instances they would convince the bank that the decisions as to foreclosure were not justified. The politicians upon whom these settlers have relied in the past are unable to help them in the way desired. Settlers are threatened with the loss of their homes in which they have lived for many years, and are in a desperate plight. I hope the commissioners will in the near future agree to meet a deputation from them. If they do, I feel it will go a long way towards alleviating the present troubles and distress.

The Minister for Lands: Where are the present troubles?

Mr. McLARTY: They are found throughout the group settlements, and throughout the country. I have no desire to be parochial.

The Minister for Lands: Were there no troubles there before?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, but the troubles and the uncertainty that prevail to-day are greater than those which prevailed in the past.

The Minister for Lands: So long as I can remember there have been troubles. The Government you supported were in office while troubles existed.

The Premier: This is a belaboured story.

Mr. McLARTY: Some months ago the commissioners advertised for two chief inspectors, one to represent the wheat belt and the other the South-West. I understood that the appointments would play a considerable part in the future policy of the bank. Although applications were called for some months ago, nothing has yet been done to make the appointments. One naturally wonders why the delay has occurred. The action of the commissioners in refusing to meet the representatives of the settlers,

or the settlers themselves, is causing grave hostility towards the bank. Everything possible should be done to discourage that feeling. I hope the commissioners will review their decision and agree to meet the settlers. The Speech refers also to local industry. I agree that one of the most effective means whereby we can cope with unemployment is by supporting local products. I commend the Minister for the enthusiasm he has put into this matter. It will be remembered that the ex-Premier was also most enthusiastic about the same thing. He was the first to draw attention in this House to the urgent need for the support of local industries. He continually emphasised the effect such support would have upon unemployment, and was always urging that this policy should be put into operation. The present Government seem to agree with that, and I congratulate them on carrying it out. The Speech refers to the timber industry. It is a good sign that this industry should now be so brisk. I should like to see even greater activity. Wherever a man has a reasonably good chance of paying for his own home he should be encouraged to get one. The spending of money on the erection of homes is one of the sound ways of laying out loan money. The building trade provides work all round. A home of his own gives a man a permanent interest in something. If people are unfortunate enough to become unemployed, they still have an interest in something. The housing of people and the provision of homes for them to live in must tend to bring about a contented community. My own experience with the Workers' Homes Board has not been a particularly happy one. If a man wishes to own his own home he has to wait several months before his application is considered. I know there are many applicants for these homes, but I do think it would be a wise policy if the Government made more money available for the building of homes for the people. A great many of these applicants can offer reasonably good security, and if they can do so they should be encouraged to own their own homes. To relieve unemployment certain public works are being carried out from loan money. One of our greatest problems is to decide what work men will do and what work machines will do. I agree that where machinery displaces men, the men so displaced should be provided for.

Mr. Sleeman: And their hours reduced.

Mr. McLARTY: I believe that, too, will come about.

Mr. Hegney: It has come about.

Mr. McLARTY: To a certain extent. Men should not be called upon to perform certain work that machines should carry out. It is economical where possible to employ men on work for which they are most suitable. The problem is to decide what work machinery can profitably do, and what work men should do. We should plan our public works well ahead. We should know what works are to be carried out in the future, and what actual part in them machinery is going to play. If there are certain works which can be done by machinery with a consequent saving of expenditure, and the men displaced can be employed in other industries, those works should be carried out by machinery. Our main concern is to provide work for the individual as well. Money must be made available for rural rehabilitation. As the session progresses no doubt we shall have an opportunity to discuss that question. The position of our primary producers is one of urgent concern for the current session. The reference to rural rehabilitation in the Speech appeals, I am sure, to us all. As regards markets for the goods we produce, I agree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that in connection with marketing, organisation is becoming increasingly necessary. I certainly hope the Minister for Agriculture is turning his thoughts in that direction. Greater benefits could, in my opinion, be obtained from the local market if we had a better system of distribution. There should be more advertising of our local primary products. This applies especially to dairy products and fruit. Unquestionably in Western Australia there is a tremendous wastage of fruit. During the months of June and July particularly, the wastage of citrus fruits is extraordinarily great. I do not quite know what would have happened to the citrus growers latterly, had it not been for the goldfields market; assuredly the metropolitan market was glutted with fruit. I would not advise people to plant citrus fruit, or put money into citrus growing, at the present time. We seem to have far more citrus trees already than will supply the wants of Western Australia. The only hope of the citrus industry is an export market, and in the meantime every effort should be made to develop our

local market. There can be no doubt that the local market is the best market for citrus growers. Indeed, the same remark applies to most of our products. If we can obtain good local markets for them, that will be best for the producers. The Victorian Government, I believe, have been making efforts to develop and regulate the distribution of foodstuffs. They appointed a committee in that connection. The Victorian Minister for Employment and Industry claims that this committee, which he created, has proved highly valuable. Our Minister for Agriculture might consider the advisableness of creating an honorary council to advise him as to the limits of the local market and also in regard to distribution. My belief is that such a council would render good service, and would result in larger quantities of our primary products being absorbed locally. I am aware that the Federal Government have recently appointed Trade Commissioners to go oversea. I was particularly gratified to see that a Western Australian was amongst those appointed. My hope is that these Trade Commissioners will discover new markets abroad for our primary producers. We are continually being told about markets waiting for our products in China, Japan, the Straits Settlements, and elsewhere. Yet we do not seem to be able to secure the full advantage of those markets. I trust that the Trade Commissioners will be able to expand our markets abroad. Reference has been made to the potato-growing industry. It has been pointed out that we are now producing enough potatoes for our requirements. The position as regards producing enough for our own requirements need not trouble us, but in the near future Western Australia will be producing far more potatoes than are required locally. When the great irrigation areas come into productivity, they will supply tremendous quantities of potatoes. Besides, there are other areas being newly planted with potatoes. The industry is bound to expand greatly. The question we, and particularly the Minister for Agriculture, have to face is what will happen when the potato-growing industry reaches the stage of overproduction; and that is a situation which must come about speedily. In my opinion the Minister for Agriculture would be well advised to appoint a board to deal with

the position. I know that the Federal Government have appointed an advisory board on which Western Australia has two representatives, but I do not know that that body will prove of much service to our producers. I feel that the only way in which the Minister for Agriculture can effectively help the industry is by appointing a board with statutory powers to control the industry and to organise the marketing of its products. As in the case of many of our primary industries, a large proportion of the product of the potato-growing industry will have to be exported. Legislation is contemplated, I understand, in connection with the whole-milk industry. All I wish to say on that subject at present is that I should like to see the board become more permanent. The year to year business is not helpful. My view is that the Whole Milk Board have done good work, but that the trouble is the absence of certainty as to whether the existence of the board will continue. I should like to see a term of three years for the board, thus enabling them to formulate a definite policy and act upon it. In regard to marketing matters and the attempt of certain people in the East to obtain from the Privy Council a ruling as to Section 92 of the Federal Constitution, under which dairying, butter and dried fruit and other primary industries are controlled, I hold that if the Privy Council's decision is such as to declare that there has been infringement of Section 92, or that the creation of the marketing boards is illegal, the effect must be most serious upon primary industries throughout Australia. This, of course, is not only the concern of the Western Australian Government, but also the concern of every Government throughout the Commonwealth.

The Premier: The High Court of Australia has held that the boards are legal.

Mr. McLARTY: Naturally I know the High Court's decision, but it has been resolved that there should be an appeal to the Privy Council; and there is no certainty that the Privy Council will uphold the decision of our High Court.

The Premier: Two appeals to the Privy Council are pending now.

Mr. McLARTY: Every Australian Government should have plans formulated for meeting this serious emergency should it arise.

The Premier: The general opinion is that the Privy Council will not uphold the decision of the High Court of Australia.

Mr. McLARTY: That is so. However, the Privy Council may give a decision which will prove detrimental to Australia; and therefore a grave responsibility rests upon all the Governments concerned.

The Premier: The High Court of Australia has declared that these boards are within Section 92 of the Federal Constitution. The general opinion of our authorities seems to be that when the pending appeals are heard the Privy Council will not uphold that.

Mr. McLARTY: I should like to make a few remarks with regard to the Secession Delegation. I congratulate the members of that delegation on the good work they accomplished while they were in England.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And on their expenditure?

Mr. Sleeman: Do you agree with what Mr. Watson said?

Mr. McLARTY: I did not agree with all that Mr. Watson said. I suppose the interjection has reference to direct action. I never agree with direct action. I trust that the Federal Government will not think that the meeting of the Federal Cabinet in Perth has quietened the secessionists. I am sure there has been no such effect. Our Premier has said that he will co-operate with the Premiers of the smaller States. I trust the hon. gentleman will do so. If close co-operation could be secured with the other smaller States, it would do a good deal towards getting the Federal Constitution amended so as to give the smaller States a fairer deal. I do not know what was in the mind of the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson) when he desired to know what expenses had been incurred by the Secession Delegation. Probably no one has any serious objection to the amounts being divulged. However, in my opinion the members of the delegation have rendered good service to Western Australia, even if this State had to pay twice as much as the expenditure actually incurred. I feel that as the result of their mission abroad, Western Australia will benefit. The Government have a good deal to answer for in respect of their administration during the recess. Last night the Deputy Leader of the Opposition offered some effective criticism of the Government. It will be interesting to hear the reply to that criticism.

Mr. Sleeman: Do you agree with what he said?

Mr. McLARTY: I agree with a great deal of what he said. I consider that the hon. gentleman made an excellent speech. His most serious criticism of the Government had reference to their interference with the Arbitration Court. Undoubtedly the Government did take sides in the dispute in question. With the merits of the case I am not concerned at present. That phase does not enter into consideration at the moment. The Minister for Mines in London expressed himself most emphatically to the effect that the Government would not destroy something they had helped to create: but I consider that the action of the Government in this instance was in fact such as tended to destroy what they had assisted to create. It is no wonder that the responsible representatives of the employers waited upon the Minister for Employment to ask him what the Government's intentions were in regard to the future of industrial arbitration. For the life of me I cannot see where those gentlemen offered any insult to the Minister. During this session of Parliament members on this side of the Chamber will join with those gentlemen in insisting upon learning what the Government's intentions are in regard to the future of arbitration. There are many more matters on which I could speak. When I first entered Parliament I asked an hon. member what I could speak about on the Address-in-reply, and he told me I could speak about anything under the sun. I do not wish to do that at this juncture, but there are some interesting matters that will have to be discussed later on. I notice that the bulk handling problem seems to concern the new member for South Fremantle (Mr. Fox). Although I do not represent any wheatgrowers in my constituency, I hope the Government will speedily have the bulk handling system in full operation. I would like to say something concerning the State Transport Co-ordination Act, but I do not intend to do so at this stage. I was interested in the report that appeared in the "West Australian" in which the Commissioner of Railways pointed out that the Railways had a much greater earning capacity since the operation of the Act than formerly. I believe members are glad of that fact, for that was the object of the legislation. Nevertheless, it has borne severely on some sections of the community. Of course,

it represents new legislation and it is only natural that there should be found, as a result of experience, room for improvement in its provisions. I hope that we shall have an opportunity to review the operations of that Act and amend it in certain directions before the present session closes. I do not intend at this stage to say anything about local matters affecting my constituency, although naturally I have in mind works that I would like to see put in hand. They concern the Minister in control of country water supplies. I am grateful to both the Mitchell Government and to the present Government for works that have been undertaken in the Murray-Wellington electorate. I do not desire to be unreasonable in the future, but in a growing district such as the Murray-Wellington electorate, there are always works that require the attention of the Government. I shall place particulars regarding those matters before the responsible Minister at the proper time. I desire to express my gratitude to the Government for having appointed the Irrigation Commission. Irrigation is a matter of vital importance in my constituency. The success of the work of that body has been notable in the irrigation area.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Kalgoorlie) [5.18]: At the outset I desire to offer my congratulations to the newly appointed Minister for Agriculture, Hon. F. J. S. Wise, upon having attained full Ministerial rank. Without indulging in any disparaging remarks concerning former Ministers for Agriculture, I am of the opinion that the advent of the new Minister will result in nothing but benefit to agriculture throughout Western Australia. I also offer my congratulations to the new members who have been elected to this Chamber. I have known Mr. Fox, who now represents South Fremantle, for many years and in having elected him to this Chamber, I am satisfied that the people of South Fremantle have placed with us a man who will prove of some worth to the electors. Mr. Boyle, the new member for Avon, is well known throughout the State. He has taken an active interest in the affairs of our primary producers and particularly in connection with the wheat-growing industry. I look upon him as an acquisition to this Chamber, although I must confess I would have preferred to see Mr. McCabe elected. Mr. McCabe has had an extensive experience in connection with the wheat-growing indus-

try and would have been a decided acquisition to this Chamber. In saying that, of course, I do not speak to the detriment of Mr. Boyle.

