

Still I do not think it would be desirable to make exemptions from the Shops and Factories Act and from the Inspection of Machinery Act, as the hon. member would have us do.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: The desire of Mr. Stewart is to have only one inspector to inspect butter factories, instead of having three or four inspectors going round making inspections under the various Acts. We can have a provision to cover that. Indeed I have drafted one which I propose to move as an amendment.

The Minister for Education: But it is the law to-day.

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I did not know that. I have yet to learn of a case where it has been accepted. In how many instances is the machinery inspector an inspector also under the Shops and Factories Act? Where has that economy been practised? I would not expect an inspector of a butter factory to be competent to inspect a steam boiler, but any ordinary man could satisfactorily inspect the rest of the machinery to be found in a butter factory.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: What about the refrigerating machinery?

Hon. J. A. GREIG: I see no particular difficulty in that. Apart from steam boilers, there would be nothing to fear in leaving the inspection to a butter factory inspector. If, as the Leader of the House says, the position is already provided for, I will not move my proposed amendment.

Hon. H. STEWART: I now realise that my amendment does not meet the position. Therefore I will withdraw it.

Leave to withdraw the amendment refused.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move--

That progress be reported.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: As I reminded the hon. member this afternoon, it is not unusual for a private member to move to report progress. If any hon. member wishes that progress should be reported, the practice is for him to ask the Minister in charge to move accordingly. However, if the hon. member wishes to take charge of the proceedings, I do not mind.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I asked the Minister just now to report progress, and I understood him to refuse. Consequently I moved merely to test the feeling of the House. Still, I have not the slightest wish to take the control out of the hands of the Minister. I will withdraw my motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.29 p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 8th November, 1922.

	PAGE
Questions: Roebourne Gaol	1447
Circuit Court, North-West	1447
Cotton Growing, Imperial Assistance	1447
Railway Construction—1, Advisory Board's report; 2, Narragin-Dwanda route ...	1448
British Capital for Western Australia ...	1448
State Shipping Service	1448
Bills: Industries Assistance Board continuance, 1R.	
Land Act Amendment, 1R.	1448
Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amendment, 1R.	1448
Jarndup-Denmark Railway, 1R.	1448
Busselton-Margaret River Railway Deviation, 1R.	1448
Esperance-Northwards Railway Extension, 1R.	
Kojonup Agricultural and Horticultural Society's Land, 1R.	1448
Navigation Act Amendment, 3R.	1448
Light and Air Act Amendment, Council's Message... ..	1448
Leave of Absence	1448
Motion: Game Act, Opossum Skin Royalty ...	1448
Returns: Government Employees	1449
North-West, Assets, Revenue, etc.	1453

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

QUESTION—ROEBOURNE GAOL.

Mr. TEESDALE asked the Colonial Secretary: Is it the intention of the Government to close the Roebourne gaol and transfer the prisoners to Broome?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: The matter has not yet been determined.

QUESTION—CIRCUIT COURT, NORTH-WEST.

Mr. TEESDALE asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a commissioner to proceed to the North-West to adjudicate on the several session cases pending, thus saving hundreds of pounds in passages and witnesses' fees?

The PREMIER replied: The whole question as regards action to be taken for hearing the cases referred to is at present being carefully considered.

QUESTION—COTTON GROWING, IMPERIAL ASSISTANCE.

Mr. TEESDALE asked the Minister for Agriculture: Will he instruct the London Agency to apply for a proportion of the million sterling set apart by the Imperial Government to develop the cotton industry within the Empire?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: £1,000,000 was, I understand, set aside for the purpose of organising the growing of cotton within the Empire, not to meet the actual cost of growing it. The British Empire Cotton Association will send

one of two cotton experts to Western Australia to advise the Government as soon as experts are available.

QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

Advisory Board's report.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Premier: 1, Has the Railway Advisory Board recently reported on the question of a new railway to serve the districts East of the Yilliminning-Kondinin railway, and East of Jilakin Lake and Walyurin? 2, If so, when will the report be laid on the Table of the House?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Railway Advisory Board has inspected the Newdegate district and the district East of the Yilliminning-Kondinin railway, but has not yet completed its report. 2, Answered by No. 1.

Narrogin-Dwarda route.

Mr. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Works: 1, Have the Government received further reports and minutes regarding the route of the Narrogin-Dwarda railway from Mr. Babington, of the Public Works Department, and other officials? 2, If so, is it the intention of the Government to lay those papers on the Table of the House, in order that members may peruse them in connection with the adjourned debate concerning that railway?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes.

QUESTION—BRITISH CAPITAL FOR WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Mr. STUBBS (for Capt. Carter) asked the Premier. 1, Are the Government co-operating with the firm of Hyem, Hester & Co., Ltd., in their attempt to raise capital in the United Kingdom for investment in Western Australia? 2, If not, is he aware that advertisements have been inserted over the firm's name in the "London Financial News" of 1st August, 1922, inviting reference by intending investors to the Hon. the Premier of Western Australia?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Certainly not. 2, Yes. The advertisement was brought under my notice and I immediately instructed the firm concerned they had no right to use my name as a reference and to discontinue its use.

QUESTION—STATE SHIPPING SERVICE.

Hon. W. C. ANGIN asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to cease running the s.s. "Bambra" on the North-West coast? 2, If so, is it the intention to replace the "Bambra" with another vessel?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Not at present. 2, Answered by No. 1.

BILLS (7)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Industries Assistance Board Continuance.
- 2, Land Act Amendment.
- 3, Agricultural Lands Purchase Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Premier.

- 4, Jarnadup-Denmark Railway.

- 5, Busselton-Margaret River Railway Deviation.

- 6, Esperance Northwards Railway Extension.

Introduced by the Minister for Works.

- 7, Kojonup Agricultural and Horticultural Society's Land.

Introduced by the Minister for Agriculture.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. Mullany, leave of absence for two weeks granted to Mr. J. MacCallum Smith (North Perth) on the ground of urgent private business.

BILL—NAVIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

MOTION—GAME ACT, OPOSSUM SKIN ROYALTY.

To disallow Regulation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Williams - Narrogin) [4.42]: I move—

The regulation under the Game Act, 1912-13, published in the "Government Gazette" of 6th October, 1922, and laid upon the Table of the House on the 12th October, 1922, be disallowed.

This regulation relates to the royalty on opossum skins which has been increased from 1s. to 1s. 6d. per skin. At the time this increase was made the price at Williams for opossum skins was 42s. a dozen, or 3s. 6d. each.

The Premier: They were bringing twice that price.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I made inquiries last week from the two dealers in Williams - Narrogin and both informed me that the price they were offering was 36s. a dozen. If the local value is greater, as was stated by the Colonial Secretary last week, then a very great benefit will be conferred on the poor people engaged in trapping opossums by letting them know that they are not receiving a fair price.

The Minister for Works: Poor! Some of them are making £10 to £12 a week.

