

him with a bag of sugar, yet the merchant who provided the manure and everyone else who had participated in the distribution of the crop proceeds, has been threatened with proceedings unless the money paid to them is refunded. It is about time we had another Royal Commission to inquire into the whole position and close the settlements up.

Mr. McLarty: You were lucky in getting the last inquiry.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: That is so. Although I do not agree with all their findings, the Royal Commission submitted a wonderful report. With regard to the fat lamb industry, I appeal to the Minister for Agriculture to give consideration to the improvement of the Albany Cool Stores and the provision of proper facilities for handling fat lambs. It is useless for Government officers to lecture to the people in the country areas advocating the breeding of certain classes of lambs if the Government do not provide adequate handling facilities for them when the lambs are ready for export. It is no good telling the growers to send their fat lambs to Fremantle, because the freight is too heavy and the wastage altogether too great. With slight improvements to the cool stores at Albany, the position could be met, and I guarantee that within the next three years my district will be producing 60,000 fat lambs annually for export. I am satisfied that if the Government were to announce their policy and indicate that facilities would be available by the time they were required, the settlers would be prepared to go ahead.

The Minister for Agriculture: Do you suggest the spending of £25,000 in anticipation of the lambs being bred?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: No.

The Minister for Agriculture: You cannot have a unit installed at less than that cost.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: All I ask is that the Government announce their policy, and let the settlers know that provision will be made to take their fat lambs.

The Minister for Agriculture: I may not be here.

Mr. Panton: Is that your swan song?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: It is useless asking the people to go in for the breeding of fat lambs for export unless the Government announce that they will provide the proper facilities for handling them at the port. The people should know where they stand and what is expected of them. I appeal to the Government to give more consideration to group settlers. We must not condemn all

because some are unsatisfactory. I know some really good, genuine men who have been on their blocks for 8½ years, and their hearts are broken. The Agricultural Bank has treated them in a scandalous fashion. A little more consideration should be extended to them and greater executive power should be granted to the officer in charge of the district. I have every faith in that officer and if Mr. Storrie were given a little more power, he would be able to deal with the position. The practice of directing proceedings from the head office is ineffectual. The officers in charge do not know where they stand, because of the orders that come down from Perth. Unless something is done quickly, I believe the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) will be far out in his calculations. I hope not, but the whole position rests largely upon the wasting disease, which is the curse of the Denmark district. While the departmental officers are investigating the position, why not accept the McGough formula as a temporary expedient, even if it is not regarded as a permanent cure? As the cows have to be treated annually under the Vita Lick system, the McGough treatment is preferable. The Vita Lick treatment has to be administered every day and has to be continued year after year. My candid opinion is that it is not within 50 per cent. as effective as the McGough treatment. I have been watching the developments, and while Vita Lick has undoubtedly checked the disease, the cattle remain stationary and do not advance towards better health. On the other hand, if after 28 days treatment the McGough formula results in a 50 per cent. increase in production, it cannot be unsatisfactory. The formula is to be had very cheaply. The Minister referred to the number of cows treated, but McGough is not permitted to treat animals inside the group area.

Mr. Marshall: Why?

Mr. WANSBROUGH: Because the whole thing has been handed over to the Vita Lick people. McGough has not a string to his bow. He had no friends behind him; that was the trouble. Next year we have to face an election. I hope that we shall all be returned, and that there will be no wasting disease.

MR. PARKER (North-East Fremantle) [5.31]: I do not propose to occupy much time, and I will be unlike some members who have made that remark on opening

and have then spoken for some hours. I take this opportunity to congratulate the Government on their work during the last two years. No doubt it has been an extremely strenuous time for the Government, as it has also been for members of Parliament.

Mr. Sleeman: And the unemployed.