Mr. Thorn: You cannot have both.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: No, and I certainly look forward to Mr. Boyle being of considerable use to Western Australia. Turning now to the subject-matter of His Excellency's Speech, I heartily congratulate the Government on the many topics of interest mentioned therein, and to extend my felicitations to the Government on having reduced the deficit to £167,000 during the last financial year. The present and other Governments, in the course of the past few years, have been faced with a most difficult position. The Mitchell Government were confronted with many difficulties. They happened to take office in 1930, when we were right in the throes of the depression, and no doubt did their best, to their way of thinking, in the interests of the State. It remained for the present Government, when they assumed the reins of office, to take hold of the situation in such a manner as to secure the gratifying results recorded in the Speech. The Government will have at least another eight or nine months within which to administer the affairs of the State before facing the electors. The farming and pastoral areas have been hard hit so far during the present season. The recent rains will no doubt effect some improvement, but I think it is generally accepted by the Premier and his Ministers that there will not be that buoyancy of revenue during this financial year that we would have experienced had the season been more favourable. The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) mentioned that action should be taken to secure an improvement in markets in the interests of the primary producers of the State. I was thinking along similar lines. When we read of action taken by both State and Federal Governments to secure overseas markets for surplus products, I am often reminded that we have within our own borders, and within Australia itself, a market that has not been exploited to the advantage of the people, particularly in Western Australia. We have a whole army of men who are out of work. In consequence of their being workless, we are losing a market that could be availed of if work were provided for them. Therefore, the first essential that presents itself to Governments throughout

Australia, and particularly in Western Australia, is fully to utilise the market that we can provide locally for the absorption of our own products. I know that the Government have carried out excellent work in providing additional employment for our people. To date the Government have gone to the very limit of the money available for the purpose of absorbing labour. At the same time, it strikes me as necessary to secure the co-operation of the people as a whole, with a view to absorbing all the labour available and thus create a local market that would be of distinct advantage to the producers. I know the Government have that matter under consideration and that they are doing everything possible to secure the result we desire. Reference is made in the Speech to the mining industry. We all realise what a wonderful asset Western Australia has in its mining industry, and as a result of the increased activities in that sphere, some additional thousands of men have been absorbed in employment. That has proved beneficial to the State as a whole. The action of the Government in assisting the mining industry to the extent they have done has redounded to the general good of the whole community. The scheme inaugurated by the present Minister for Mines, known as the prospecting scheme, has resulted in the recovery of additional gold, and has provided avenues of employment for upwards of 2,000 men. The Government have secured in return quite a substantial sum as a result of the gold won by those prospectors. There is another phase of that scheme that is beneficial to the mining industry. Many of the young men who were induced to seize the opportunities that were offered to them, have become qualified to take employment in the industry itself. Within recent months I have met several of them and they informed me that they had no intention of returning to the coast, for they realised better opportunities were available in the mining areas. That very fact must result in additional benefit all round. No doubt most of them will secure something in addition to the ordinary rate of wages as a result of their prospecting activities. It was an excellent move on the part of the Government to send the Minister for Mines to the Old Land. From what I have read of the published reports dealing with the Minister's doings since he reached London, there will be added interest taken in Western Australia

from a mining investment point of view. That being so, everyone will agree in applauding the Government for having selected a man like the Minister for Mines to proceed to London, for Mr. Munsie can deal with mining matters in a manner that will appeal to the British investors who have money awaiting investment in mining ventures. Generally speaking, the mining industry is buoyant. There are some phases that require further consideration with a view to creating a greater stimulus to investment and prospecting. Large sums of money have been made available to assist prospectors, mining companies and leaseholders, but at the same time I would remind the Minister, who is representing the Minister for Mines during the latter's absence in London, that there are large areas of auriferous country that are without adequate water supplies. Many of the prospectors have the advantage of permanent water supplies already provided, but in the country south from Boorabbin and Woolgangie there is a scarcity of water and men cannot prospect those areas until some provision is made for water supplies so as to enable them to carry on. Similarly attractive country lies north towards Mt. Jackson, and towards Sandstone on the Murchison, as well as to the westward of Mulline. The Government would be well advised to spend money for water supplies to enable prospectors to work in those areas. By so doing they would be furthering the scheme to assist the mining industry. It is pleasing to note that, as a result of the increased mining activity last year, the State secured 14,000 ozs. of gold over the previous year's output. That represents a considerable advance in the wealth production of the State, and should in itself appeal to the outside public to furnish capital for the development of mines that may become permanent producers. I compliment the member for Brown Hill-Ivanhoe (Mr. F. C. L. Smith) on his speech in moving the adoption of the Address-in-reply. He was necessarily concise in his remarks, but he handled the subject matter of his speech ably and well. He pointed out some of the benefits that had accrued to the State as a result of the occupancy of the Treasury Benches by the present party. There are many matters concerning his electorate, as well as mine, which he would have liked to touch

upon had time been available. I intend to bring under the notice of the Government several matters of considerable importance to the people who live in mining areas. As a result of the great improvement in the industry, thousands of people have been attracted to the mining districts, and because of the influx, there is a dearth of housing accommodation, and rents have increased enormously. This matter was brought under the notice of the Government some little time ago, and no doubt they have considered means whereby this hardship suffered by the workers of the goldfields may be relieved. Increased wages are not of much use to the workers unless some control is exercised over the cost of living. Because of the enormous increase in house rents, the cost of living has been increased considerably. Some time ago I approached the Workers' Homes Board with a view to securing an extension of their activities to goldfields areas, but so far the board appear to be disinclined to take action in that direction. No doubt they would accede to the requests of some people for assistance to build homes if they were in a position to put up substantial deposits, but workers, generally speaking, have not the cash to do that. I suggest to the Government another way of dealing with this matter. Within the last few years legislation has been introduced to establish a fair rents court. The measures passed this House, but failed to pass another place. The Government would be well advised to resubmit a fair rents Bill and send it to another place. I would go so far as to agree that such a measure should apply to the Kalgoorlie and Boulder districts only. When I mention that a three-roomed house in the town of Kalgoorlie is rented at 30s. a week, a house that cost probably no more than £400, members will realise that action in the interests of the goldfields people is necessary. It seems to me that investors who have been fortunate enough to secure blocks of land at low values and who are inflating those values are securing a rake-off in the shape of high rents to which they are not entitled. The Government should take this matter in hand immediately and introduce the necessary remedial legislation. Another matter affects the sick and infirm of the mining industry. For many years there has been a hospital at Kalgoorlie, but as a result of the influx

of population, the hospital accommodation is quite inadequate to meet requirements. Recently the Minister representing the Minister for Health was approached with a request that additional accommodation should be provided. I believe he made an offer to the goldfields community to provide additional accommodation, the cost to be borne on a fifty-fifty basis. To-day I asked for details of the amount of hospital tax collected in the Kalgoorlie-Boulder districts, and of course failed to get the information. I was informed by the Minister, however, that in the last three years a sum equal to £16,000 had been spent on renovations and additions to the Kalgoorlie hospital. That sounds quite a substantial sum, but I assure the Minister that it is insufficient. It has certainly proved quite inadequate to provide the accommodation necessary to meet the needs of the district.

Mr. Lambert: The Kalgoorlie hospital will be considerably relieved when the Coolgardie hospital is opened in a month or so.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I understand that at Coolgardie a six-roomed house is being converted into a hospital, and that a 10ft. verandah will provide further sleeping accommodation. In the event of the hospital being established at Coolgardie, the Kalgoorlie hospital will certainly be relieved to the extent of the demands now made on it by Coolgardie patients. I hope the Minister will consider this matter and do his utmost to meet the needs of the goldfields people. Another matter of considerable importance affects the workers in the mining industry. Legislation has been passed to provide for cash payments to workers who have contracted the disease of silicosis. In 1915 the Scaddan Government were instrumental in bringing into operation a voluntary scheme of contribution providing for a maximum payment of £2 5s. a week to afflicted miners and their dependants—£1 5s. for the worker and the balance for the dependants. That was followed by the introduction of the Miners' Phthisis Act in 1922-23. That was a skeleton measure which did not provide for any payment to workers suffering from tuberculosis who were excluded from the industry. The object of the Act was to exclude tuberculous miners from underground working. Later on such excluded men were paid the current rate of wage, or were found employment. In the

event of falling sick, they receive the current rate of pay. If they died, the widow received £2 a week and 8s. 6d. for each child under the age of 16 years. Later on the Workers' Compensation Act was passed, and provision was made in the third schedule for the payment of compensation for industrial diseases. The maximum amount stipulated was £750. In 1933 a consolidating measure was passed embodying the provisions of the Mine Workers' Relief Fund Act, the Miners' Phthisis Act and the third schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act. Under the Miners' Phthisis Act no limitation was imposed on the amount that an injured worker could draw, but as a result of the passing of the consolidating measure, a limit of £750 has been imposed. Naturally those concerned resent the fact that while a man who came under the old Miners' Phthisis Act may draw payments to an unlimited amount, those who come under the provisions of the consolidated measure are limited to payments amounting in all to £750. They desire a re-enactment of the Miners' Phthisis Act so that they will be permitted to draw sums without any limitation. I ask the Minister to take this matter into consideration, and I hope he will see his way to comply with the request and restore the provisions of the Miners' Phthisis Act to those workers. The Government should also consider the question of legalising the State Insurance Department. It is well known that Bills have been passed by this House to that end, but have failed to secure the approval of another place. At present industrial insurance is being undertaken by the State Insurance Department, though the institution has been established without parliamentary authority. The liability of the department is such that members should seriously consider the need for legislation to legalise the transactions of the department. No less than £214,000 of a reserve fund has been built up and it is really essential that that reserve fund should be held in anticipation of future liabilities, because year after year medical examinations have taken place in the laboratory at Kalgoorlie which go to show that the liability under the provisions of the Third Schedule of the Workers' Compensation Act are increasing considerably. Hence the desirability of having that reserve fund available. When we have such a sum of money as £214,000 in reserve, I think members will realise the need that

exists for legalising the department. There is another phase of the question worthy of consideration. This department has been brought into being without statutory authority; therefore we have created a precedent by establishing a department without the sanction of Parliament. Parliament should certainly now pass legislation to legalise the State Insurance Department. I do not know what form such legislation should take. If I remember rightly, a Bill was introduced some years ago and it had a very wide range in that it provided for general insurance. A previous Government introduced a Bill to create a State monopoly of industrial insurance only. However, this is a matter that should be dealt with by the Government because thousands more men are employed in the mining industry to-day than were employed when the department was first established. So the financial responsibility has become greater, and in my opinion, therefore, it is necessary that the Government should not delay in submitting the required legislation. I have no intention of dealing with the matters referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition last night. He dealt with quite a big range of subjects and it was noticeable that during the greater part of the time he was on his feet the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Nationalist Party were not present in the Chamber. Thus the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had a comparatively easy job. His remarks were mostly addressed to the Government and I think I can leave them to the Government to deal with. The last matter upon which I desire to touch is that of unemployment on the goldfields. We on the goldfields are in rather an unenviable position in that we have not only unemployed persons coming from the metropolitan area and from other parts of the State, but we also have quite a large number of unemployed men coming from the Eastern States. Perhaps we cannot very well quarrel with them for coming here because the majority of us in this Chamber originally came from the Eastern States. At the same time, we have many unemployed on the goldfields and they find it very difficult to obtain work because of the presence of so many from other districts. Unfortunately since the depression set in, all Governments, when they make work available, describe it as relief work, and unless a man is on sustenance he has very little chance of getting a job on those works. I realise that the Government have a most difficult

proposition to handle, but I do think that the goldfields residents who are unemployed should receive a little more consideration than they are getting at present. They have their homes on the goldfields and to be asked to go to other districts or to the metropolitan area is not to their advantage. It means to them a distinct loss. The Government might give this matter their consideration and see whether it is possible, when Government works are put in hand, for the goldfields unemployed to secure employment. I have nothing further to say except that I think the Government have a good record and I am looking forward to important legislation being introduced this session. I shall have an opportunity later when the Estimates are before the House of bringing other matters under the notice of Ministers.