Mr. JOHNSTON: But not in my district. I made it my business to go to the representatives of the two firms buying skins and they informed me that the trapping season should

have started three months earlier, in which case the skins would have had a higher value. Through the season being left so late, all they were offering was 36s. a dozen to the trapper and then only if the skins were of approved quality and not what is known in the trade as "rumpy" or inferior. This price is without the royalty; the buyer of the skins pays the royalty of 1s. 6d. It is rough on a man who goes into the bush trapping opossums that after all his work he gets only 3s. for himself and has to pay the Government 1s. 6d. The royalty is too high. Some people have been anxious to start opossum farms, but have not been able to get their places gazetted as such under the Act. To do so they must fence the boundaries of their properties with opossum-proof fences, which they are unable to do. Mr. Burron Rodway informed me that had he been able to get permission to develop his farm as an opossum farm, the value of the furs from the opossums he would have bred would have equalled the value of his wool. That shows the value to which the opossum industry should be developed. He says that the present opossum season has been declared open too late in the year, and also that the people have come round his property trapping his opossums.

The Colonial Secretary: But it is not the wrong time of the year.

Mr. JOHNSTON: That is a point which is a good deal disputed. Many of my electors, who are experienced in opossum trapping, assure me that it would have been very much better for the value of the furs and for the number of opossums had the opening of the season been in June. Apart from that, however, as regards the western part of the Great Southern district a mistake has been made in throwing some of the areas open to the opossum trappers for three years running. For two years running we have had the whole State thrown open for opossum trapping. There are localities where it is necessary for the protection of the orchardist that an open season should be declared.

Mr. O'Loughlin: That is questionable, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON: At any rate I am advised, and I think correctly, that it would have been much better had the Fisheries Department thrown open only those parts of the State where opossums were very plentiful, and if the department had continued to protect the animal in those localities where there is to-day a danger of the opossum, with its valuable fur, becoming extinct. I am informed that in some parts west of the Great Southern railway which have been open for opossum trapping three years running, the little animal is being exterminated to-day. Further I am advised that Western Australia is not getting the proper amount of wealth from the opossum skins because the trapping season is opened too late in the year. The plea I am putting up is that according to Australian sentiment we should not heavily tax a man who goes out into the bush to get something, whether it be sandalwood, kangaroo skins, or opossum skins. Such a man should get a fair return for his labour. At

any rate, we find that the price of opossum skins to the trapper to-day is 3s., in addition to which a royalty of 1s. 6d. has to be paid to the Government. Immediately the royalty was increased from 12s. to 18s. per dozen, the price to the trapper went down by 6s. per dozen; so that it is quite clear that the extra royalty is coming directly out of the pocket of the trapper. The men who go opossum trapping are generally small settlers, bush workers, or men down on their luck. Some years ago it was the case in the Great Southern district that men came in with very large catches of opossums; but to-day catches are, unfortunately, very small in that district, and I am afraid that if the Government continue throwing open the whole State to trapping year after year, as they have been doing recently, the opossum will in some parts of the State be entirely exterminated, and thus a very valuable source of revenue lost to the State altogether.

On motion by the Colonial Secretary, debate adjourned.

RETURN—GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WITHIN 24 MILES OF PERTH.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [4.51]: I move—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing the total number of employees of the Government and State trading concerns employed within a radius of 24 miles of the Perth Town Hall on the 31st October, 1922.

I may say that I asked for this information by way of question, but was informed that a return must be moved for.

The Premier: I am not opposing the motion.

Mr. A. THOMSON: In that case I will content myself with moving the motion formally.

Mr. SPEAKER: Although the Premier treats the motion as unopposed, that does not prevent it from being debated.

The Premier: No, Sir; we know that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not wish hon. members to be led astray in that connection.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [4.53]: I fail to understand the motion. Hon. members will need to exercise their imagination in order to grasp the meaning of the motion. What are the employees of State trading concerns but employees of the Government? There is no difference, except that some Government employees are permanent.

Mr. A. Thomson: The object is to include all the employees of the State within that area.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That information will be of no benefit to any person.

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Everybody knows that there must be a large number of State employees in the metropolitan area. But

the State trading concerns employees represent a very small proportion of that number. There is only one State trading concern in the metropolitan area, so far as I know.

Mr. A. Thomson: But the motion says, within a radius of 24 miles.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That does not mean a great number. Naturally, the larger proportion of civil servants are in the metropolitan area. A fair number of railway employees also reside in the metropolitan area, for one thing by reason of the railway workshops at Midland Junction. There are also a number of railway employees at Fremantle, because of the harbour there. The hon. member has given no explanation as to why he wants the return.

Mr. A. Thomson: The Premier said he would accept the motion as formal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member ought to know that on private members' day no motion is formal. Any person can discuss a motion if he so desires. I fail to see any necessity for carrying this motion. Why should the expense and trouble be incurred of preparing such a return?

Mr. A. Thomson: The department should be able to give that information very easily.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is more difficulty and more expense attaching to the matter than the hon. member thinks. We should have to go round to each department for the purposes of the return.

Mr. A. Thomson: But the departments know how many men are on their wages sheets every week.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We should have to ascertain from the Railway Department the number of men employed in the traffic branch, and the number on works and ways. As to guards, I do not know how we should proceed. One guard might sleep in Perth, and another up the country, and another outside the 24 mile radius.

The Minister for Works: If it is only the number that is wanted, the wages sheets will show that.

The Premier: We will just give the totals.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The totals would have to be dissected. But what is the reason for the return? The hon. member must have some reason for moving the motion. There must be something at the back of it. Perhaps the hon. member thinks the metropolitan area has too many Government employees.

Mr. A. Thomson: No. Ridiculous!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Or perhaps he thinks there are not sufficient men employed by the Government in the metropolitan area. If I asked for a return of this kind, I should expect to be required to give some reason for it.

The Premier: I hope you will always remember that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do always remember it. A motion for papers may be as purely formal as the motion for the first

reading of a Bill. However, in this instance nothing is to be gained by carrying the motion. I move an amendment—

That all the words after "concerns" in line 4, reading "employed within a radius of 24 miles of the Perth Town Hall on the 31st October, 1922" be struck out, and "separately" be inserted in lieu.

The information that would be disclosed would thus be of value to everybody.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.4]: The hon. member wanted to know why the member for Katanning required the information. He explained that the member for Katanning should have given good reasons when asking for it. The hon. member himself, however, has not given this information.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: It is easily given.

The PREMIER: My friend chastised the member for Katanning severely; yet he fails to tell us why he wishes the information he now seeks to obtain.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I do not want it at all; I can get it from the returns.

The PREMIER: I do not know that the information will be of much value when it is supplied.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning—on amendment) [5.5]: I hope the member for North-East Fremantle will not press his amendment. I am willing to accept an amendment to include all who are employed in the service. I am frequently asked how many people are employed by the State and I am unable to supply the information. The return will be of value to every hon. member.

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.6]: I move a further amendment—

That after the word "separately," there be inserted "and giving the locality where employed."

The Minister for Works: Then you will not get the return for three months.

The Premier: Confine it to the metropolitan area.

Mr. A. THOMSON: If I am permitted to do that, I will alter the amendment to read—

And giving the number employed in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle—on amendment) [5.7]: I oppose the amendment. There is no such recognised place as the metropolitan area. "Metropolitan area" is not quoted in any Act of Parliament, although for the carrying out of some statutes certain districts have been included in those statutes for the express purpose of defining a particular area.