Mr. PARKER: A considerable amount of unpleasant legislation had to be passed, and it was subject to proper and due criticism, but I think we can all say that the fears that were entertained have not been realised. I refer to the financial emergency, rent reduction, mortgagees' rights restriction, and various other laws passed under the Premier's Plan that have undoubtedly relieved the position considerably. This is proved by the fact that there have been no extraordinary disturbances and no riots. There has not been much upsetting of the people; in fact, the people have taken all the emergency legislation in very good part. It is quite true that the Acts have been ably administered, and, although they have not given satisfaction to all parties, they have given general satisfaction to the people at large. Unfortunate individuals who have not been able to pay their rents have received some relief, and landlords, although much burdened, have been able to support the burdens. No doubt, there has been a good deal of grumbling, but it has not been very serious. The taxes that have been levied on the people have not been particularly severe. The hospital tax is undoubtedly the most severe—1½d. in the pound—but we hear very little grumbling about it, or about any other tax. All said and done, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. There is a considerable amount of money still floating around available for various forms of investment for quick returns. Since the charities' consultation has been in operation, various mushroom consultations have grown up in the form of crossword puzzles. We have only to walk along the street near newspaper offices to find people—who have been endeavouring to show their intelligence by solving the mysterious missing words—forming up queues, and the police having to be engaged to control them and ensure that they do not interfere with traffic. This shows that there is plenty of money about, and that people are not by any means destitute. It

is gratifying in one sense to know that unemployed people are able to win quite large sums of money. I presume they do and can only get their money from the dole, so the dole is apparently more than sufficient for food needs.

Mr. Sleeman: They do not get many sixpences from the dole.

Mr. PARKER: They get quite a lot of prizes.

Mr. Sleeman: Lucky ones.

Mr. PARKER: We have seen the names and photographs of unemployed in the Blackboy and Myalup Camps as the winners of large sums.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: They are not on the dole; they are getting £1 a week over sustenance.

Mr. PARKER: That is virtually the dole.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: It is a different thing.

Mr. PARKER: The member for Geraldton probably knows of people on the dole endeavouring to increase their money by saving up sixpences and entering a speculation. Now they have to save only 3d. According to the Governor's Speech, the farmers are in a very much better position this year than last year. We are told that the quantity of superphosphate despatched to the farming districts is much greater than it was last year, and it is anticipated that the record crop of 1930 will be exceeded this season.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: I do not know that the farmers are in a better position.

Mr. PARKER: No, they are not, because they are receiving so much less for their wheat. However, we were told by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at the opening of this Parliament that 75 per cent. of the farmers would be bankrupt. They are not bankrupt in the sense that I understood the hon. member to mean.

Hon. A. McCallum: More than 75 per cent. are bankrupt.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: You would say insolvent.

Mr. PARKER: When he used the term "bankrupt," I thought he meant the process of going through the court. Obviously, the position is not so. The Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act undoubtedly has done much for the farmer, and we are told that it will possibly be adopted in other States. Anyhow, it has benefited many of our farmers to the extent of enabling them to remain

on their holdings, and they are receiving advances in the shape of superphosphate.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: Those advances have been made to keep them on their holdings.

Mr. PARKER: We hope we shall be able to keep them on their holdings until times become normal. We hope that prices will increase to enable them to make reasonable profits out of their holdings. There has been a good deal of criticism as to what the Government should do, and not much constructive criticism. I wish to offer some criticism that appeals to me as being constructive. One thing that continually passes through my mind, especially when I go to Government offices, is the number of girls employed in the civil service. As one travels to the city in the morning, one is impressed with the number of girls employed in offices generally. That does and must mean that the girls are taking the place of men. It is far more economical from the State point of view that the men, and not the girls, should be employed wherever possible. The men have responsibilities, whereas the girls do not have the responsibilities that men would take upon themselves if they could get the various jobs now filled by girls. It is economically unsound to have so many girls employed at work which could be done by men.

Mr. Marshall: I think Parker & Rog have a fair number of girls in their office.

Mr. PARKER: Unfortunately, not as many as they would like to have, and I am afraid the work is not that which men could do. I should like the Government to sell some of the vacant land in the North-East Fremantle electorate. A lot of Government land is reserved, especially in the Buckland Hill Road Board and in the Cottesloe municipality, and it is of no use for the purpose for which it was reserved.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: A lot of it is endowment land, is it not?