MR. BOYLE (Avon) [5.53]: I wish to thank the Premier for the graceful tribute he paid to the memory of the man whose seat I occupy to-day. I endorse those remarks and hope that I will be able to work as hard in the interests of my constituents as did the late lamented Mr. Griffiths. I wish to thank members, particularly the members for Murray-Wellington and Kalgoorlie, for their congratulations on my return as member for Avon. I much appreciate their remarks. In offering a few comments on the Address-in-reply, I desire to refer to that statistical compendium known as the Governor's Speech. I notice that the State's revenue for 1934-35 was, in round figures, £9,333,000 against £8,481,000 in the previous year, an increase of £850,000. Of course increased revenue means increased expenditure, but the position to-day is made much easier for the Government by the improvement in the economic position. Unfortunately, however, this improvement does not extend to the primary industries of wheat and wool growing. But the improvement in the great gold mining industry has provided over 11,000 workers in the State with well-paid employment, in addition to which the Government have had the benefit of adventitious aids—if one might call them so—in the tremendous increase in revenue items such as the financial emergency tax, which, in 1932-33 for seven months yielded £202,000, in 1933-34 grew to £411,000 and last year increased to £684,980.

The Premier: Those words "adventitious aids" were first used by Sir Henry Parkes.

Mr. BOYLE: I do not claim any originality in using those words. The hospital tax, which of course is an earmarked tax, certainly relieved the Government of a most important function, and that is the care of the sick. In 1932-33 that tax provided £148,000, in 1933-34 £154,000 and last year £193,000. So the improvement shown by the Government in the financial position has certainly been considerable. Apart from that tax which, as I have already said, is earmarked for a specific object, the Government have had £684,000 from the financial emergency tax, and, according to the report presented by the Minister for Railways last night, the Government have had the benefit of the improvement in the railway position. That is to say, the deficit in the railway accounts was last year only £99,000 as against £275,000 in the year before. So allowing for additional expenditure, the difference in the Treasurer's favour in respect of the railways was £175,000.

The Premier: You would be well advised to wait until you have had a little more experience before you discuss finance.

Mr. BOYLE: I am certainly pleased with the position as disclosed. The improvement in the finances decidedly is to the benefit of the State; I do not dispute that for one moment. But it has been stated that the deficit now has been reduced to £167,000, and I wish to show that the reason for that reduction is to be found in the various taxation measures. I, as president of a certain organisation, supported the action of the Government when they introduced the Transport Act. The organisation with which I am connected raised no objection to that legislation; on the contrary we stood with the Government in the fervent hope that the railway revenue would increase to the extent that it would be possible to provide some relief for the primary industries. The revenue derived from the carriage of wheat alone last year was £528,000. Altogether I venture to say that wheatgrowing in itself provided close upon £700,000 of revenue to the Railway Department of Western Australia. I understand the difficulties. The Premier said that I should wait until I have had more experience before I criticise Government finance. Anybody who takes an intelligent interest in finance must take notice of figures. I do not think anyone can claim a divine right or has any prerogative in the understanding of ordinary financial affairs.

I sympathise with the Treasurer of this State, and indeed the Treasurers of the other States, in the difficult position in which all find themselves in the relationship between the States and the Federation. According to the latest Commonwealth Year Book in the year 1932-33 the revenue of all the States was £116,000,000 while the Commonwealth managed to raise and spend £70,000,000. So the position to-day is that the States have been left with mainly the spending departments, while the Federation has taken over the departments of revenue. The decrease in unemployment from 11,175 persons at the 30th June, 1934, to 9,173 on the corresponding date of this year is very gratifying indeed. But the goldfields have again proved great helpers in this regard, and we find the increased employment on the goldfields to be 2,600 persons over those of the previous year. So again we can say truly, "Thank God for the goldfields," as we did in 1892 and 1893. But I should like to draw the attention of the House to the steady exodus from the land, which is going to make it very difficult for the Government, any Government, to cope with the unemployed problem. It is estimated that 500 wheat farmers are leaving their farms annually. I emphasise that while our primary industries are slowly bleeding to death, no Government, however well managed, can restore economic equilibrium in a State such as this, with an agricultural revenue of 72 per cent. as against the 52 per cent. of the Eastern States. Until Governments realise that, I am afraid the spectre of unemployment in this State will never be laid. There is one thing on which in another sphere, I complimented the Government, namely, the appointment of the Royal Commission on Bulk Handling. That Commission's report has been submitted, and I, for one, accept it. I realise the difficulties that Commission had to face. The organisation to which I was attached certainly desire that the wheatgrower of this State should have a controlling interest in the policy of any bulk handling scheme put forward, and the commissioners, in their report, recommend that legislative protection for wheatgrowers be afforded; in other words, that there be passed an Act of Parliament to see that the interests of individual wheatgrowers are conserved.

With that proposal I am in cordial agreement and I will do my best to assist the Government in any methods they adopt for the extension of bulk handling in Western Australia. I am a convinced bulk handler of wheat. It is most extraordinary that Australia is the only exporting country in the world exporting wheat in bags. In the past we have been buying from India jutes, the value of which in 1930-31 amounted to £751,000. The average seasonal quantity of bags used by the wheatgrowers of Western Australia would represent £400,000 in value. I notice that the Royal Commission say the saving in bulk handling is from the farm to the siding, that is to say, in the cost of cornsacks. But I should like to remind the commissioners that the price of cornsacks has a fluctuating value and that if we were to lose the 25 per cent. exchange, one has to assume the savings would depreciate to that extent. I disagree with the commissioners in attaching the importance they do to that point, for experience has shown that there should be a saving in bulk handling right from the farm to the point of destination. The commissioners point out that there is a saving of 2s. 6d. per ton in overseas freights. How much of that is coming to the wheatgrower? The commissioners say that on the bulk wheat handled, $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel went to the merchants. When one realises that $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per bushel means in every million bushels £2,080 extra rake-off, one can understand the position. Without some influence that can only be wielded by Parliament—it is beyond the functions of Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd.—other interests will continue taking a rake-off of £2,080 on every million bushels. We owe nothing to India in this regard. For years we have been bled in buying cornsacks from India. Some years ago the State steamer “Kangaroo” was laid on the berth in Calcutta. I was speaking to Mr. Baxter, the then Chief Secretary, and was given to understand that the “Kangaroo” was to lift jutes for Western Australia; but the “Kangaroo” lifted no jutes for Western Australia, because the cornsack people have their own ships, and their own ships carried those jutes to Western Australia at a freight of 45s. per ton as against the 16s. 6d. per ton that had to be paid on wheat as back loading—nearly 30s. per ton extra in bringing combine con-

trolled jute to Western Australia as against taking our wheat back to Indian ports. Rural rehabilitation is a work in which I have been seriously engaged for nearly five years, and it is with a great deal of sadness and disappointment I notice that from our peak year, 1931, when we had 3,955,000 acres under wheat, we have fallen to 2,763,000 acres this year, or a decrease of 1,200,000. And the decline is going to be accelerated unless we take steps to bring back prosperity, or at least contentment, to the wheat belt. The settlement of the wheat belt was never a party question, and I say the re-settlement of the wheat belt should not be a party question either. It should be the duty of every member of the House to see that so important an industry is brought back to at least the position it occupied five years ago. It may be asked, how will that be done? It can be done. When the pioneers settled the wheat belt, were not they in infinitely worse case than we are to-day for re-settling the wheat belt? To-day there are fully 1,500 farms abandoned. Undoubtedly there are certain areas that should never have been settled, at least from a wheatgrowing point of view. I have had a great deal of sympathy with the officers and controllers of the Agricultural Bank in that regard, for during recent years I have travelled 7,000 miles per annum in and out of the wheat belt. So I know what the people of the wheat belt are suffering to-day, and I think the House should not allow the important wheat industry to become the care of the Country Party or, indeed, any other single party. It should be the care of Parliament, and whichever Government may be in power, every assistance should be given to overcome these problems.

The Minister for Lands: When did it become the care of the Country Party? It never has been.

Mr. BOYLE: The Minister for Lands has drawn my attention to a statement he once made.

The Premier: Our party has done more for the wheatgrowers than ever the Country Party has done.

Mr. BOYLE: To a deputation that waited on him, the Minister for Lands said that as the wheat belt did not return Labour candidates, the people of the wheat belt should not expect the Government to be interested in them.

The Minister for Lands: When was that statement made? Was it made by me?

Mr. BOYLE: It was made at a deputation in your office, at which I was present. The Minister for Lands: It was never made.

Mr. BOYLE: I say it was.

The Minister for Lands: It is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. BOYLE: The wheatgrowing industry to-day is a bankrupt industry, and should be approached with that viewpoint in mind. I may be again departing from the—

The Minister for Justice: Truth.

Mr. BOYLE: No, I am speaking the truth as I know it.

The Premier: Are you a wheatgrower, or a P.P.A. man?

Mr. BOYLE: I think we had better have a Royal Commission to go into that question.

Mr. Seward: You are hitting them on the raw.

Mr. BOYLE: The wheatgrowing industry is a bankrupt industry. The Federal Royal Commission, I suppose the finest Royal Commission ever appointed in Australia, proved beyond doubt that the wheatgrowing industry in the Commonwealth is a bankrupt industry.

The Premier: The Leader of your party said your word could not be taken.

Mr. BOYLE: Because the leader of this party said that, does not necessarily mean that it was true. I am not interested in what the leader of this party may have said; the platform of this party is what I signed allegiance to, not the leader of the party. He is entitled to his opinion, and so am I to mine.

The Premier: He said your word could not be taken.

Mr. BOYLE: As the result of inquiries made by the Federal Royal Commission into solutions of wheatgrowing difficulties, that Commission has laid down in its report—and it should be supplemented by action in this State as, for instance, the question of a compulsory pool—

The Premier: Anyhow, we have known your leader for years and we know what he said, but we do not know you.

Mr. Seward: You will know him.

Mr. BOYLE: The solution as laid down by the Federal Royal Commission is a perfectly feasible one. When that Royal Commission was first appointed, the opinion given by Sir Herbert Gepp, their leader, was very different from the conclusions now

arrived at by the commissioners. Three things are absolutely necessary.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. BOYLE: Three things are necessary to rehabilitate the national industry of wheat growing. It is essential to fix a minimum price at sidings of not less than 3s. a bushel. That is the view of those with whom I have been associated for the past five years. It is the result of careful consideration and of communication with organisations in the Eastern States. In representing the association with which I was connected, it was my practice to make one or two visits a year to the Eastern States, when wheatgrowers' representatives from all over Australia conferred. The result of our deliberations is epitomised in the report of the Royal Commission. There is only one point of disagreement and that is an important one, namely the compulsory writing-down of farmers' debts. The Commission recommended that the farmers' excess debts should be held in cold storage. That is the principle embodied in the Farmers' Relief Act of New South Wales. The writing-down of farmers' debts to their capacity to pay is essential, according to the Royal Commission, and they place the value of wheat at 3s. a bushel, of wool at 6d. per lb. for farmers' lots, and of lambs at 10s. For us in Western Australia it is essential also that the farmers' tools of trade should be put into such a condition as will enable them to carry on the industry economically. The estimated cost of doing that in Western Australia is £1,000,000. The Royal Commission, in their report, said that the cost throughout Australia would be £10,000,000. That is why I, with others, strenuously object to the Federal Government's finding £1,500,000 for a compounding of farmers' debts in Western Australia. That can have no direct value whatever. The mere writing-down of excess debts to the extent of £1,300,000, with £200,000 in reserve, is merely a means of providing for the payment of that money to somebody, and the probable destination of the money will be in financial institutions. In my opinion, that will have no real effect in improving the position of the farmers. Practically every State of Australia has evolved legislation to protect the farmer. In New South Wales there has been operating for

some time what is known as the Farmers' Relief Act. From a governmental point of view—and in saying this I am making no invidious comparisons—I consider that the Government of New South Wales have kept well abreast of farmers' requirements. For some time the Act has been operating with considerable success. In the Press to-day I read that Mr. Main, Minister for Agriculture in New South Wales, is submitting to Parliament a Bill to provide for a compulsory pool in that State. As one of the speakers mentioned to-night, Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution is the lion in the path of marketing legislation. A High Court decision has upheld the marketing legislation on the statute books of some of the Eastern States. The disinclination of the Federal Government—I say this with regret—to implement the promises made during the last election is responsible to-day for a concerted movement in wheat-exporting States to get farmers to adopt the principle of a compulsory pool. In New South Wales, as I have indicated, a move is already being made. I have a wire from the secretary of the Wheatgrowers' Federation of Australia, who is also a member for the district of Albert in South Australia, asking what steps the Government in this State propose to take in the matter of setting up machinery for a compulsory pool. The Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act of this State falls far short of efficiency. It contains many good sections; in fact the Act is commendable with the exception that it falls down on the most important point, namely, a compulsory adjustment of debts. Section 11, Subsection 7, will not permit of a composition of farmers' debts unless four-fifths of the creditors agree. In Western Australia this practically places control in the hands of the first mortgagee. If members examine the figures given by the Royal Commission on Farmers' Disabilities, which sat in 1931, they will find that the Agricultural Bank has close on £14,000,000 involved in the agricultural areas and the Associated Banks about £11,000,000, making a total of £25,000,000 out of the £32,000,000 involved. Therefore the financial institutions show no great alacrity in the matter of writing-down. No effort will be made by the financial institutions to bring about a writing-down of debts. They say their position is secure, and so long as the properties are kept in working