The Minister for Works: I think you are wrong there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Certain districts are described as "metropolitan area," but only in accordance with a particular Act. By agreeing to the amendment we shall be describing the metropolitan area as that area having a 24 miles radius of the town hall, and then the hon. member will get the information which we have just said he shall not have. I may instance a Bill we had before us only the other day, in which the metropolitan area took in Armadale and Kelmseott. Those places were, however, included only for the purpose of that particular measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: The member for North-East Fremantle has drawn attention to the fact that we have just struck out "twenty-four miles from the Perth Town Hall." If the metropolitan area is embraced within the "24 miles" struck out, I do not see how I can accept the amendment. I do not know what the metropolitan area is. We do know, however, that in general conversation it covers

Mr. A. Thomson: Fremantle to Midland Junction.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, and in some cases it takes in Armadale.

Mr. A. Thomson: Having cut out "24 miles" we could reduce the distance to 12 miles.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member moves in that direction the difficulty can be overcome. The House has already decided that information embracing 24 miles from the Town Hall shall not be given. The distance, however, may be reduced.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have already struck out the words "employed within a radius of 24 miles of the Perth Town Hall on the 31st October, 1922." We cannot now put in at the end "within a radius of three miles of the Perth Town Hall," because we have struck out "Perth Town Hall." The hon. member is seeking to insert the words "metropolitan area." I object to those words, as the metropolitan area is not a defined area. Only the other day in a Bill we had the city of Perth described as the metropolitan area. In other Bills the metropolitan area is defined as embracing certain electoral districts extending to Rockingham, 30 miles from Perth. I do not think it necessary to define any area in the motion.

Mr. A. Thomson: That is a matter of opinion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member has given no reason for the return. He simply says he wants to know the number of public servants. Is that a reason?

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Nothing of the sort. He has not said why he wants the return, what benefit the return will be, or even that it will be of any benefit.

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes, it will be.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is merely the hon. member's view. He says that many people are anxious to know the number of public servants employed by the Government.

Mr. A. Thomson: I am one of them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The motion as it stands will give the numbers employed by the Government.

The Minister for Works: But it will not show where they are situated.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member does not know what he wants. First, he prescribes 24 miles. The House refused that, and so he said, "Well, I want a list showing the various districts in which they are employed." When the Premier said that would take too long, the hon. member said, "Well, let us have it within the metropolitan area." The metropolitan area might include the 24 miles radius already struck out.

Mr. A. Thomson: You know it does not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know nothing of the sort. The hon. member does not know what he requires. I hope the House will not agree to the amendment. The motion as it now stands presents no difficulties in the preparation of the return asked for. I could give the hon. member the number myself. The hon. member is too lazy to get it out for himself. He could get from the Public Service List the total number on the permanent staff. As for the others, he can turn up the Railway report, where he will get the number of men employed on the railways. He can get the report of the State Implement Works, which shows the number of men there employed. Also he can get the reports of the other trading concerns.

The Minister for Works: But he wants the numbers as on the 31st October.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That is the difficulty. The reports will show the number employed each year. The hon. member's desire is to put the Government to considerable expense, all because of a little whim of his.

Mr. A. Thomson: That is not correct.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If I wanted the figures I would go and look them up for myself. The numbers of men employed by the Government are always changing, and so all that the hon. member can hope for is the approximate number.

The Premier: There is no objection to furnishing as much information as can be inexpensively given.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Could the Premier give definitely the number employed on the Peel estate?

The Premier: Yes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I am not too sure about that. It would be only approximate.

Mr. A. Thomson: We could get the last wages sheet.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, and perhaps half the men were paid off the next day. The information can only be given approximately.

Mr. A. Thomson: I am prepared to accept the approximate figures.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It ought to be sufficient. Those figures can be obtained from the ordinary returns.

Point of Order.

Hon. P. Collier: I take the point of order that if the House were to carry the motion

in its present form, it would be stultifying itself. For the House to order that a return be prepared presupposes that the House calls for information which will be accurate. The wording of the amendment leaves the motion vague and indefinite. "Metropolitan area" may mean anything. It may mean the city alone, the city and suburbs, it may include Maylands, or Bayswater, or Guildford, or extend to Fremantle, according to the conception of the man who happens to be using the term. There is no definitely defined area which can be described as the metropolitan area. Therefore to carry the motion in its present form, the House would be ordering something with which compliance could not be made, and so would be stultifying itself.

Mr. Speaker: I do not follow the point of order. The House has decided that it will not agree to a return showing those employed within a radius of 24 miles of the Perth Town Hall. The amendment is for a return showing the number employed in the metropolitan area. If the metropolitan area embraces the 24 miles radius which the House has already struck out, I cannot accept the amendment. It has been urged that "metropolitan area" may mean almost anything, according to the conception of the person using the term, and that in respect of accuracy, the House can only ask for information that can be given.

Hon. P. Collier: That is my point.

Mr. Speaker: If no accurate information can be given, the House would be foolish to accept it, although it may ask for it. The point is that the figures could be furnished accurately to a certain date.

Hon. P. Collier: No, because we do not know what the metropolitan area is, and therefore the return cannot be prepared.

Mr. Speaker: I am at a loss to know what the metropolitan area means. If the hon. member were to withdraw the amendment and move for a return covering a lesser radius, I could accept it. The striking out of "Perth Town Hall" is not essential. The substance of the excision was the 24 miles. I could accept an amendment for a return showing the number of persons employed within, say, 12 miles of, say, the Treasury Buildings.

Mr. Lutey: With all due deference, Sir, in my view the amendment will be in order only if it name a greater radius than 24 miles. The House has struck out the radius of 24 miles and, as I see it, the hon. member would not be in order in moving for any lesser radius.

Mr. Speaker: If there be any desire on the part of the House to have a return covering the number employed within a certain radius of less than 24 miles, it can be done by withdrawing the amendment and moving another amendment. It will be for the House to say whether these words shall be included or not.

Hon. P. Collier: There is no definite term set down.

The Minister for Works: What I am concerned about is the date.

Mr. Speaker: That is struck out.

The Minister for Works: If the date were fixed for the last pay day it would be possible to get the information, but it would cost the State a great deal to obtain it.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member withdraw his amendment?

Mr. A. Thomson: Yes.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Debate resumed.

Mr. A. THOMSON (Katanning) [5.30]: I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion: "Employed within 15 miles of the General Post Office on the last pay day."

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.31]: These words are in effect identical with those that we have struck out. I have never heard of such a motion being moved since I have been a member of this Chamber. It is a wonder the hon. member did not put in the words "Town Hall clock." He has not the courage to say why he wants the information. Surely we are entitled to know.

Mr. A. Thomson: I have told you.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He has not done so. Why should there be this expenditure? If members are willing to vote blindfolded for every childish request made by the hon. member I will have nothing more to say.

Amendment put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	24
Noes	14

Majority for .. 10

AYES.

Mr. Augelo	Mr. Mann
Mr. Broun	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Denton	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Durack	Mr. Richardson
Mr. George	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany

(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. O'Loghlin
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Munis

(Teller.)

Amendment thus passed.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [5.37]: The hon. member has given us no reason why this motion should be carried, although he has been asked to do so. He is treating the House with contempt by his refusal to give the information.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Some members will vote for anything. It is a mere waste of time to move such a motion.