Mr. PARKER: I am speaking not of endowment land but of Class A reserves. One portion is on the eastern side of Broome-street, near the Cottesloe council chambers. It is of the usual sandstone nature, and very rough. It is situated opposite the golf links, and some years ago the golf club attempted to use portion of it for links, but that was impracticable, the land being too rough. It can never be used for recreation purposes. Furthermore, the Cottesloe municipality has the sea beach along one side, while there is a very broad railway

reserve running through on the other side. Consequently there are plenty of air spaces. Roads run along the beach and past other reserves, and there is not much land to produce rates. Again, on the railway side there is a long road, and on only one side is there property that is rateable, so it becomes a severe burden on the ratepayers to maintain the roads. If only some of the land could be sold, it would produce more rates for the municipality. True, it is not a good time to sell real estate, but I feel sure that land to which I refer would bring a reasonable figure for residential sites. In Buckland Hill a large area of land was re-purchased some years ago when the Government thought of building a railway line across the river at Blackwall Reach. I understand that that scheme is not now intended, and all that land is lying idle. Surely it would be wise to release the land for sale. The road board would then get some rates from it. The local authority has the river beach and also other Class A reserves which are quite sufficient for breathing spaces. Again, those extra rates would mean that more people could be employed in maintaining existing roads and building new roads that are so urgently needed in the Buckland Hill area. It is unfortunate that it is not within the bounds of practical politics to construct a modern bridge over the river, to connect up Fremantle with North Fremantle. I hope that, as soon as money is available, the Government that may then be in power will carry out this very urgent work. Members are in the habit of receiving all sorts of pamphlets in which are offered remedies for the ills suffered by Australia, and indeed the world generally. These pamphlets are written by experts, and so-called experts. I am not able to say who the experts are, or even whether the experts are correct. We know that in every walk of life one expert comes along with a theory of his own, and that another expert arises with an exactly opposite theory, and it is difficult to decide which expert is correct. We know that if we had a veterinary surgeon looking after farm horses, he would always be finding something wrong with them. I am not suggesting that veterinary surgeons are not useful because we know that their advice is very necessary; I am merely contending that if a veterinary surgeon had the responsibility of controlling farm horses all the year round, I am afraid he would always want to

have them under supervision so that they would always be in perfect condition, and perhaps in that way the farmer would lose the services of the animals. I sometimes feel that that is the case with our financial experts, and particularly those who rush into print and scatter pamphlets around. But, boiled down, is not the position that we have to live within our means, whether it be the individual, a corporation, or the State? The question is, how are we to live within our means? The attempts made so far have undoubtedly been of great assistance, but we cannot do everything at once. I am looking forward to the time when the Government will be able to permit sustenance workers to earn more money. There is no doubt that those who have been partly employed have not by any means been able to make sufficient to maintain that standard of living of which we are so proud. Unfortunately, we cannot afford to allow these people to earn more, though we can look forward to the time when those who in past years were thrifty will again be able, by means of their savings, to resume the payments on the dwellings not entirely paid for. The position to-day is that the Government must continue to look after those who have been unable to look after themselves. That seems wrong; nevertheless it has to be. I desire to say a few words on the subject of taxation. We know how unpopular taxes are, but I intend to suggest one or two that might not come within the category of being unpopular. I suggest that a tax should be imposed on the issue and distribution of dodgers—I am not speaking of electioneering dodgers, but those that are so frequently left in motor cars.

Mr. Sampson: That would not help the printing industry.

Mr. PARKER: I feel sure that the printing industry would not suffer by the imposition of a tax such as I suggest. Even if less paper were used as the result of the tax, it would not be the Australian worker that would suffer because all the paper that is used is imported. This tax, I should say, would raise a fair amount of revenue which would be useful to the Government.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: What do you suggest—a shilling a hundred?