order—we were told recently that these cycles run in periods of 20 years—there will be no relief from that source. According to the Lieut.-Governor's Speech, the number of sheep in Western Australia in December, 1934, was 11,163,000, compared with 7,700,000 in 1925, showing an enormous increase in the number of sheep carried. Of the 11,163,000 sheep in the State, no fewer than 5,570,000, or a little over 50 per cent., are carried in the agricultural districts; that is, the districts excluding the Murchison, the goldfields and the North-West. The member for Irwin-Moore (Hon. P. D. Ferguson) referred to a plebiscite that had been refused by the Minister for Agriculture. I know that in the agricultural districts a strong feeling prevails that the small growers, who together produce slightly over 50 per cent. of the wool, should have some say in the marketing of it. That is one of the reasons why provision should be made for a ballot. I wish to commend the Government for the introduction of the Agricultural Bank Act. The Agricultural Bank Commission was the outcome of a resolution passed at the 1933 conference of the Wheatgrowers' Union. I believe that the Commission did a fine job, and it was no reflection on the former trustees of the Bank, Messrs. McLarty, Moran and Maley, that the Bank's affairs had fallen into such a chaotic condition. The trustees were working under an obsolete Act that was not suitable for existing conditions. In certain publications I gave a favourable review of the Act, and I am still of opinion that the Act makes provision for a writing-down of the debts of Agricultural Bank clients to the capacity of the farms to carry. That is a common-sense provision in Sections 64, 65 and 66. The present Commissioners of the Bank are charged with a great responsibility. A point I made plain during my addresses in the wheat belt was that no Act could operate with any degree of satisfaction unless it was sympathetically administered. To-day we are all waiting for a declaration of policy by the Commissioners of the Agricultural Bank. Mr. McCallum said that the Commissioners were enforcing Sections 51 and 52. It is reasonable to expect that they will withhold any drastic enforcement of those sections. Last year, as president of an organisation, I circularised every member of the Legislative Council requesting that a measure of protection and sympathy be extended to the farmers grow-

ing what are known as sidelines. Many farmers have been able to remain on their holdings only on account of their work in the preparation and sale of sidelines. I have mentioned that I am prepared to assist the Government to the utmost of my ability to restore to the farmers of the wheat belt some degree of comfort and security. In this State it is a national work; it is not a party question. If to date we are not satisfied with the progress made, there is no reason why we should not make a commencement and pull together as one to restore the key industry of Western Australia to the position it once held. To-day the position of the man on the land is deplorable. With the general improvement in conditions in Western Australia, the improvement on the goldfields where 11,000 men are in full work, the improvement in the timber industry and the building trade, we are left with a plain duty to perform, namely to use our best endeavours to restore the key industry of the State to the position it once occupied.

MR. MOLONEY (Subiaco) [7.45]: I did not desire to speak at this stage. No doubt there are some members, better versed in the matters we are dealing with than I am, who will take advantage of the opportunity offering and constitute themselves judge and jury by leaving their orations until the last. Nevertheless I feel it incumbent upon me, as the Whip desires that someone should fill the gap, to address myself to the motion before the Chair. I was impressed by the remarks of the Leader of the Country Party, made in the course of a well-delivered speech. Although many of his utterances were greatly exaggerated and were full of carping criticism of the Government, there remains the fact that he was doing those things which postulate a pre-election speech. No doubt from the point of view of the Country Party he did his job well. He took the Government to task because of the income they had received by way of revenue, for the reduction in the annual deficit, and for the fact that they have been getting more loan money than the previous Mitchell Government received. I throw my mind back to the time when the present occupants of the Treasury bench went before the people. We were told by the Opposition, then holding the reins of office, that if a Collier Government were returned all confidence would cease, and that bad and all as things were, they would be infinitely worse

under the rule of a Labour Government. One of the panaceas for our ills at that time offered by the Leader of the Country Party was a reduction in the basic wage of 11s. 1d. per week, so that it might conform to the Commonwealth standard.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: That has whiskers on it.

Mr. MOLONEY: It will bear repeating as it is such a significant statement. It meant reducing the amount each person in the community would receive, and that in turn meant loss of purchasing power compared with what it would otherwise have been.

Mr. Thorn: You know he did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. MOLONEY: We were told there was no possibility of effecting any improvement. They told us they would do what they had done in the past, namely, nothing. Absolute stagnation prevailed at the time. It is remarkable that one of the high priests of the Country Party, who made his first speech in the House to-night, publicly proclaimed that the only Government which ever did anything for the primary producer was the Labour Government.

Mr. Sleeman: He has forgotten about that.

Mr. MOLONEY: We are told the Government should anticipate the wishes of the Country Party. The Leader of that party suggests that the Government should give the farmers wire netting for nothing, that they should not send men into the country, to poison dogs or foxes or even emus, but should leave that all to the man on the land. I obtained first hand knowledge of what is being done by men on their holdings when I accompanied the Minister for Lands to the group settlements. If the destruction of vermin were left to the men on the holdings that I saw there, then emus would certainly never be decimated.

Mr. Thorn: There are no emus down there.

Mr. MOLONEY: We are told that the basis of Government is sound finance, that a policy of reform should be instituted, and the Government should stabilise the finances, that they should make credit available, and should at all times balance their budget. We have been told these things so often we accept them as truisms. The very people who are now castigating the Government for ineptitude and extravagance, and for getting too much money, are the people who could least afford to do any castigating. They found they were impotent to secure

money or find work for the people, even though they proclaimed as their slogan during the election "work for all." The things they promised were only figments of the imagination. Although these things occurred some time ago it is just as well we should remember them. We were told that deficits would gradually increase, and that a Labour Government would be unable to get any money. During the past three years the credit of the country has been restored. The Loan Council has given the Government the money they desire with which to carry out their policy. Deficits have been reduced from £1,421,000 in 1931 to £167,000. In 1931-32 the Mitchell Government went behind—perhaps I could say the Ferguson Government—to the tune of £1,558,000. In 1932-33 the deficit was £854,000. The total was truly appalling. After the Labour Government have been in power for two years, not only have they been able to secure money for much-needed works, but they have been able to reduce the deficit to £167,000, although the estimated deficit was £474,000. That was a remarkable achievement, and yet not one word of praise is forthcoming from the Opposition. We shall be told probably by the Leader of the Nationalist Party, if he is true to form, that we are heading for disaster, which is exactly what he told us last year. The ship is going on the rocks, and the only way to save it will be to return the Nationalist Party to power at the next election.

Mr. Sampson: You are prognosticating correctly.

Mr. MOLONEY: In the circumstances the improvement that has been effected has been remarkable. When the Labour Government took office the position was indeed bad. It could not be rectified immediately, but it has been rectified as I have shown. In the first year of office the Government put much needed work into operation. They did all they could in the way of rehabilitating industry. They built railways and provided many public utilities. They instituted works in every direction. In the first year the deficit was £784,000, but last year it had dropped to £167,000. It is not possible to contradict that statement. We are told that the Government are getting more money than the Mitchell Government received. What does it matter how much money they get so long as they do something with it? We are told they are doing

too much work in the metropolitan area. I hope the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan) does not endorse that statement. If he does, it will sound the death knell of his hopes at the forthcoming election. The statement shows the mentality of the Country Party, in view of the amount of work that has been done in the country. The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) thanked the Government for what has been done in his electorate. I could mention the Canning dam, the harbour improvements at Esperance, Bunbury and the North-West and many other works which have been carried out in those centres, or are in contemplation. I could refer to the water supplies throughout the country and to the fact that there are men at work everywhere. No less than 2,000 men have been sent out under Government guidance to look for gold. The Government advanced £300,000 to the Wiluna mine, and mining generally has been bolstered up. Yet we are told the Government are catering only for the metropolitan area. In view of all this, it is idle for the Country Party to endeavour to castigate the Government. One can only assume that the statement is made that nothing has been done in the country, that everything has been done in the metropolitan area, to secure political advantage. I hardly think the people will swallow that. I only hope that on the hustings those statements will be repeated. Let them be made to the people. Let them be told that there was an improvement during the Mitchell regime, and that only then did things begin to improve. Let them say that an improvement was noticeable before the Mitchell Government went out of the field, and that if they had only been left in office everything would have been all right. It is only too apparent what the position would really have been. One of the greatest aids to industry, electric power, is being fostered by the Government. I refer to the belated addition to the East Perth power station. I compliment the Government upon spending half a million of money at this station. This will enable the power house to cope with industrial development, and will afford that most important suburb, Subiaco, an opportunity of getting the benefit of the electricity supply. At present we are being exploited under the contract

with the Government by the Perth City Council. I asked the Premier if it was possible to abrogate that contract, but it appears that the sanctity of contracts is such, it is impossible to get out of it. If we are to compete with other countries, we must have the most modern means available for production. Electricity is one of the most potent forces for expediting the production of those things that are required for human comfort. Even in Japan the people are most up-to-date in their electrical equipment. Other countries are using electricity in every industrial activity. If we are to keep pace with them we must also step forward. I congratulate the Government upon their enterprise. The general manager for the electricity supply, Mr. Taylor, has been in England for several months, but will shortly return. I understand that the plans will now be gone on with, and that the additions will then be carried out and the work completed.

Mr. Sampson: It is time they did move.

Mr. MOLONEY: It has remained for the Labour Government to do this.

Mr. Sampson: It does remain. I wish they would do it.

Mr. MOLONEY: That, again, is an instance to which the term "procrastination" has been applied by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party, as well as to the Royal Commission on the bulk handling of wheat. The irony of it lies in the fact that the preceding Government had ample opportunities for doing those things, had they so desired.

Mr. Patrick: They started 50 silos, you know.

Mr. MOLONEY: They had an opportunity with the Bill before the House, which Bill was voted out. When they had an opportunity, they did not avail themselves of it. The present Government have done something towards attaining a broad basis, towards ascertaining from the scientific point of view whether the scheme is practicable or not. Then, when the Royal Commission furnish a report favouring the project under certain conditions, we are still told that the present Government showed themselves lacking in their duty. It is hard to know what to do, hard to know how to please the primary producers in particular. For my part, I shall not make the attempt, for the simple reason that I realise that no matter what one does, one does not give satisfaction. The

Labour Party, in fact, is the only party that ever did anything for the agriculturists. That was the statement made by the "spear-head" of the attack on the Government to-night—a most eloquent attack, let me say. If it was based on sincerity of purpose, if the Labour Party is so successful in representing the farmers, why is not the hon. member I allude to over here, by the side of the men who do things for the farmers? Unemployment was mentioned by the Deputy Leader of the Country Party. He plumed himself and the late Government, in which he held a portfolio, upon the fact that that Administration had done equally well with the present Government, if not better, in dealing with unemployment. The hon. member said that the figures were the same for both Governments; but he did not say that over 4,700 persons had been taken off relief entirely during the term of the present Government. Neither did he mention that whilst to-day there are only 750 men on sustenance, there was a considerably larger number while his party were in power. As regards Subiaco, I will give the actual figures.

The Premier: And I will give the figures.

Mr. MOLONEY: When the Mitchell Government left office there were altogether 4,977 men on sustenance, unable to get a day's work of any description. At Subiaco there were 480. To-day there are none at Subiaco. In the time of the previous Government there were 8,668 men on relief work, making a total of 13,645 men dependent on the State. The Deputy Leader of the Country Party was substantially correct in the figures he gave, but he did not tell us the truth. He did not tell us that during his party's term of office half of the men in question could not get a job at all, but were on sustenance at 7s. per week per unit. The position to-day is that there are 4,346 fewer men depending on Government relief work or Government sustenance than there were two years ago. The number on sustenance has been reduced from 4,977 to 750. In other words, some 4,000 men who during the term of the previous Government were, practically speaking, unable to get one day's work, are to-day on relief work, and on the average their wage has been raised from £2 16s. per unit, distributed over the whole number mentioned, to £3 1s. Those figures, in my opinion, refute the allegations of the De-

puty Leader of the Country Party in that regard.