Question, as amended, put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	23
Noes	14

Majority for .. 9

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Davies	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Denton	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Durack	Mr. Richardson
Mr. George	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Stubbs
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Johnston	Mr. A. A. Thomson
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. Thomson
Mr. C. C. Maley	Mr. Underwood
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Mann	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Chesson	Mr. O'Loghlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Troy
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Wilson
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Munzie
	(Teller.)

Question as amended thus passed.

RETURN—NORTH-WEST, ASSETS, REVENUE, ETC.

Debate resumed from 25th October, on the following motion by Mr. Durack:—

That a return be laid upon the Table of the House showing: 1, The value of all assets belonging to the State, in that portion of the State north of 26th parallel of south latitude, standing in the Government records of the 30th June, 1921. 2, The reserve by way of depreciation and sinking fund against the cost of these assets, if any, and the amount. 3, The amount of depreciation and sinking fund so provided for, if any, allowed for in valuation of assets as per No. 1. 4, The total revenue derived by the State from all sources in that portion of the State north of 26th parallel of south latitude for the ten years ended 30th June, 1921. 5, The revenue derived in the two years ended 30th June, 1921. 6, The cost of upkeep, working expenses, cost of collection of revenue, and all other revenue expenditure for the ten years ended 30th June, 1921.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.44]: I have made inquiries into this question and find that it will be almost impossible to secure the information, and certainly it will be very costly to do so.

Hon. P. Collier: It will cost more than the revenue paid in from those sources about which the information is required.

The PREMIER: I do not agree with that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You would be pretty safe if you did.

The PREMIER: It would cost some hundreds of pounds to prepare the return, seeing that the accounts have not been kept to meet such a purpose. The hon. member wants to know the value of the assets belonging to the State. The hon. member wants the valuation of all the assets belonging to that part of the State north of the 26th parallel.

Hon. P. Collier: You would have to make a valuation of the whole State!

Mr. Lambert: Could not the Northern Railway Development League get out that information?

The PREMIER: He also requires information as to the reserve by way of depreciation and sinking fund against the cost of the assets, the amount of depreciation and sinking fund, and the total revenue derived by the State from all sources in that portion of the State north of the 26th parallel of south latitude, for the 10 years ended the 30th June, 1921. What the hon. member really requires is a balance sheet regarding the northern parts. He asks for information as to revenue from all sources which would include stamp duties, taxation, proportion of the Commonwealth returns, harbour and wharfage dues and the hundred and one small items of revenue which would be involved. It would be a really big task, and I do not think it could be procured except after a lot of work.

Hon. P. Collier: I do not think you could have the information prepared.

The PREMIER: The hon. member also wants the cost of upkeep, working expenses, cost of collection of revenue, and all other revenue expenditure for the 10 years ended the 30th June, 1921.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a contract!

The PREMIER: It is really impossible to apportion the cost of an officer's work when that work is partly for the north and partly for the south.

Hon. P. Collier: It is certain you could not get the information out accurately.

The PREMIER: I trust the member for Kimberley will not press his motion. I do not think even if he procured the information it would be valuable to him or to the House.

Hon. M. F. Troy: You can hardly refuse such a warm supporter!

The PREMIER: I am not prepared to agree to a motion of this description, which will cost hundreds of pounds to carry out.

Hon. M. F. Troy: It would be money well spent.

The PREMIER: I do not know what good it would do, or what could come out of it.

Hon. P. Collier: A new State might come out of it.

The PREMIER: I am not so sure about that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: They will not be so anxious for that when they look into the matter.

The PREMIER: If it is a question of working towards unification, we will not bring it about in that way. Before we come to a decision regarding smaller States, there should be a full discussion on that question by the House, and we should ascertain whether the House is in favour of that movement before consenting to get information such as that sought in the motion. I do not believe we should endeavour to cut up the State, which would mean a step towards unification. If any such object is behind the motion, I ask the member for Kimberley not to press it, because the return would be costly and almost impossible to get out. Every small item of revenue and expenditure, no matter where collected, would have to be accounted for and he will appreciate that this will be a very difficult matter. I hope the hon. member will withdraw his motion. The House must have regard to the question of cost, coupled with the utility of the return asked for. So far as I can see, no good purpose will be served by going to the expense of furnishing the return.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [5.50]: Not only the motion before the House, but the speech by the member for Kimberley in moving it, indicated why the return was asked for.

The Premier: I do not think it did that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then the Premier has not read the speech of the hon. member. The whole indication of the speech to demonstrate the necessity for the return being furnished was that, without such direct information, the member for Kimberley would not be able to comply with the request he had had from Carnarvon.

Mr. Durack: I had not received the telegram.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member read it.

The Premier: He read a telegram from some people at Carnarvon which had been despatched to someone else.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Besides reading that telegram, the hon. member went on to point out that the information was required in connection with the movement to divide the State.

Mr. Durack: It applied to a certain extent.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: He referred to our own Constitution to show that provision was made when a responsible government was granted to Western Australia, to meet the position should the State be divided. He did not refer to the Federal Constitution, where-

in it is provided that not only must the consent of the Parliament of the State be obtained, but also a majority of the electors of the State. The objection raised by the Premier was on account of the cost of the return.

The Premier: That was one objection.

Hon. M. F. Troy: What objection have you?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: My objection is principally based upon the reasons advanced by the member for Kimberley when moving for the return. I do not think the time has arrived, nor is it likely to arrive for many years to come, for the State to be divided.

Mr. Pickering: Hear, hear!

Mr. Davies: There is a smaller States league at Geraldton.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is also a league at Albany, to which the member for Kimberley referred when speaking to his motion.

Mr. A. Thomson: He referred to Albany where a conference was being held.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The small population in Western Australia means that it is impossible to carry on an additional Parliament here, nor are the funds available to carry on the functions of another State.

Mr. Willcock: How did we get on when we started under Responsible Government?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We had the whole of the people of the State behind us.

Mr. Willcock: There were not so many in those days.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There were far more than there are in the part of the State referred to in the motion.

Mr. Willcock: No; I will prove you are wrong.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There were about 60,000 here in those days. No area in Western Australia could be subdivided so that we would have such a population, unless an extremely large area was chosen, and that would be by no means beneficial. There are some people in this State anxious for this subdivision, in order to secure more power in the North-West. They have found a Minister to back them up in that direction. Whether that attitude is adopted for gaining greater power by means of legislation or in order to exercise more influence with the Commonwealth Government so that indentured black labour may be used in the North, I am not prepared to say.

Hon. P. Collier: That is what is behind it.

Mr. McCallum: There is the black hand!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We know there are some—I am pleased to know they are few in number—in this Parliament who advocate black labour for the development of the northern parts of Western Australia. Seeing that we have a Premier who is strongly opposed to the introduction of coloured labour, they know that they can make no headway in that direction unless they succeed in dividing the State and taking control of their own Parliament in the North.

The Premier: They would lose it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: So far as I can see, that is what is behind it.

Mr. Davies: Can we discuss the new States movement under this motion?

Hon. P. Collier: That is the object of the motion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Kimberley told us that was his object when he moved for the return.

Mr. Munsie: He told us that the new States movement had come to stay, whether we liked it or not.