Mr. PARKER: I have no wish to kill the printing industry by imposing a heavy tax.

Mr. Sampson: Why not tax legal documents?

Mr. PARKER: Those are taxed and it does not prevent the preparation of leases and other legal documents.

Mr. Hegney: Any way, the lawyers would not pay the tax.

Mr. PARKER: Another evil has arisen in our midst—the car watcher. I do not know why a person cannot leave his car in the street without having to pay someone to look after it. I am not suggesting that any of the men who take it upon themselves to watch cars are dishonest, but one has a feeling that if he does not put his hand in his pocket, the car watcher, or one of his friends, might accidentally drop his pocket knife on to a tyre. I say candidly, however, that I do not know of any such thing having happened.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: Perhaps you always put in.

Mr. PARKER: No, only once I think, and that was because the car watcher claimed to know me and he might have come from my constituency. In that instance I was not prepared to risk refusing to pay him. I do not know why the police force, for the maintenance of which we all subscribe, should not have the duty cast upon them of protecting property of this description. Notice of the introduction of a Bill to deal with the stealing of cars has been given in this House, and it may assist us to do away with the car watchers of to-day. These people apparently have some sort of organisation and they wear a uniform. Seemingly, they have come here to stay, but they are imposing on the people an unnecessary burden. One cannot go to a picture show without having to pay 6d. or 1s. for parking his car in the street. Surely the police force are capable of preventing theft or damage being done to cars parked in the streets. If a person has a valuable car, he should put it in a properly controlled garage, where men are employed on a proper wage. There is a further evil, and that is that a car watcher will keep his pitch and no one else can get near it. Sometimes the watcher will employ other men at an extremely low wage. Recently I was in the local court where a man appeared on a small debt judgment summons, and he said he could not afford to pay anything because he was a married man and was receiving only 30s. a week as a car watcher. He added that he was not receiving the tips: he was employed by someone else. Another man who appeared

before the court the other day in connection with a minor disturbance in a hotel described himself as a car watcher; so obviously he was not watching cars at the time. If these people are permitted to remain, why not collect something from them by way of taxation?

Hon. J. C. Willcock: The general feeling is that it is organised blackmail.

Mr. PARKER: I know, and that is the reason why most people pay. Candidly, however, I have not found that to be so, but it is the feeling that is held. I was pleased to see the railways had reduced their fares on the suburban lines with a view to getting back some of the traffic that has drifted to the motor vehicles. I am glad to see this because it is a matter that I mentioned when I was first permitted to speak in this House. I should, however, like to see a little more done by the railway authorities. Around most of the railway stations there is vacant land, and I cannot see why that land should not be converted into parking areas. People who live a mile or so from railway stations, and who own cars and at the present time drive direct to the city, might be prevailed upon to drive to the railway station and leave their cars there, if they could be assured that they were doing so with safety. Then they could utilise the railway service to the city. There would be much less risk of cars being interfered with if they were left on railway land; at any rate, a regulation could be framed to provide a severe penalty in the event of interference. I am not suggesting that the Railway Department should put men on to watch the cars. No doubt regular travellers would make some arrangement with the porter or station-master who naturally would keep a friendly eye on the cars belonging to such travellers. We would thus relieve congestion in the city parking areas and would secure more traffic to the railways. It was gratifying to notice a statement in the Press recently that the Government intend to consider more seriously the overlapping of departments, Federal and State, such as the Health Department, Public Works Department and others. It is essential that the people should be educated with reference to the effect of tariffs, which must be reduced if we are to promote trade with other parts of the world. Australia cannot live in a state of isolation, and I for one will be exceedingly pleased to see ships entering Australian ports full of produce, from other parts of the Empire for preference, and

from other parts of the world where necessary, that can be more easily and more economically grown or manufactured elsewhere than in Australia.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: What would you do with the Australian workers?

Mr. PARKER: The reason why I want to see what I have indicated is so that the Australian worker shall be employed.

Mr. Sleeman: Where?