The Premier: I wonder where he got his information from!

Mr. MOLONEY: That he may reveal to us later.

The Premier: I shall have something to say about that.

Mr. MOLONEY: I realise that at all times—

The Premier: I have never got down to taking figures and information from Government officials.

Mr. MOLONEY: I realise that a person representing a constituency is supposed as a rule to confine himself to the parochial affairs embraced in that constituency. I have endeavoured to take a broad view. I consider that, generally speaking, it is incumbent upon members of Parliament not merely to survey what is within the horizon bounded by the suburban gardens. As an earnest of my desire in that respect, I have, during the short period of my membership, endeavoured to familiarise myself with the country ranging from Esperance to the gold-fields, and even to the group settlements, and all around. In thus familiarising myself I consider I have broadened my views in many directions. Members of the Country Party, possibly being over-zealous in their desire to preach the doctrine of equality insofar as it affects the primary producers, appreciate the fact that many anomalies and many disabilities exist. True it is that often the latest convert proves the greatest zealot. However, there are assuredly many things on which I am in accord with the Country Party, or with the Opposition. Even though prepared to give credit to the Government for those things which they have done, I bear in mind that there remain many things which are bound to become part and parcel of this party's programme. After all said and done, any Government must work according to a plan, and any Administration returned under our present Constitution is returned upon the basis of a three-years membership. In accordance with that fact the Government's programme is laid down. If one is to get anywhere, one's programme must be in conformity with what is contained in the party's schedule. I hope that the programme which is being pursued by the present Government will even remove some of the anomalies existing to-day as regards the unemployed position. We must, how-

ever, realise the work which is being done by the Government. There is the re-lining of water pipes, representing an expenditure of £85,000 in the metropolitan area, where 90 per cent. of all the pipes have now been re-lined. There is also the Buckland Hill reservoir, and the King's Park reservoir. Sewerage work is going on. Of every one of those works the bright feature, to my mind, is that it will return interest, proving a reproductive work in that sense. Not for many years has the district I represent received the consideration which is being extended to it by the present Government. Attention has been given to the storm waters, which have been allowed for years to run unchecked. Only the other day an amount of £3,000 was allocated to storm-water drainage, a matter that has been clamouring for attention for years past. School grounds in the Subiaco district will in future be drained by that means. Sewerage is being connected, giving essential facilities to people who have lacked them for many years. However, there are yet things remaining to be done in the district, and it will not be my fault if they are not done. I appeal to the Government to proceed on the lines indicated in the Governor's Speech of last session. I have since bombarded them with representations as to the desire of Daglish residents for a bridge which will obviate the danger of serious accidents and give the people access to the suburb on the opposite side of the railway. Again, the repair of the Axon-street bridge is most essential. If the Government do those things, they will be able to plume themselves. In view of the rehabilitation of schools which were almost falling down, and in view of the many other works they have carried out, the Government can console themselves insofar as my district is concerned, and can say that they have done many things which have not been attended to for many years in that particular electorate. I conclude by expressing my conviction that the party opposite, even though they castigate the Government, will, if they search their hearts, admit that the present Administration has stood up to the position under arduous conditions which members on the other side of the Chamber were not able to cope with, and has stood up to those conditions even when they became accentuated. On the day the present Ministers took office they began to place men in reproductive work instead of putting them

on to clean footpaths, or to scrape mildew off old buildings. Instead of repainting and rehabilitating, men were put to work on sewerage and on reconditioning of railways. Ministers have done all those things on a well-ordered plan, and so I say, "Give credit where credit is due."

MR. THORN (Toodyay) [S.11]: With other members on this side of the Chamber, I desire to express pleasure at seeing the Premier restored to good health. Undoubtedly we missed the hon. gentleman greatly during the latter part of last session. I desire to inform him that during his absence his Government on various occasions went very much astray. At one period I found it necessary to read to Ministers a speech of the Premier, just by way of pulling them back on to the right track. The member for Gascoyne (Hon. F. J. S. Wise) tried to make out that the Premier's speeches were copyright, but Mr. Speaker ruled otherwise.

The Minister for Justice: You took too long about it.

The Premier: Was it a fairly good speech?

MR. THORN: It was a very good speech. In my opinion it was a speech displaying a correct attitude on the subject under discussion at that time. I wish also to congratulate the member for Avon (Mr. Boyle) on his very able speech, and to state that I was never in any doubt about him, because five years ago, when we contested the Toodyay seat, I found him a most worthy opponent. At that time I felt quite convinced that he would find his way into this Chamber. I desire, further, to offer congratulations to the newly-elected member for South Fremantle, Mr. Fox. I was connected with the Fremantle wharf for many years, and though I never had the pleasure of meeting the hon. member there, I heard many discussions concerning him. I believe that in industrial troubles at Fremantle the hon. member always proved himself a wise counsellor. We had an exhibition here to-night, in the speech of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Moloney), which showed that wise counsel is highly necessary on those benches. I also tender my congratulations to the newly appointed Minister for Agriculture. I will go no further than to say I am sure that in him we have a fully equipped agriculturist who will conduct his department with ability. As a member of the Country Party, I was

very pleased when our Leader, who is the Leader of the Opposition, was honoured by the Western Australian branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association with the appointment to represent us in London during the King's Jubilee celebrations. Mr. Latham is keenly interested in the welfare of the men on the land, and one of their greatest problems to-day is that of marketing. I know it is his intention to make all the inquiries possible regarding that position while in London, and I believe that his trip will prove of great value to Western Australia in considering that phase in the future. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition very ably represented him in this Chamber last night in continuing the Address-in-reply debate. Some members regard the Deputy-Leader's speech as brief, but I think he covered the ground very well indeed, and dealt with practically every subject concerning the welfare of the State. He certainly did not leave very much for other members of the Party to say.

The Minister for Lands: He solved the rabbit problem.

MR. THORN: The Minister for Lands laughs again the moment rabbits are mentioned. Last night the Deputy Leader of the Opposition seemed to tickle the Minister's fancy every time he mentioned the pest. The Minister surely realises that rabbits represent one of our most serious problems to-day. The task of eradicating the pest must be tackled with earnestness, otherwise the farmers will be eaten out of house and home. It is our duty to keep you people warned of the position.

The Premier: Whom do you call "you people"?

MR. THORN: I am addressing the public of Western Australia.

The Premier: Who are "you people"?

MR. THORN: I stand corrected; I refer to the people of the metropolitan area. We must continue to impress upon the city dweller the value of the primary production of the State. Everyone who receives wages or salary obtains it initially from primary production. In those circumstances, when we see rabbits proving a menace to the wealth of the State, it is necessary for us to impress upon all concerned that it is high time we tackled the problem in earnest. A former Premier, Sir James Mitchell, said on many occasions that money merely represented exchange, and that the real wealth of a country was what it produced.

The Premier: Was that the first time that statement was ever made?

Mr. THORN: I said the statement was made on several occasions, but the trouble is that the Premier does not yet seem to have taken it seriously.

The Premier: I do not take you seriously.

Mr. THORN: You will have to; I will see to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will address the Chair.

Mr. THORN: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition mentioned the need for orderly marketing, and that always seems to amuse the Government.

The Minister for Justice: No fear.

The Premier: What do you mean by "orderly marketing"?

Mr. THORN: We cannot overlook the fact that every country is busily engaged in organising. They are getting down to the organised marketing of primary products.

The Minister for Agriculture: A year or two ago you would have prescribed that as "socialism."

Mr. THORN: Owing to economic conditions overseas and severe competition from outside markets, we are forced to control our industries from the inception so as to assure that our goods are properly produced, correctly graded and packed, and sent overseas in a condition that will enable buyers to purchase with confidence.

The Premier: Just one moment! What do you mean by "organised marketing"? Give us your interpretation.

Mr. THORN: I will give my interpretation to the Premier.

The Premier: I bet you will not.

Mr. THORN: It is the organised control of the goods that we are producing.

The Premier: That is not it at all.

Mr. THORN: Until we do that, we cannot make the progress that we desire.

The Premier: But what do you mean by "organised"?

Mr. THORN: I will explain that to the Premier.

The Premier: Come on then!

Mr. THORN: As a matter of fact, I have explained it and the Premier should know what it means.

The Premier: I know what you mean, but tell us what you mean by "organised."

Mr. THORN: Nevertheless, here we have markets adjacent to Western Australia. I was surprised the other day when examining the record of Calcutta imports, to note the number of primary products that could

have been supplied by Western Australia. Those goods were imported from America, the Argentine and many other countries. To-day Japan is competing all over the world, and has a large share of the trade in Western Australia. That is simply because she has her own shipping facilities and, by being able to maintain continuity of shipments, is able to conquer market after market. This is too big a problem for the State Government; it is a proposition for the Commonwealth Government to handle. We have markets at our back doors, but we cannot supply the goods required, because we have not the necessary shipping facilities.

The Minister for Justice: Who controls the ships? Who sold the Commonwealth ships?

The Premier: At any rate, perhaps you will tell us what you mean by "organised marketing."

Mr. THORN: I cannot dwell upon organised marketing all night; we must adjourn some time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must address the Chair.

Mr. THORN: I have explained the matter to the Premier, and I cannot keep on repeating myself. Recently the Primary Producers' Association sent representatives to the East Indies, visits being paid to Penang, Singapore and other ports, with a view to investigating the possibility of opening up markets for Western Australian products. The instructions given were to go into the matter fully and for containers that were used by the different countries to be brought back for inspection. It is useless expecting to capture new markets unless we are prepared to put goods up under conditions desired by the people concerned.

The Minister for Lands: That is not organised marketing.

Mr. THORN: We have made a start in that direction, and are now packing vegetables and fruit in containers as desired by the consumers overseas. We are receiving repeat orders, and the business is progressing, but the difficulty is that the shipping service is inadequate to enable us to maintain continuous supplies. There is another feature that is also serious. I refer to the active policy sponsored by the Minister for Agriculture in Great Britain. He has set out to make Britain as self-contained as possible, and he is assisting the producers

in the Old Country to a very large extent. That represents one more reason why we should adopt proper marketing methods in Western Australia—in other words organised marketing.

The Premier: Why do you not tell us something and say what you mean by "organised marketing"?

Mr. THORN: I will give the House an illustration to indicate what the future holds for us. Take the position regarding poultry and egg production. Although the Old Country has imported most of their utility birds from Australia, English experts there have been successful in producing a hen that now lays 365 eggs per year.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Was organised marketing responsible for that?

Mr. THORN: What hope have we of coping with that situation when a fowl on the farm lays 14 eggs and then goes broody?

Mr. Stubbs: That is not organisation!

Mr. THORN: To deal now with the problem of mixed farming: We have been told by authority after authority that there is no hope for the man who tries to live on the growing of wheat alone. In consequence of that, the advice has been tendered to go in for mixed farming.

Mr. Wansbrough: The Good Book says that "man cannot live by bread alone."

Mr. THORN: That is so; I know. The difficulty to-day is that many of the men on the land cannot go in for mixed farming until adequate water supplies are provided throughout the country areas. I had hoped that the present Government, in view of the money that has been at their disposal for expenditure on new works, would have provided some efficient water supplies in country areas. The position becomes impossible when we know that farmers right up to a month ago have had to cart water. There have been instances of farmers carting water with horse teams, and when the teams arrived home, they drank half the water they had brought in on the wagon.

Mr. Withers: It was their water.

Mr. Wansbrough: And they were on the water-wagon.

Mr. THORN: The member for Subiaco (Mr. Moloney) spoke eloquently this evening and used many long words that would be jolly hard to find in the dictionary. He told us what the Government have been doing—for Subiaco! When references are made to unemployment, we hear talk about the equality of sacrifice. I am prepared to

say there has been no equality of sacrifice throughout the period of the depression. There are more new motor cars to be seen on the road in the city than ever before. They purport to be real signs of prosperity, and yet there are people in the back areas who would come to town if they had money to enable them to do so. Not having the funds, they are forced to remain on their holdings and endeavour to carry on.

Mr. Hegney: How would you propose to bring about a redistribution of wealth?