Hon. P. Collier: He wants to know the value of the property and assets to be taken over.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Seeing that they are great believers, under false pretences, in unification, I am not surprised that when the member for Kimberley asked for the return, the Premier virtually refused to furnish it.

Hon. P. Collier: They have adopted unificationists as candidates for the Senate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Kimberley has said that the policy of his party is in favour of smaller States. In 1917 their leader gave an address before the Australian Journalists' Association's conference in Brisbane during the course of which he pointed out the difficulties under which Australia was labouring. The title of that address was, "A Plea for Unification." It was not a plea for smaller States. To-day the position is that Country Party candidates are going about the State trying to throw dust in the eyes of the people by saying that they are neither in favour of the smaller States movement nor of unification, but that they favour the holding of a convention for the purpose of discussing the advisability of altering the Constitution. The Premier uttered a few words regarding the motion which were significant. He asked the member for Kimberley to withdraw the motion as it would cost several hundreds of pounds to prepare it, and that it would be impossible to get a correct statement of what the hon. member required. The Premier's statement was practically a direct invitation to hon. members to reject the motion, if the member for Kimberley would not withdraw it. I agree with the Premier and hope that the House will reject the motion. Unification or the subdivision of Western Australia into smaller States would not be a good thing for us at the present time.

Mr. Pickering: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It might be a good thing for some of the Eastern States and for those parts of Australia close to the seat of Government. That is one of the complaints urged by the member for Kimberley regarding our Government here. As it is, there is not a large enough population in the North to enable that population to carry on a Government there. If the State were divided into smaller areas, sovereign rights would have to be handed over to each

of the new States and it would not be possible for the people there to finance their responsibilities.

The Premier: If the smaller States system were adopted here, each of the States would have to be given its sovereign rights.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It has to be realised that if a new State were created in the north, the people there would have to carry the responsibility for their portion of the expenditure and part of the loans raised by the State, not only on the population basis. If they did, they would not be able to meet their proportion of the annual expenditure.

Mr. Willecock: The trouble is the money is being spent in the metropolitan area.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not.

Mr. Willecock: Give us the return and let us see.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Money is being spent in the metropolitan area, but it is private money. The greater proportion of loan money has been spent in the country.

Mr. Underwood: What about the money we spent on the dock at Fremantle?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The money spent at Fremantle including the amount spent on the dock showed a profit to the State last year of £78,000. I think the people of Fremantle would be willing to take over the Fremantle harbour. If they once took it over, there would be no necessity to strike any municipal rates in the district.

Mr. Willecock: We have a harbour at Geraldton and more of the produce should go through it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have always avoided so far as possible setting one district against another. The more ports we get, the better it will be for the State. I do not care what port is improved or what harbour is extended.

Mr. Durack: You are a good fighter for Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If we had 50 new harbours, it would be so much the better for Fremantle. When in office I started the Geraldton harbour. The present Government stopped it. I assisted to improve the Albany harbour and started the Bunbury harbour extension. I mention this to show that I have never set one port against another.

Mr. Durack: You got a quid pro quo.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No matter where a harbour is built, Fremantle will benefit from it. If the Government are anxious to hand over public works to the local authorities, I would recommend the people of Fremantle to accept the responsibility for the harbour. We would not have to pay any rates afterwards. Paragraph 1 of the return asked for would involve considerable research by a special staff.

Mr. Durack: Those records should be kept.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think they are. It would be necessary for the Premier to go to England to ascertain from the naval authorities the cost of surveys in that part of the State.

Mr. Angelo: They were not paid for by the State.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: For years the State paid for such surveys, up to the time the Federal Government assumed responsibility. I believe there is a boat in the north now engaged on survey work. Paragraph 2 of the return would also present a difficulty. A staff would have to be employed to go back to the foundation of the State in order to ascertain those particulars.

Mr. Willcock: I think you will oppose the motion.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I shall oppose anything having for its object the dividing up of the State at the present time. We have suffered through being joined as one State with the rest of Australia and, if Western Australia were divided, we should suffer even more. The hon. member is not satisfied with the totals indicated in paragraphs 1 and 2, but wants them subdivided as mentioned in paragraph 3. He wants a kind of cheek, so that the north shall not pay threepence more than is due. He is anxious to have a subdivision of the State and another Government for the new State, but he wants to ensure that no charge is unfairly debited against the north. Paragraph 4 asks for the total revenue derived from all sources for the ten years ended the 30th June, 1921. It would be very difficult to obtain those particulars. Paragraph 6 asks for the particulars of upkeep, working expenses, cost of collection of revenue and all other revenue expenditure for the ten years. Why ten years? The rabbit-proof fence would come within that.

Mr. Underwood: No.

Mr. Willcock: Yes it would.

Mr. Marshall: It would not.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: See how anxious the hon. member is to exclude, from the amounts which the proposed new Government should bear, the expenditure made by the State out of loan moneys which the people of the north promised to pay in full! To my mind this shows clearly that the people of the north realise that they are not in a position to carry on as a new State. Apparently they are even afraid of the proposition. They have not the means with which to carry on.

Mr. Angelo: We shall be glad to give £2,000,000 to get away, besides all you have spent.

Hon. P. Collier: You have not paid for that rabbit-proof fence yet.

Mr. Angelo: We have kept up the contracts.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Have you? We shall see about that later on. If I were Premier, I would accept the offer of the member for Gascoyne—the two millions plus all expenditure—but I do not think the people of the north could raise the money. I fancy the hon. member would find out that in this, as in many other propositions he has placed before the House, a majority of the electors would be opposed to him.

Mr. Angelo: You are wrong there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I visited Carnarvon on one occasion and a gentleman there said "You must have some good jokes in the House with the member for Gascoyne, because we laugh at his propositions when we read about them."

Mr. Angelo: That was one of my opponents.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I replied, "It is the duty of the member for the district to try to represent his district in the best light possible, but we do not take all the member for Gascoyne says as gospel. We know that a lot of it is imaginary." I am afraid his offer of terms for separation would be like many other propositions he has brought forward. I have very great sympathy for the hon. member, because most of the propositions he brings forward turn out failures.

Mr. Angelo: Mention them.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The very latest settlement.

Mr. Angelo: That is all you know about it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I happen to know something about it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not aware that this is mentioned in the motion.

Hon. P. Collier: It is one of the aspects to be valued.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Government have gone to some expense to send officials up north to report on various matters. First they sent Mr. Moody, the horticultural expert.

Mr. Angelo: Did you read his report?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes. Then they sent the dairy expert and the irrigation expert; and another official was there during my visit. This expense comes within the 10 years. Some soldiers were sent up there and money was advanced to them.

The Premier: What about cotton?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I noticed that the cotton expert did not recommend Carnarvon for cotton growing.

Mr. Angelo: That is wrong. There are plots there now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The latest expenditure was in connection with soldier settlement, but I am told that the settlement has shifted from Carnarvon to Perth.