Mr. PARKER: At North Fremantle. If our ports are fully occupied with shipping, we shall have the workers of Fremantle, North Fremantle and South Fremantle earning good wages.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Then you would suggest that the workers displaced at the factories would be absorbed at the ports on waterside operations.

Mr. PARKER: I do not think it would make the slightest difference to the number of men employed in secondary industries, but I believe we would have far better goods produced in a far better way with lower overhead charges—

Mr. Sleeman: Did you refer to better goods?

Mr. PARKER: Yes—

Mr. Sleeman: That is a reflection on the Australian worker.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: It is a libel.

Mr. PARKER: My statement was neither a reflection nor a libel on the Australian worker. I contend he will be better off if he gets the goods he requires at a reasonable price, due to less overhead expenses.

Mr. Sleeman: If you want him to have the cheapest goods, you want him to get them from the Japs.

Mr. PARKER: I was talking about satisfactory goods, not shoddy goods. I want to see Empire trading carried out for preference, particularly regarding goods that cannot be produced in Australia except with heavy overhead expenses.

The Minister for Railways: If we cannot buy outside Australia, how can we sell outside Australia?

Mr. PARKER: That is the position. No country is healthy if its ports are idle.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: But no country progresses that relies on primary industry alone.

Mr. PARKER: I quite agree with that statement.

The Minister for Lands: But each country has to go through that stage.

Hon. J. C. Willecock: It is always poor during that period of its history.

Mr. PARKER: We must go outside Australia for our markets.

Hon. A. McCallum: Are you arguing that the country makes the ports prosperous or that the ports make the country prosperous?

Mr. PARKER: I was arguing that a country is never prosperous unless its ports are full. We want ships to come here with full holds and to depart with full holds. We want to open up and maintain our trade with other countries.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: Your argument was all in favour of unloading.

Mr. PARKER: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is what you said.

Mr. PARKER: No. I am not advocating the importation of goods at all. What I am arguing in favour of is trading with other countries, especially within the Empire. I want to see ships coming here fully loaded and departing with their holds full of our goods. It is by that means that we shall become a wealthy country.

Mr. Wansbrough: You want the trade to come to one port only.

The Minister for Lands: Some will have to go through Albany.

Mr. PARKER: Certainly; I do not want the port of Fremantle to be overloaded. I am sorry that the time is not ripe for the Government to be able to sell some, if not all of the trading concerns. I am sure that if those concerns were in the hands of private companies a greater number of men would be employed.

Hon. A. McCallum: The Government got rid of one in your electorate, and more men have not been employed.

Mr. PARKER: One in my electorate has practically closed down, but I am sure that if it had been in the hands of private enterprise, the concern would be on a far more healthy basis than it is to-day. It would probably have survived the present times of difficulty. That is a matter of opinion on which some of us will assuredly differ. My opinion is that trading concerns cannot be controlled by a Government. There is no scope for the workers to rise, nor yet any incentive for the manager to put as much energy into his work as there would be if the concerns were privately owned.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: And, in addition, State trading seriously interferes with the profits of private enterprise.

The Minister for Lands: And the concerns contribute nothing towards taxation.

Mr. PARKER: Of course, State trading interferes with private enterprise.

Mr. Kenneally: Particularly the profits.

Mr. PARKER: That must be so. Unless we get right down to socialism, that is bound to be the position.

Mr. Sleeman: I presume you want the State ships sold, too.

Mr. PARKER: I do not regard the State Shipping Service as a trading concern. I am consistent in that respect because in 1906 I attended a deputation to the Government asking them to put boats on the coast. I have lived on the North-West coast and know how essential boats are; just as essential to the North as railways are to the people outback.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: That is pure socialism.

Mr. PARKER: That may be so. I am not hidebound; I know there are exceptions that prove every rule.

Mr. Sleeman: Could not private shipping companies carry on there?