Mr. THORN: Now I should like to refer to a matter already alluded to this session, namely the attitude of the Government towards the miners' strike on the goldfields. In that the Government absolutely flouted the Arbitration Court, an institution which they themselves built up. Because of that powerful union on the goldfields, the Government went up there and assisted the strikers to break the award and forcibly take what they had asked for. I know that you, Mr. Speaker, are a thorough believer in the Arbitration Court, and I notice that you have been doing really good work there lately. An important factor necessary to the reducing of the cost of production is the extension of our electric power system. Throughout the suburban areas our producers are badly in need of electric current.

The Premier: Does that include the Swan district?

Mr. THORN: In this regard I should like to thank the Minister for Railways for the extension he has made in my district lately. It will be invaluable to all those settlers.

The Premier: But that is spending loan moneys in the metropolitan area.

Mr. THORN: That money was spent in a producing area, and I thank the Minister for it. It is a very urgent matter and I hope the Government, now that they are installing new plant at the power station, will find themselves in a position to make further necessary extensions.

The Premier: But your Leader says we are spending too much in that regard.

Mr. THORN: We find ourselves short of power, a disability that has brought about the necessity for the installation of the new plant. Yet a feature that seems to me altogether unfair is that the City Council can go on making their extensions, and now we find that the Fremantle Municipal

Council are making an extension right through to Rockingham. It is unfortunate that those two councils can provide those facilities for the people in their respective areas, yet the Government have been unable to do the same. I know what the reasons have been, and I am hopeful that, now that the new plant is to be installed, those extensions will be carried out.

Mr. Lambert: Will you support a movement to review the agreement with the City Council?

Mr. THORN: I will discuss that with you later. Several speakers have referred to certain members of Parliament who have gone to the Agricultural Bank to make representations on behalf of their electors. I am genuinely sorry the new Bank Commission have seen fit to announce that members of Parliament will not be interviewed. The only business I ever had with the Agricultural Bank was as a liaison officer. If ever I went to the Bank I went there to help the Bank just as much as my client. People in the country cannot get prompt answers to their correspondence with the Bank, they have not the money to come to town in order to get a personal interview, and all that we may have done for them has been done with a view to saving them that expense. I maintain that we were carrying out a good work, and I cannot see how the Premier can say that political influence was used.

The Premier: Oh!

Mr. THORN: How could I, as a private member of Parliament, go and use political influence at the Bank? I have not the necessary power, and if I dared to attempt it I would soon get a rap over the knuckles from the Minister controlling the Bank. He would not permit members of Parliament to go there and use political influence by dictating to the officials.

The Minister for Lands: I will bring you a file to show that it has been done.

The Premier: Many files, dozens of files.

Mr. THORN: We will be pleased to see them, but I am sure you will not be able to prove by them the exercise of political influence. Anything I ever did in going to the Agricultural Bank was of a helpful nature to both parties concerned. What do we find to-day? We find that the chairman of the Bank Commission, an ex-member of this House, goes to the Bank and builds a stone wall around himself. He does not want to

see anybody, but only to make his job as easy as he can. What has he done up to date? Nothing at all, he has no policy. And we find that the very fine officers who have conducted the work of the Bank in the past are being displaced by new officers who, I am sure, can do no better work.

The Premier: You yourself cannot bear comparison with the man there to-day.

Mr. THORN: I will back myself against any of them. I have every confidence in myself.

The Premier: Yes, the confidence of a nonentity.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr. THORN: I am still hopeful that the chairman of the Commission will alter his policy. If he does not, it will be altered for him at a later date; there is no doubt about that.

Member: That is contemptible.

The Premier: That is worthy of you; you are looking for votes.

Mr. THORN: I know that when we on this side of the House speak out, it is regarded as contemptible. We have sat here and been flogged by the Government side of the House; plenty of contemptible remarks have come from that side of the House already this session. I have said nothing that is contemptible; I have only given facts to the House.

The Premier: And you are complaining because your political influence can no longer be exercised on the Bank. It is most contemptible.

Mr. THORN: As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said last night, the Government saw fit to take a plebiscite of the miners in order to get their opinion as to whether they would work 40-48 hours alternate weeks, or whether they would work only a 44-hour week. The Premier said that ballot cost the State £389. Yet when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked that a plebiscite of the woolgrowers be taken, the reply was that it could not be done. As to what the Minister for Agriculture said, he is quite entitled to that opinion, but it generally takes 66.1-3 per cent. of the woolgrowers to carry such a plebiscite.

The Minister for Agriculture: Why not take it?

Mr. THORN: Why do not you treat all alike; why make fish of one and flesh of another?

The Minister for Agriculture: What will you do if you do take it? What you want is for the Government to hallmark it.

Mr. THORN: No, we merely want an expression of opinion. I should like to refer to our export apple cases, because I have just had an interview with a man recently returned from London, who told me to beg of the Government not to change the colour of our export apple cases, not to take on the white softwood case. He said the West Australian fruit that arrived in London was for the most part in excellent order, and that it was known by its redwood case. He urged that we should not allow the Eastern States apple growers to persuade us to change the colour of our case, because that case had come into serious competition with the Eastern States exporters on the London market, and they would very much like to get rid of it, probably for their own benefit. Now I have only one more matter to deal with. It is the attitude of the Minister administering sewerage and drainage, when he met the deputation from the Perth City Council. All that the deputation asked for was the approximate cost of the new installation of the sewerage system. They were well entitled to ask for that, because they were representing the ratepayers and they had every right to get an estimate of what the ratepayers are to be saddled with.

Mr. Lambert: And we have as much right to ask them what rates they propose to strike next year.

Mr. THORN: Probably they would give the information. They only wanted to learn the cost so that they might know what the ratepayers would have to pay. I am still hopeful that those figures will be supplied to them. In my opinion the present Government looked very well indeed when they were sitting on this side of the House, and I hope and expect to see them here again in the near future. I have no more to say except to urge the Government to take notice of some of the matters we have placed before them and give them their earnest consideration.

MR. NORTH (Claremont) [8.43]: In common with other speakers, I desire to congratulate the new Minister for Agriculture on his appointment, and also the two new members on their election. Although the Press have seen fit to say that the Address-in-reply debate should be cut short—pos-

sibly very sound advice—yet it provides a splendid opportunity for private members to express their views. The chief advantage of the debate is that it brings out a variety of outlook early in the session for the information of the Government. I make no apology for the fact that there are many subjects which I view differently from many other members of the House. So long as I am a member of the Nationalist Party I am entitled to that, because this party has hitherto been open to all shades of opinion, the only qualification being one's responsibility to his electors. That is valuable in the House because, although it is necessary that we should have strong parties, there are times when perhaps the right to diverge from the beaten path and follow new lines of thought is essential, and I for one would welcome it if all parties encouraged divergence of views and the introduction of new lines of thought. There is not doubt that the longer we live through the present depression, the more we realise that the world is not getting out of its troubles. It is a sort of paradox that the better we are doing, the more glowing the story told in the Lieut.-Governor's Speech about the reduced deficit and the reduction of unemployment, the nearer we are to bankruptcy. That, of course, is not according to the Government's point of view, but according to those people who give us advice.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: Who are they?

Mr. NORTH: I will quote one. Sir Herbert Gepp recently spoke to some of the farmers in an important town in New South Wales. He said—

Indefinite continuance of the steps by which Australia is at present maintaining a semi-equilibrium will mean in the end a collapse of our social and financial system.

Mr. Patrick: What did he mean by that?

Mr. NORTH: He went on to say—

Farmers and industrial workers face each other across a great chasm. Each can produce far more than enough to supply the present normal needs. Increased purchasing power for the masses seems the only way out.

That has been said for years. We know that the Labour Party have said that increased purchasing power for the masses is necessary. The leader of my party, the member for Nedlands, also expressed the same idea in an important speech delivered to the party conference, namely that increased purchasing power was the way out.

The question is, how? The masses have become disgusted that no acceptable solution has been found. When the Government tell us, as they do with truth, that they have reduced the deficit and reduced the number of unemployed, by which means they are to an extent increasing the purchasing power of the people, they come under the tirade of Mr. Gepp, the economists and others of that kind, who say that the course we are pursuing is leading to national bankruptcy. To use the words employed by Mr. Gepp, the course we are pursuing is leading to a collapse of our social and financial system. The public are getting sick of hearing that. It has been told them so long. It seems to me that the time has now arrived when the Premier and those associated with him might take up this point at the Loan Council. To those who follow statistics relating to the deficit and to loan expenditure, it is self-evident that the end is in sight. When my leader suggests, as he has done, an Empire works programme as a via media to carry on pending a solution of the problem by experts, the idea should either be exposed as a hopeless fallacy or some other method should be proposed. Sir Herbert Gepp was chairman of the Wheat Commission and has held various highly-paid positions under the Federal Government, and when he tells us that social and financial collapse is imminent and that we must increase the purchasing power of the masses, we are entitled to ask him how that should be done. If he refers us to the Commonwealth Bank Board or to some other officials, we are entitled to ask for an answer in that quarter. From the fights that confront me in my election it appears that I have launched a fairly good attack. Already, some months before the election is due, an opponent has booked up the station boardings for posters. The rumours and stories being circulated about me on this occasion are snappier than ever they have been. Let me repeat one. I happen to have a high fence enclosing my property because it is near the sea and the winds blow strongly. I am told that I practice the nude cult, and that the high fence is to prevent people from looking in. Hence it is quite possible to be making a strong attack in a particular arena without being successful in trimming up the Government in Parliament. In view of Sir Herbert Gepp's statement, I say the time

has come when any responsible Government in Australia should demand of the authorities who control our financial system, consideration of his remarks. I have a series of recommendations passed by the London Chamber of Commerce in May. The London Chamber of Commerce is an influential body that cannot be overlooked. I believe that some 6,000 or 7,000 firms are associated with it.

The Minister for Lands: Why not leave that to your leader?

Mr. NORTH: My leader not only has a solution; he trims up the Government as well. On this occasion, however, the sting is in the tail. The London Chamber of Commerce is a body that cannot be ignored. I did not see these particular recommendations published in the Press. I may have missed them; certainly they should have been published. The London Chamber of Commerce put these alternatives before civilised western nations as a means of getting out of the present troubles—

(1) A complete new system of international finance.

Of that there is little hope, so that may be dismissed.

(2) To sustain life on rice or a similar cheap diet and destroy wealth.

According to some people the way to make progress these days is to destroy things.

Hon. P. D. Ferguson: How will the wheatgrowers get on if people take to living on rice?

Mr. NORTH: No 3 recommendation is the same as that made by Sir Herbert Gepp—

(3) The only third way is to enable the people to consume the surplus goods by increasing purchasing power.

That brings us back to the same point. The method of the present Government, and of the previous Government, has been to incur loans, to get all the loan money we could. That, of course, has the effect of building up the interest bill. I was looking through the Commonwealth returns the other day and was struck by the substantial reduction in the interest bill, due to overseas conversions and to the compulsory reduction of interest rates in Australia. The figures showed that the interest bill had dropped in a few years from £58,000,000 to £50,000,000. The only disturbing factor was that, while we reduced the interest from £58,000,000 a year to roughly £1,000,000 a week, the taxation of the people of Australia, including

of course, this State, rose from about £80,000,000 to £92,000,000. Notwithstanding the efforts of the Commonwealth Government to reduce the interest charges, under the present system, taxation must inevitably increase.

The Premier: Those recommendations are not very clear. In a way they are very general.

Mr. NORTH: That is the trouble; they are too general.

The Premier: Will you just tell us what has got to be done?

Mr. NORTH: I could tell the Premier what ought to be done by the Government but it would not be my province. If the Premier had been sitting in Opposition for nine years, he would find it very hard to make recommendations.

The Premier: Go on.

Mr. NORTH: I recommend that the Premier should refuse to carry on at the Loan Council without at least supporting the lead given by the Premier of Tasmania, Mr. Ogilvie, K.C., in a speech recently delivered in London. I have not seen a report of that speech in the local Press, but it was reported in the "Age," the "Argus" and the "Sydney Morning Herald." The effect was that Mr. Ogilvie had given up any idea of nationalised banking as being hopeless, and that there was no benefit to be obtained in future from Arbitration Courts and such devices, but that the only thing for the people of Australia, of whom he could speak for one half, was monetary reform, and that was what he had to go for.

The Premier: Well now, what does monetary reform mean? Tell us that.

Mr. NORTH: It means getting away from running the currency on gold, and running it on the productivity of the country.

The Premier: Be more specific! Tell us in plain words!

Mr. NORTH: I have never desired to adopt the role of lecturer in this House. I have endeavoured to express the opinions of those qualified to speak on such subjects. While I am prepared to offer a few remarks, I do not wish to become a sort of second-rate schoolmaster.