Mr. Angelo: You are absolutely wrong. One man came down, but the rest are there. You should keep to facts.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Before tea I was pointing out that there had been considerable State expenditure in the area to which the motion refers. The mover does not wish the expenditure to be divided in the return. In other words, the hon. member does not want a true statement of the money actually expended, because he puts a limitation on the expenditure. To my mind this shows clearly that the hon. member is not too anxious to get the return or to know what is the actual position from a financial point of view. He is, however, desirous of knowing what would

be the liability of a new State if one were created out of the northern portion of Western Australia. In fact, that is the hon. member's one anxiety. Let the House consider the position. We have in Western Australia at present a population of approximately 340,000. We have to meet all the expenses of government. I realise, and I believe those who have the interests of Western Australia at heart realise, that attempts are being made to take away our sovereign rights and by subdivision of the State to decrease the strength of Western Australia as a whole, in opposition to those who are endeavouring to deprive us of our sovereign rights. We are told that Australia would benefit considerably by a subdivision of the areas of the existing States. That may apply to some States with fairly large populations, but it cannot apply to a State like this, with a small population. In the case of Western Australia the tendency would be to place increased taxation, or shall I say increased hardships, on those who are left in the smaller State to carry on the government there. Costs which are to-day unnecessary would be rendered unavoidable by the creation of smaller States. In my opinion there is no difference whatever between a subdivision of existing States into smaller States, and unification as spoken of to-day. If action were taken for the purpose of subdividing an existing State into States possessing the same sovereign rights and powers as are given by our Constitution of to-day, the matter would have to be approved by the British Parliament. Unfortunately, those who have the strongest voice with the British Government, who have a preferential hearing from the British Government are the Commonwealth Government, and not any State Government. Once an attempt is made to bring before the British Parliament a proposal for the subdivision of Australian States into States of smaller area, the British Government, backed by whatever Federal Government, irrespective of political complexion, may happen to be in power, will bring into force in Australia a Constitution on the lines of the latest Federal Constitution granted in the British Empire—I refer to the South African Federal Constitution. South Africa has unification, and power there is in the hands of the Federal Parliament. The South African Federal Legislature has the power to legislate for the South African States. We can rest assured that very little difficulty would be experienced in inducing the British Government to grant to the Australian Federal authorities that which they have been aiming at for some considerable time. It is stated that the party with which I am connected are out for unification, but I have always said the opposite, maintaining that our party desires that the people should have what they want. The Labour Party want the people to understand thoroughly what the question of unification means. They want the people to realise that if there is to be subdivision of existing States there must be unification. There is another party saying that we want smaller States.

That party I describe as dishonest, as endeavouring to mislead and deceive the people and throw dust in their eyes. The party in question know very well that it is impossible to get smaller States with the same conditions as to sovereign rights existing to-day. Yet another party say, "We will have a convention." But that is only an apology for the other thing, only a set off. The member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) can bear me out that soon after the last Federal election it was stated by representatives of the Federal Government that the convention would mean the bringing about of unification. That was stated in London. It shows clearly that the party in question are not acting honestly by the people. Whether the Labour Party agree with unification or not, they recognise that it is a matter which will have to be carried out constitutionally, by submission to the people in a straightforward manner, and without the people being led astray by any other issue. In my personal opinion, the time has not yet arrived for altering existing conditions as regards Western Australia. We are making headway—slowly of course. At present our finances are in rather a bad way, but we hope by united efforts in this Parliament and in future Parliaments to overcome that difficulty. By a large increase of population, by settling the lands of this country, we shall overcome the difficulty without depriving ourselves of the territory which we now have the right to control. If this State is divided, neither portion can possibly be successful. But such a subdivision is the ultimate object of the motion. So far as I can gather, the mover's desire is to give effect to the wishes of a few of his electors—very few, I believe—to be placed in a position to know definitely how they will be affected financially by a subdivision of Western Australia.

Mr. Underwood: No; we want to get a fair deal.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not object at all to an inquiry directed towards that end. I quite agree if the desire is to ascertain whether the public money of this State is being fairly distributed. But the mover did not use that argument. He said in effect that he wanted the return for the purpose of enabling the North to realise its position in the event of a new State being created.

Mr. Durack: Did you read my speech?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I did; and the hon. member, very forcibly, quoted not only the letter which had been sent to him, but also our existing Constitution, and also the statements made when responsible government was granted to Western Australia. I do not think that the great majority of the people of Western Australia desire the subdivision of this State at the present juncture.

Mr. Willcock: Half the people of this State are in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Money: Local administration is necessary.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is local administration.

Mr. Money: Not enough.

Mr. Underwood: You ought to have a look at it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it is wrong, it is our fault. There is no doubt about that. I have never known in this Chamber any member to take action which would result in benefiting one part of the State at the expense of another. I have heard statements made that such has been done, but I do not know of a single instance.

Mr. Lutey: How about the Esperance railway?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The less said about that the better.

Mr. Willcock: You must say something about it sometimes.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I have heard it stated repeatedly that the metropolitan area has received the greater portion of loans raised for the development of the State, that more money has been spent in that area than it was entitled to. Hon. members know that is not true. The metropolitan area has not received one shilling above what it was entitled to. As a matter of fact, it has not received anything except what it contributed itself. The metropolitan area has been built up with private money. The same thing applies to all countries. It is easier to declare in favour of decentralisation than to actually carry it out. Decentralisation is a word that takes with people in the country, but the difficulty is to carry it into effect. We cannot alter human nature. When I came to Western Australia over 30 years ago Fremantle was the business port of the colony, and at the same time one could have fired a cannon along Hay-street Perth, without hitting anybody. Yet the seat of Government was in Perth and through that being so, it was made the central place to which people directed themselves. That is the position everywhere. It could not, however, be so in England, because it is merely a hop, step and a jump between one town and another. There the area is small, and it is occupied by millions of people. I remember reading a pamphlet published by Dr. Earle Page wherein he pointed out that we had six capitals in Australia in which the people were congregated. To get over that difficulty his idea was to create more capitals. Of course anything can be done with money, but we have not got it.

Mr. Underwood: The North is producing the money.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Only some of it. The North is producing a good deal of wool. But reverting to Dr. Page's pamphlet in which he advocated the establishment of more towns. I always understood that decentralisation meant the building up of the interior, and making it convenient for the people to get markets it is necessary to have as many seaports as possible. That would have the tendency of assisting in the development of the State. To create more Parliaments and

to provide for more Government officials and an increase in taxation will not help to develop the State. Unfortunately for Western Australia with its small population jealousies have sprung up between the towns. That accounts for some of the dissatisfaction.

Mr. Durack: Healthy rivalry, not jealousy.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not rivalry at all. Mr. Speaker, you have been in this House when the interests of a majority of the members have been in the metropolitan area. But never on any occasion have I known an instance where, to serve their private interests, those members voted against anything which would retard the development of the country.

Mr. Willcock: If the country was not developed those who were in the cities would soon go bung.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Exactly; they realise that the success of their private affairs and the property they hold in the metropolitan area depends entirely on the progress of the country. No one has anything to gain by doing anything to retard the development of any part of the State. I was talking to the Minister for Agriculture the other day about wheat and he said to me, "You raise more wheat in your electorate than is raised in any other part of the State." That is true, but the electorate I represent does not grow it. The wheat there is raised by machinery. If I, as member representing that district, had used my vote in any way to interfere with the development of the wheat-growing areas, the wheat referred to would never have been "raised" in my electorate. It is the action we have taken to assist in the development of the State as a whole, that has put us in the position to which the Minister referred. It is the only line of action one can take. It is all humbug when we hear people talk of members voting for decentralisation. All the talk in that direction is merely for the purpose of deluding the people who reside in the interior. It is the development of the whole State that builds up the metropolitan area. Without the development business would go down and we would all be in the bankruptcy court.