Mr. PARKER: When I was living in the North-West, two or three shipping companies were operating on the coast and there were far more boats travelling up and down then than there are to-day, even with the State ships. Unfortunately I do not think those companies would return to the trade, and it is essential to keep the State boats on the coast.

Mr. Sleeman: Then private enterprise has failed there?

Mr. PARKER: I do not know that we can say that, but I know that there were more boats on the coast when private enterprise was more interested in the trade. It has to be admitted that that was in the days before the Navigation Act was passed, and I cannot say what the position would be now. I take no exception to the State boats. I would like to see the Public Service Act amended in a direction that would make for economy and greater efficiency. Instead of having a Public Service Commissioner, there should be a public service board consisting of the Under Secretaries of the various departments. Their deliberations would have the effect of levelling the service up instead of the present position under which

one individual, the Public Service Commissioner, is supposed to know exactly what every clerk is doing and what his services are worth. Theoretically he is supposed to have that knowledge and to adjust conditions accordingly. If the Under Secretaries were to constitute the board, it would have a tendency to get away from the watertight compartments constituted by the various departments under the existing system. There would be made possible exchanges of officials that would be beneficial to the individual officers and to the service at large. So long as the service is divided into watertight compartments with the Public Service Commissioner at the head, many departmental heads fear to admit that they are overstaffed for the time being because they consider they might not be able to get the men back when business increased and their services were required. In those circumstances, a departmental head is chary about allowing another department to avail itself of the services of one of his officers. Human nature enters into the question and the greater number of men under an individual officer's control, the greater he considers his salary should be. All that sort of thing could be overcome if we had a Public Service Board composed of the different Under Secretaries, and there would be less inter-departmental jealousy. That sort of thing must always exist to some extent, but it could largely be avoided if my suggestion were adopted. I would like to see this matter given consideration with a view to effecting economy and securing useful results for both the Public Service and the State. It might help to eliminate some of the waste that always exists in Government departments and big businesses generally.

Mr. Marshall: Is the scheme you suggest in operation in any part of Australia?

Mr. PARKER: I cannot say. I do not think we should rely upon other people to carry out experiments for us.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS
(Hon. J. Scaddan—Maylands) [7.30]: May I join with those who have preceded me in the debate in welcoming to this Chamber the three new members who have been elected since last session, and join, too, in expressing regret at the loss of the very highly respected members that have passed away. I congratulate the new members on their

maiden efforts in the House. Personally I am grateful for the fact that I cannot remember my own first effort, but to those members who have come along this session I do heartily extend congratulation. I have noticed some criticism, particularly in certain sections of the Press, against what is termed the waste of time in discussing matters on the Address-in-reply. But one of two things must happen: either we should rid ourselves of this debate entirely, or members should be given opportunity for saying what they are expected to say. There are not many opportunities to discuss things in a general way. As a matter of fact, it is probably the outstanding feature of our system of Government that at some period of each session an opportunity should be given members to introduce matters of public interest in order that they should be discussed. So from that point of view I do not think a discussion on the Address-in-reply can rightly be termed a waste of time. It is true, of course, that we do sometimes repeat what another member has already said. But even that may be desirable, because what is said again may be said in a different way, and therefore may be considered from a different angle. At the moment we are living in difficult and strenuous times, and any members who can render assistance by introducing new views on a discussion of this kind are entitled to have an opportunity for so doing. But I do not wish to be misunderstood, because I recognise that, in the main, debates of this nature generally tend to discussion from a party interest angle. I do not know, after all, that that is not to be expected, because, while it is the Government's function to govern, it is the function of an Opposition to see that they explain their reasons for doing certain things, so that the public may understand the why and wherefore of it. Therefore, without a satisfactory Opposition we could not have a really satisfactory Government, and I do not complain of the criticism by members opposite, because, as I say, it is at present their function to oppose, and some day it may again be their function to govern, although perhaps in a different way from that taken by the present Government. But one thing to which I do take exception is the assertion continually made by some members, not all on the other side of the House, that those on this side have a lack of the milk of human kindness. Let me say in reply that we per-