The Premier: Tell us the meaning of monetary reform.

Mr. NORTH: A lead has been given by one of the Premiers, Mr. Ogilvie, K.C., who has definitely dropped the policy of nationalisation of banking.

Mr. Moloney: Why is he doing that?

Mr. NORTH: I urge members to read the report of his speech. He pointed out definitely that that was barking up the wrong tree. What was required was not the mere public ownership of financial institutions, but a complete reform in their policy.

Miss Holman: Nationalisation of credit?

Mr. NORTH: It would mean using public credit for public purposes, and would prevent any manipulation of that credit for private gain. Exactly the same fight is being waged in the United States of America. We have all read of the famous radio priest who is preaching the same doctrine. He is opposed to socialism: he says that credit must be centralised and operated for the community, not for private interests.

The Premier: But you are talking on broad general lines. Just tell us in a specific way what you would do. Tell us something about it. Do not keep on the broad general lines.

Mr. NORTH: It would be a good plan if the Premier brought this matter before the Loan Council.

The Premier: What matter?

Mr. NORTH: The question of arranging Australia's money supplies on a reformed system, not upon the old system based on gold or sterling.

The Premier: On what particular line?

Mr. NORTH: Arrange loan estimates and all matters affecting the Loan Council, not on gold reserve or sterling reserve, but firstly on the productivity of Australia and secondly on the demands on that productivity. That would be a big start. The Premier would have at his side a gentleman who could speak more fully on the subject than I would dare to do in this House. If that were done, it might have beneficial repercussions elsewhere.

The Premier: Surely you know that would set our stocks further back than they were when the Lang propositions were put up.

Mr. NORTH: We have reached the stage when the public have to face the truth. I have heard it said on the other side of the House that the stock ramp last time was organised on the market in London. Whether that was so or not, I have information that things are happening in the world that may or may not be known to individual members of this House. Alberta.

a sister province of the British Empire, is engaged on this subject. It has employed to put the Province in order the very gentleman the Premier invited to lunch in this building about a year ago. Major Douglas has been engaged on a two-year contract to put the affairs of the Province in proper order. His first condition was that a wireless station should be set up, and the Press organised to prevent hostile attacks upon him.

Mr. Lambert: All showmen are like that.

Mr. NORTH: All the western provinces of Canada are fighting for monetary reform. What they need is the use of the national credit rather than the borrowing of money with which to carry on.

Mr. Lambert: It is the cowardice of people who will not state definitely that they must have national banking if they wish to get anywhere.

Mr. NORTH: I am sorry if the hon. member likes to take what I may call a fellow-Premier to task.

Mr. Lambert: I do not subscribe to Mr. Ogilvie's ideas.

Mr. NORTH: The matter cannot rest where it is. We have a definite warning from the chairman of the Wheat Board that we are faced with both social and financial collapse. Is any greater warning than that required?

The Premier: Do you believe in the nationalisation of banking?

Mr. NORTH: I do not think nationalisation has any bearing on the subject either way. I have no more fear from nationalised banking than from nationalised railways. Already we have our nationalised railways. I see very little difference between nationalised railways and the Midland railway. There may be certain individual concessions which settlers cannot get but which they would get from a nationalised railway. The whole thing about nationalised railways is that they are merely security for the first preference bonds to outside capital. No matter how hard the State may work, or how well it may do, it is always paying 4 per cent. overseas. If these railways had been privately owned but constructed and even administered by national credit, we would have had the reverse of that position. We would have had the efficiency of private enterprise. A position somewhat similar occurred in the case of the Com-

monwealth Great Western railway, which was built out of between 80 and 90 per cent. of national credit.

Mr. Lambert: You had better not go too deeply into that.

Mr. NORTH: The interjection does not affect the issue in the slightest. There is a definite contrast between the railway that was built in Australia out of money that was not borrowed, and our State railways on which we have borrowed £25,000,000 or more.

Mr. Lambert: You know how it was built.

Mr. NORTH: I do not pretend to be a wiseacre on these questions, but I have sufficient knowledge to know that what I say is correct. The railway was built out of national credit. Lord Forrest was, I think, the last statesman in the Federal sphere who had the audacity to stand up for national credit in the financing of public works. At home I hold a document of his that is very valuable to me. If I can carry on a few of the ideas he had in mind before he died, I shall be pleased to do so. As soon as he left the Treasury bench of the Federal Government, the whole question of building public works on national credit died out. We have been up to our ears in debt ever since.

Mr. Lambert: The only loan he ever floated was floated 40 years ago for the building of the goldfields water supply.

Mr. NORTH: He was a younger man in those days. Towards the end he realised the value of what was then called the note issue as a means of financing Australia's public works. I hope that time may come again. I am not attacking any private banking institution, but I say that the salvation of the banks and those that operate them depends upon the use of national credit for national purposes, leaving private credit to handle its own private operations.

Mr. Lambert: It is only right to remind you that in Lord Forrest's day the private banks had their own note issue.

Mr. NORTH: Precisely. I wish to make some important points which have already been dealt with in other parts of the world. We have been definitely warned that we are facing social and financial chaos if we go on as we are doing. Our only chance is to bring before the Loan Council, which is running the show as the only financial

operator in Australia, the fact that there are new methods. If they say the ideas are foolish and fallacious, let us have a Royal Commission, such as has been promised, but has not yet been appointed. The Premier could help us there. Of course I know the difference between being in office and being in Opposition. Although I have never been more than a whip for the Government in office—

Mr. Lambert: A very efficient one.

Mr. NORTH: —I know that the point of view is quite different. I can understand the Federal Ministry to-day going very quietly upon these subjects whilst reviewing large loans in London. Every country is facing what we are facing. I have not read out the resolutions of the London Chamber of Commerce for nothing. It is an important public body and is not composed of Labourites. In their view the people have either to take to eating rice and to destroying more of the goods that are produced, or the Government must increase the purchasing power of the masses. It is said that if the banks are nationalised, that may do the trick. But that is not the issue. Are our national institutions that are administered nationally more effectively operated than if they were privately operated? No one will say that our State railways are better operated than are private railways. I do not say they are worse operated, for that is immaterial at the moment. Any one who studies the report in the British Encyclopaedia on the subject will see that the opinion of railway experts is that they are not interested in the question whether railways are nationally or privately owned. British railway opinion is now coming to the belief that railways have been hamstrung by their debts, and that they cannot modernise their lines or their engines because of these debts. That is the problem before the world. I make no apology for having moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission. I trust it will yet be appointed. As a means of hurrying up the Prime Minister, Tasmania is now engaged upon a very important monetary inquiry, at which all kinds of bank managers and others have been called to give evidence. The report will be issued in September and may prove useful to us. It is idle for members to fight about the question of country versus town whilst this subject remains unsolved. If Sir Herbert Gepp, who knows the factory side as well as the farming side,

says that both sections of Australia are so efficient that they can flood each other with all they want, and that all that is lacking is purchasing power, what is the use of all this talk to-night about searching for foreign markets?

Mr. Patrick: We cannot eat all our own wheat.

Mr. NORTH: I do not want to be thought to be preaching if I touch upon that subject too. I have studied the views of those who have given a great deal of time to it. As a member of Parliament I am only here to represent views and ideas. The time is coming when all this talk about searching for markets will be as dead as the Dodo. The talk about living on the farmer is fast becoming an anachronism. The only way to the truth is to imagine this country alone in the world, with every other country sunk beneath the sea. We will then find out what nonsense it is to talk of living on the farmer, any more than the farmer lives on anyone else. We only require about a thousand farmers to feed the people of this State, and we have something like 10,000 farmers. The other 9,000 are only here to produce goods that are sent away to meet the interest abroad, and imports.

Mr. Withers: And to have representation in Parliament.

Mr. NORTH: I am with the farmers. Many of them know what is wanted in this country. They have no thought of attacking private banking institutions, but believe in reforming our policy in such a way that everything that is produced can be sold, and if it cannot be sold through being not really wanted it should not be produced.

Mr. Lambert: Unless you buy, you cannot sell.

Mr. NORTH: If the hon. member had read all the books available on economics, he would find them all contradicting each other. The old slogans certainly lasted for some time, but the longer we stick to them, the deeper we get into the mire. I protest against the passing of pious resolutions that we should start work here and there without having any end in view. That is a point which my leader has made many times. He does not object to sewerage as sewerage. It happens in this State that for many years we could, as Sir James Mitchell would like to have done, absorb everyone in industry, working six days a week, and having at least ten years work ahead of him. There is so much in this

State to do. Professor Hitton, who has been travelling throughout Europe for the Bank of New South Wales, has advised Australia that the only way to circulate goods is by conscription. This shows the mental collapse we are coming to by attempting to stand by the old system. Surely we can move with the times. I have never made any pounds-shillings-and pence suggestions. With many others I think that members of Parliament have only the right to make policy suggestions, and not the right to put forward expert suggestions. They may have ideas of their own. During the many years I have been in this House, I have learnt from members a tremendous lot concerning many subjects when members spoke on what they knew all about. Nevertheless it seems to me that the best work of members as a Parliament is in initiating policy, leaving the policy to be carried out by those qualified. As Mr. Curtin once said, in another sphere, it is for politicians to say where a bridge should be built, but not to fix the number of rivets and girders and the number of tons of steel needed to complete the structure. The obvious fact to-day is that the 10,000 or 14,000 men who are the subject of controversy, particularly towards election time, although they can hardly win an election in themselves, are after all not to be shuttle-cocks for us to play with. They are not victims of any machine. As I have said on many occasions and on many platforms, those 14,000 men represent the triumphs of the engineer and we make them victims of an obsolete economic system. Poor fools who are willing to be the goats and talk on these new subjects, thus risking political suicide, do not receive much encouragement; but they do perhaps receive more than members of this Chamber may think. In my district there is now a band of insurance managers and other businessmen of much capacity who have got right down to this subject. There are, all over this State, farmers who are right down on this subject. Therefore I would warn my friends of the Country Party, while I sympathise with all their talk about waste of money on the Stirling Highway, waste of money on sewerage—

Mr. Moloney: I hope Country Party members are listening.

Mr. NORTH: I know exactly their viewpoint. They think of the struggling cocky living on boiled wheat, and so on. I know

their point of view, and I know the city point of view as well. It may interest some farming representatives to know that there are many farmers employed on sewerage work at Claremont and Cottesloe to-day. Those farmers are bitter men. They are bitter at heart. They are sick of this civilisation. They have put in 10 or 15 years of work on their blocks and have been hounded off them: and so they have come to Claremont and Cottesloe, having lost all they possessed. They are taking sewerage work now, and are having the laugh, saying "The other fellow is producing the bread now." It is not the people who made the Stirling Highway who are the enemies of those men, nor is it those persons in Europe who will not or cannot pay the prices for the products of those men. Nor is it the French farmers, who are charging 7s. 6d. for their product. Those men know that their enemy is an economic system which has failed in a machine age. They do not stand just waiting on what will happen. They demand that a change shall be made by investigation; and if no report as the result of investigation should prove of use, they say "Go on with public works as hard as you can, full time, until the solution is come by. If there is no solution, let us go to Russia for an example and come right out with State socialism." That is my stand personally. And many people in my district are with me. My leader has said something of the same kind in my district.

The Premier: I do not think he has said that.

Mr. NORTH: He has said that the present system has failed, and that even if we have to go to Russia for a policy we are not going to stand this drift to bankruptcy. If there is anything in what I have said, should not this Chamber give a backing to the Premier and the Cabinet? I know about capital being shy, but capital is being hunted in every country. This evening's paper tells of French riots. There is peace in the United States of America, is there not? To-night we read that Mr. Roosevelt, who is the good mild man, much milder than Huey Long, far milder than Father Coughlin, "the Radio Priest," now talks of "sharing the wealth." The moderate Mr. Roosevelt proposes to tax wealth 75 per cent. in some instances.

The Minister for Lands: But he is raising tremendous loans, on which he proposes to pay interest; and that means taxation.