Mr. Teesdale: How do you explain the Albany business when the boats left there?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Because the shipping companies desired to go to Fremantle which was nearer the seat of Government.

Mr. Teesdale: It was hurtful to Albany.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That may have been so, but it could not be helped.

Mr. A. Thomson: Albany is in a better position than Fremantle, and yet the boats pass that port. Now the stuff is dragged away from there.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not.

Mr. A. Thomson: And you compel the people in the Katanning district to pay higher freights to Fremantle.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We do nothing of the kind. I repeat that the more ports we have opened up the better for Fremantle.

Mr. Harrison: Did the Manchester Ship Canal make a difference to Liverpool?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It might have done, but that does not impair my argument, which is, the more ports the better.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is repeating himself.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I supported harbour extensions and improvements at Albany, Bunbury and Geraldton because I realised that they were necessary to the advancement of the State. However, the subdivision of Western Australia at the present time would be prejudicial to the interests of the State, and would check that progress which we have been entering upon during the last two years.

Mr. Underwood: What progress? More people are going out of the State than are coming in.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not believe it.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is nonsense.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If it were so, we should not be short of house accommodation.

Mr. Willecock: But the statistician's figures prove it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It might be so for a brief period in the year, but generally speaking it cannot be. I do not believe it. Anyhow, I hope the motion will not be agreed to, especially in view of the admitted object with which it has been moved.

Mr. ANGELO (Gascoyne) [8.4]: On the 27th November, 1918, I moved for similar information to that now being sought by the member for Kimberley. My reason for doing so was in order to draw attention to the very valuable asset Western Australia has in its North-West. The chief opponent to my motion was, of course, the Colonial Treasurer. It is extraordinary that it should be again the Colonial Treasurer who opposes the granting of this information. I feel certain that both he and his predecessor have a very fair idea of the revenue derived from the North-West, and also of the comparatively small expenditure incurred in obtaining that revenue. It would probably astound the people of the State if they knew the wealth produced in the North-West. However, that motion of mine was carried on the voices, notwithstanding which the return has not yet been forthcoming. The reason given for the delay in the production of the return for which I moved four years ago has been that it would cost too much. I do not think that is the real reason. The Government are not too keen upon declaring what the North-West is doing for the State. Some of our richest towns in the South-West division have been built up by money made in the North-West. Narrogin, Katanning and other well known places are merely suburbs of Kimberley, Roebourne and Gascoyne. However, since my motion was carried, the Government have made an attempt to create a North-West Department, with a separate administration. Of course, we have not yet had very much time to show any great development.

Mr. Teesdale: Our Minister has too many billets.

Mr. ANGELO: Still, the separate administration is growing, and separate books will be kept for the North.

Mr. Underwood: Those in charge of the Department of the North could not keep anything, could not keep a fowl.

Mr. ANGELO: The creation of that new department—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion does not deal with the creation of a new department. The hon. member has not yet touched upon the motion.

Mr. ANGELO: I consider the creation of the new department the first step towards separation. Separation is necessary to the development of the North-West, and also to the keeping together of the Empire. Consider the position of Queensland. Queensland has a population of 680,000 as against our 6,000 in the North. We have not one per cent. of the population of Queensland. Why? Because developing and populating the North has been dependent on a Government domiciled in the South. They have not given us that administrative range necessary to the development of so huge a territory. We are closer than is Queensland to enormous markets in the Dutch Indies, our land is almost as good as that of Queensland, and still we have not one per cent. of the population of that State. The member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) declared that Western Australia has suffered through being joined with the other States. We in the North are suffering in the same way, because of our distance from the seat of Government in Perth.

Mr. Underwood: We are not suffering at all. We are all right.

Mr. ANGELO: It is impossible for six Ministers to develop Western Australia as a whole. Taking Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria as being about equal in area to Western Australia, Queensland has nine Ministers, New South Wales 12 and Victoria nine, or a total of 30 Ministers on that side of the Commonwealth as against our six. I admit that our population in the North is rather small on which to base a separate State. But when Queensland separated, her population was estimated at only 25,000. Two years later it had reached only 30,000. It is suggested that Western Australia should be divided into two, the line of demarcation being somewhat south of Geraldton. Already there are 16,000 people in that northern area.

Mr. Willecock: There are considerably over 20,000.

Mr. ANGELO: Then in all we have something like 30,000 people; that is, if the North-West be created one State instead of, as some suggest, two separate States.

Mr. Willecock: There are 17,000 people between Carnarvon and Geraldton.

Mr. ANGELO: Knowing the disadvantage under which we suffer by reason of lack of proper administration, we are beginning to think of setting up a separate State in the North. Before tea I was taken to task

for suggesting that it would pay us in the North to return to Western Australia the whole of the money expended up there and two million pounds to boot. That suggestion did not originate with me, but was made in the Assembly many years ago by a previous member for the North-West, then an Honorary Minister. I refer to Mr. Arthur Male. Members and Ministers alike display great want of sympathy with the North. How many Ministers know anything at all about the North? The Premier, with a political life of 20 years, touched the North on a flying visit last year for the first time. I am sure the Minister for Agriculture will take the earliest opportunity of visiting the North-West. On his return from Java the Minister for Mines had to call at Carnarvon, or he would not have known much about that place. If the north is to be properly administered from the south there must be a greater number of Ministers, so that some of them may know more about it. It is only during the last three months that I was fortunate enough to induce the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) to visit us for one day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion does not refer to that.

Mr. ANGELO: The hon. member says it is not advisable to split the State into two. This return is necessary in order to prove what steps should be taken towards attaining the object which 80 per cent. of the people of the north support, that is a separate State. Australia is importing annually about five million pounds worth of tropical goods, practically all of which can be produced in the North-West. Very little attention has been paid to that part of the State. The member for North-East Fremantle said that many of the things I advocated have not proved successful. He mentioned soldier settlement, and said that the soldiers who had been placed there had returned to Perth. That is incorrect. There are only three soldiers concerned. One returned to Perth because the climate did not suit him, and the other two are battling away and I am sure will prove successful. I urged the Government not to send an officer up there who was not experienced.

The Minister for Agriculture: Mr. Clifton was sent up there.

Mr. ANGELO: He is only the assistant irrigationist. He knows nothing more about tropical agriculture than about mining. I asked that he should be allowed to remain there for three months to advise the soldier settlers, but he left after a fortnight.

The Minister for Agriculture: There was nothing for him to do.

Mr. ANGELO: Although he had done nothing he asked to be returned in a fortnight. These men are now battling with a new proposition which they do not understand and should have guidance.

The Premier: Some said they knew all about it.