Mr. NORTH: The Minister knows very well, from his long political experience, that President Roosevelt is a supreme politician. I will tell the Minister that President Roosevelt has been approached with the suggestions I am making to-night, which have been made in Canada, and which are being made in Great Britain and all over the world, and has said "I know that what we want is reform of the monetary system and social credit. I know that, but I go whither I am pushed." As long as President Roosevelt is asked to provide loans, he will provide them; but of course they will never be paid back. I made that statement here two years ago. There is the choice. I repeat again that if it is impossible for the present Government or any other State Government to influence the Federal Government, by means of a suitable Royal Commission, to make these changes, I for one, and many others, will be content to stand for full State socialism. Unless we can reform our present system so as to enable private enterprise to operate efficiently, as it did in earlier days but cannot do in this age of power machinery, I and many others will be content to go the whole hog for State socialism, because that would be far better than the present chaos and bankruptcy. State socialism would mean purely an extension of the various institutions we have now. It would mean more regulation. It would be highly irksome, I admit; and my side of this Chamber has always opposed it. But we do not have to take that hurdle to get over. I and many others are convinced that there is a perfectly practical reform of the money system available; but we do not pose as experts and say what that reform should be in pounds, shillings, and pence. We simply urge that the Commonwealth Bank should be invited, by the Premiers assembled and the Loan Council, to initiate for this country a policy which would abolish poverty. That is all.

The Premier: Who is the "we" urging that? Do you mean the Nationalist Party?

Mr. NORTH: When I was speaking a moment ago, I was referring to those persons who in my district and other districts—many of the persons, of course, being Nationalists as well,—are urging this

credit reform and the maintenance of the private banking system.

The Premier: But you are not speaking for the Nationalist Party?

Mr. NORTH: Of course I speak here as a private member. I rejoice in that fact. My opinion is that were it not for private members in these times of depression, we would be under some Herr Hitler; because the private member is the only anchor left between dictatorship and some form of chaos. At the present time Ministers are all being driven against their wills. I know how the previous Government were compelled to do things against their will. The only safety we have in our Parliamentary institutions lies in the fact that we have private members who can voice views, and say things, that are unpalatable to Governments. Otherwise Governments themselves would become victims of the world chaos. There is a French revolution reported to-night. There is a war scare ahead of us. Every economist has put his finger on the failure to increase purchasing power. But the failure is not remedied. Labour Governments get in here and Country Party Governments somewhere else. So one gets the pull-devil, pull-baker system, and no benefit results. As I have said, if our debts keep rising as they are doing, no matter how many public works we undertake we shall reach the position of complete stagnation. Therefore I feel that the place to which the emphasis must now be pointed is the Loan Council, and nowhere else. I feel it is incumbent upon not only our Premier but all the other Premiers as well to realise that. It is no use now to depend on pious resolutions.

Mr. F. C. L. Smith: It is purely for the Federal Government to deal with that.

Mr. NORTH: I do not think so, because the Federal Government themselves are amenable to pressure at the Loan Council. In a crisis like this, we cannot depend upon technicalities. Every member has the right to urge in the direction I have urged. It is not for us to say how the thing shall be done; but it is for us to bring before our respective Governments what these men who have the control of the position are saying, that it is the purchasing power of the mass that is failing. We all know that it is true; and when it is realised, there will be no less

criticism of new sewerage works or even of beautification work. For it must be remembered by all the honourable farmers in this Chamber that their export produce is going into a world where it is unwelcome. Mr. Eliot himself, in Great Britain, has said so. He wants us to consume more of our own farm produce, and wants England to grow more herself. And every other country is in a similar position. It is the inevitable trend of economic forces which we cannot control. We can, however, control our own monetary system; and the words I have uttered to-night, and the speeches I have made during the last four years on this side of the Chamber, represent steps taken to protect the very gentlemen who probably think I am their enemy; and that is the private bankers. In view of the destruction and dissatisfaction and losses everywhere, and the fear of war in every country, due to the failure of markets—I realise that the day is coming shortly when, if it cannot be shown that the monetary system is wrong, those who now operate that system will be classified as inhuman fiends. I do not stand for this. I think these men are good men, and efficient men; but no man in the world can operate a system which is mathematically unsound. I have urged over and over again the appointment of a Royal Commission to thrash out the subject. In other places there have been Royal Commissions already on the subject, but they have been devoted to side issues: main issues have been side tracked; been stalled. The real issue has never been decided. That is the whole difficulty to-day. The masses are suffering. Governments are suffering. Every Administration to-day is being put on a cross, as it were. If I did not happen to have the information which I have given to-night, and much more information, I, too, would get up and raise a lot of points in regard to sewerage problems and other matters which have been mentioned. For instance, as regards sewerage I can say I know well that sewerage work is not an economic proposition in the sense of finding the money, but that it is a very good proposition from the point of view of the Government in the sense of providing purchasing power. However, the fact that the Government are able to send the bill in to the ratepayers does not really pay for the thing, but is going to make it extremely difficult

for money to be found during the next few months all over the metropolitan area. A million or more will have to be found out of the pockets of the local ratepayers and citizens of the metropolitan area, and I think that for every one vote members may get because of the sewerage works, they will lose another vote because of the big bills that will have to be met by the people. On the other hand, the big country works that the farmers wish to have continued—I can understand their point of view; they want to continue producing at the best prices they can obtain, but I cannot see how that can be achieved unless there be a modification of the financial system—would mean that the money would be obtained under circumstances that would postpone the evil day. In the latter instance, it would be a matter of credits, whereas sewerage and water supply works mean that the money must come out of the pockets of the people almost immediately. From the Government standpoint, it may be quite all right, and those who desire to be critical may suggest that it is merely a means of “finding the cash on the nod,” but it is certainly not a good proposition from the individual’s point of view. I do not shelter myself behind the view that I do not approve of the sewerage work. I am glad that the work is to be undertaken, but I would like some modification of the system so that the money may be found more easily than is possible under existing circumstances. I have said enough to show, from the point of view of those who advocate reform, that it is time attention was given to this subject in all seriousness. I have a letter from one of the primary producers in my electorate, and it refers to milk. The letter is of interest to members because we shall probably be considering a Bill to provide for the continuance of the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act. Mr. W. Neil, writing to me under date the 6th August, gives facts in connection with his endeavours over the past five years to establish a dairy on his property in Claremont. From 1930 up to the time the Metropolitan Whole Milk Act was passed and the Whole Milk Board was established, this gentleman made continued applications to the Nedlands Road Board, formerly the Claremont Road Board, for a license to enable him to carry on a dairy on his property. Since the formation of the Whole Milk Board he has had interviews with the

chairman, Mr. Wilson. When he interviewed that gentleman two years ago, Mr. Wilson advised him to see him later as he could not do anything then, and 12 months ago Mr. Wilson again advised him that he could not grant Mr. Neil a license and suggested he should see him in another 12 months' time. The Nedlands Board refused to give him a license unless he got the sanction of the Whole Milk Board. The matter went backwards and forwards between the road board and the milk board with a reference occasionally to the Town Planning Commissioner to say whether the area concerned should be marked as "industrial." And so Mr. Neil has not been able to reach any finality. Mr. Neil has been a resident of the State for over 41 years and has been a ratepayer and taxpayer during the whole of that period. He desires to earn his livelihood and he has placed the facts before me. His contention and mine is that there are many families in the metropolitan area that cannot get any milk. There are many people who do not take half a pint amongst seven and eight in the family. I know that, as a result of my inquiries among the dairymen themselves. I know that in many instances families have to procure other requirements, and therefore their milk supplies have to go short. Mr. Neil wishes to supply milk, but it may be that, from the point of view of the milk board, they consider themselves justified in refusing the license on the ground that there is no demand for the additional supply of milk. I presume they would say that there is difficulty in selling the milk that is available now so that, in effect, there is no effective demand for any additional milk supplies. On the other hand, there is a tremendous demand for a large quantity of additional milk in the suburban areas. In bringing this matter before the House, I emphasise that it is merely one additional illustration of the point I am making, that there requires to be a drastic alteration in the system under which we are operating. I think the time is coming when we may expect the Government to take a definite step forward in that direction in their supreme counsels. It may be unpalatable.

Mr. Hegney: If the man whose letter you have dealt with, were to secure his license, would the people have a better opportunity to secure milk supplies?

Mr. NORTH: My object has been achieved in bringing the matter before

Parliament. If it is suggested that people of the metropolitan area cannot consume more milk because it cannot be produced, that is "all my eye and Betty Martin." There are dozens of producers in the city area who may have difficulty in getting rid of their milk supplies, but that is because of the destitution of the masses. When the Premier goes across to the meeting of the Loan Council, he secures reports from his officers. He has reports from the Child Welfare Department and also the Unemployment Relief Depot at Marquis Street. I happen to know that reports from those two quarters are not much chopped about. Presumably, estimates submitted to the Treasurer may be cut down from time to time, but I do not think the Premier, or any other Premier, would cut down the estimates submitted by the Child Welfare Depot and the Unemployment Relief Depot. However, we seem to have reached a stalemate. I know from my investigations among the dairymen that the requirements of the people are not being met under existing conditions. If estimates were submitted by the Premier in order to enable him to cope with the real demand of the people, in consequence of the shortage that we know many have to experience, then a much larger demand would be made upon the Loan Council and we know that at least one Premier intends to ask for more than he has had in the past. If every other Premier adopted the same course, substantial estimates would be placed before the Loan Council and the people of Australia would then have an appreciation of the difference between the real demand of Australia and the effective, or money, demand of the people. We should do what Sir Herbert Gepp and others are saying, namely, to recognise that the difficulty arises from the failure of the masses to consume, and in a consideration of the problem from that standpoint, we must start from the lowest rung. What does it matter to me if I am told that there are motor cars running about St. George's-terrace? What I look at are the hospital rate and the reports regarding malnutrition, which are not denied. We have had a Labour Government in office for years. We know where their hearts are, and we know where are the hearts of other political parties. Despite that, we are forced to realise that there is malnutrition evident in our midst. Departmental officials will

admit it, although they are guarded because they do not desire to offend. The fact remains that there must be a failure of the system somewhere. I suggest that the real failure at the moment is that the Premier does not distinguish between what could be demanded by the Child Welfare Department and the Unemployment Relief Depot, and what is actually demanded. The thing is not what the worker gets, but what the surplus non-worker or relief worker does not get. If I thought this was a question involving the shattering of our finances, or shaking our stability, I would plump for State socialism. If I thought for a moment that Australia could not make everyone as comfortable to-day as he or she was before the slump, and do so through the activities of private enterprise, I would not hesitate to favour some system under which the necessities of life would be operated through the State. Of course, I would not include in that category luxuries of any description. I feel that is utterly unnecessary at the present juncture. Private enterprise has succeeded very helpfully in promoting production. If we have failed in securing the solution of the problem, we will not get any further by merely stating that fact. It might be of some interest if members, when the Budget is placed before them, were to closely scrutinise the Estimates for the Child Welfare Department and the Unemployment Relief Depot. I believe the situation to-day, in a nutshell, is that the market we are looking for lies in the midst of our own needy citizens.

On motion by Mr. Withers, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.43 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 5th August, 1935.

	PAGE
Questions : Taxation collections	98
Lotteries commission disbursements	98
Mine Workers' Insurance	99
BILL : Supply (No. 1) £2,200,000, 2r., etc.	99

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

QUESTION—TAXATION COLLECTIONS.

Hon. R. G. MOORE (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Chief Secretary: What amount has been collected each financial year under—(a) the Entertainments Tax; (b) the Hospital Tax; (c) the Financial Emergency Tax?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

ENTERTAINMENT TAX—				£
(a)	1930-31	6 months	...	34,360
	1931-32	year	...	63,169
	1932-33	year	...	62,486
	1933-34	year	...	75,262
	1934-35	year	...	83,951
HOSPITAL TAX—				£
(b)	1930-31	6 months	...	64,534
	1931-32	year	...	133,585
	1932-33	year	...	146,042
	1933-34	year	...	154,228
	1934-35	year	...	183,398
FINANCIAL EMERGENCY TAX—				£
(c)	1932-33	7 months	...	202,336
	1933-34	year	...	411,716
	1934-35	year	...	684,980

QUESTION—LOTTERIES COMMISSION DISBURSEMENTS.

Hon. R. G. MOORE (for Hon. H. Seddon) asked the Chief Secretary: What amount has been disbursed by the Lotteries Commission each year to—(a) Government hospitals; (b) public hospitals; (c) private hospitals; (d) other charitable institutions?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied:

	(a) Government Hospitals.			(b) Public Hospitals.			(c) Private Hos- pitals.			(d) Other Charitable Institutions.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£			£	s.	d.
1933	2,770	0	0	1,662	10	0	200			26,870	18	10
1934	22,775	2	0	5,111	9	1	200			42,157	14	0
1935	16,541	10	2	10,661	6	3	55			39,330	19	4

Note.—The above are the whole of the allocations made since the inception of the Lotteries Commission, and included in these are amounts not yet paid out, one being £20,000 for the King Edward Memorial Hospital.