Mr. ANGELO: Others besides these two returned soldiers require expert advice. There are about 20 settlers concerned. Some four years ago I moved for a return but nothing more was heard of it. Possibly this motion will meet the same fate. If it is found to be too expensive to secure the information, the Premier can inform the House, and the matter can drop. If the return can be secured without much outlay the work should be done. Whilst it is being prepared perhaps the return I ask for could also be furnished with very little additional expense. I support the motion.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara) [8.20]: I do not know that the full information asked for can be obtained, especially with regard to the contributions from the north to the revenue of the State and the Commonwealth. The people in the north have contributed heavily to the Commonwealth revenue through alcohol and narcotics. Although we may not be able to get full information upon the subject it is desirable that the people of this State should have some knowledge as to the great wealth of the north. I am not speaking because I desire separation. If a motion to that effect was brought forward I would advise my electors to remain as they are.

Mr. Teesdale: You would never miss them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: Doubtless in the future there will be a northern State in Australia with a capital either at Darwin, Wyndham, or Napier-Broome Bay. Even with a capital at Darwin, I would advise my electors not to join in with any separate State. I pay no regard to the suggestion that there should be a capital at Geraldton. Perth is quite as close to Marble Bar as it is to Geraldton. Neither would I favour Albany as a capital. These towns could not find enough money to buy a suit of clothes for a sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. Willcock: We would do without one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: The object of the motion is to let the people know what wealth can be produced in the north. On that score it is worthy of consideration. Many people have accumulated wealth in the north and devoted it to development in the south. The firm with which the member for Kimberley (Mr. Duraek) is connected spent between £40,000 and £50,000 at Wagin in establishing a sheep farm. I suppose at least 100 people have expended anything from £10,000 to £50,000 of money they have made in the north in the development of the south. The proposed return cannot cover that expenditure. If the information is supplied, as far as it can be supplied, it may lead to the north receiving a better deal in the matter of expenditure from revenue. I do not say we are suffering up there, but we are endeavouring to point out to the people of the south what a good country ours is to put money into. The development of the north will greatly assist in the development of the

south. Of the revenue we have produced we have not had anything like our fair share of expenditure. The return should show how prolific of wealth the north is, and that it is worthy of infinitely more attention than it has received. Some attention has been paid to us. A Minister for the North-West has been appointed. I admit we are a simple people, but why he hooked himself on to us I do not know. I really cannot speak about the North-West department, because I shall break down and cry my eyes out. I trust the motion will be carried. The information that should be forthcoming will certainly tend to convince those people who have not seen the north how vast our wealth is.

Mr. WILLCOCK (Geraldton) [8.28]: Although I support the motion I can foresee some difficulty in obtaining the information. It may also be expensive to procure. I do not think the member for Kimberley desires to get the exact amounts under the various headings he mentioned. It should suit his requirements if the Premier detailed an officer of the Treasury, who understands the North-West and the finances of the State, to arrive at approximate figures.

The Premier: We could not supply the information as asked for.

Mr. WILLCOCK: All that is required is an approximate set of figures. There should be no difficulty in getting approximate information on the items referred to in the motion. No doubt the intention of the mover was to get some information bearing on the question of cutting up Western Australia into smaller States. We should not confine that consideration to the North-West, for there are other parts where expressions favourable to the smaller State movement have been received. Eventually we will have to cut up Western Australia into smaller States.

The Premier: Then how do you justify Federation?

Mr. WILLCOCK: The Commonwealth was brought into existence for purely national affairs. I admit that the Federal Government have overstepped the mark in various ways and instead of dealing only with national affairs, have interfered considerably with the State arena.

The Premier: Federation was a question of amalgamation. This is a question of separation.

Mr. WILLCOCK: The whole trouble with Federation is that it has gone beyond national affairs and it has dealt with avenues which should be preserved for the State. The smaller State movement had its genesis in New South Wales, where one portion, containing about 600,000 people, is desirous of separation from the rest of the State. In Western Australia we will not be in a corresponding position for many years to come. At the same time, we should know where we are and how much revenue is received, and, generally, be in possession of information under the various headings set out in the mo-

tion. At the conference held at Albury recently to consider the question of the smaller States movement, representatives from every part of Australia were present. At that gathering, the spade work was done, and it is necessary to have some authentic information and particulars on which to base arguments for or against the movement. Until we get that information, individual members cannot say whether they are in favour of the movement or not.

The Premier: Do you want it at Geraldton?

Mr. WILLCOCK: As the motion stands at present it does not affect Geraldton because the area covered is just south of Carnarvon. Before I conclude, however, I intend to move an amendment which will extend the scope of the motion to cover that part of the State of which Geraldton is the natural port. As to the question of population, we have almost as many people in the Geraldton areas to which I have referred as we had in Western Australia when responsible government was granted to us. The population in the northern districts is about 30,000, whereas the population of Western Australia at the time responsible government was granted, or at least 18 months subsequently, was only 48,000. As the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) pointed out, the population of Queensland, where the climate, soil and other characteristics are similar to the northern portion of Western Australia, was only 29,000 when self-government was granted to that part of Australia. If the people in those days could successfully carry out these responsibilities, surely it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that the people in the northern areas to-day can successfully achieve the same result here. It is necessary, however, that we should have information to guide us. If the Premier undertakes, the member for Kimberley agreeing to withdraw the motion, to employ an officer for two or three weeks to get an approximate idea regarding the several matters covered by the motion, nothing more will be required. For my part, I would have no objection to that course being adopted. I know we could be very flippant about the expenditure that is referred to, and argue as to whether the cost of investigations regarding cotton should be included in the return, and how much of the salary of an officer sent to Carnarvon to inquire into some matter should be debited to the North-West, and how much to the South-West. No doubt we can raise all sorts of difficulties, but if the Premier would realise the position and give the undertaking that I suggest, we could get over the difficulty. I move an amendment—

That in line 3 of Subclause 1, after "latitude," the following words be inserted: "and also that portion of the State enclosed by the 26th and 30th parallel of latitude and between the sea-coast and the 121st east parallel of longitude."

The amendment will extend over an area 100 miles north and south of Geraldton and extend inland for 400 miles. The population of that

part of the State is between 18,000 and 19,000.

The Premier: You should be merciful if you are strong.

Hon. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [8.40]: I support the amendment. Had it not been moved, I would have supported the motion. The only opposition to the motion is on the score of expense. The Premier holds it would be too costly to get the information desired by the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack). Are members of this House to be denied useful information that would be of value to many of us, on the score of the small expense involved? We might be influenced by that consideration if we thought that the Ministry of to-day looked at all transactions from the standpoint of the expense incurred. When we realise that Ministers themselves are not averse to incurring expense on account of jaunts to Melbourne and Sydney, throughout the country and all over Australia, one cannot understand the objection on the score of expense to the motion moved by the member for Kimberley. I have a recollection of Ministers who complain on the score of expense when a member moves for a return, who have never hesitated to attach a car or two cars to trains at considerable cost to the State. Yet when a return is asked for, the question of expense is raised! I know a Minister who travelled to the Eastern States and I doubt whether it was on State affairs, because he attended to private business in connection with the company he was interested in. I intend to make inquiries about that matter. I hold that members asking for information are entitled to have it furnished. It is important because members representing the North-West should know what the cost of works there has been, and what charges have been levied. It is a question of public business and is not brought forward out of mere curiosity. Members are entitled to the information and from that standpoint I support the motion. The member for Kimberley desires the information in connection with the new State movement. He said that the time had arrived for the formation of a new State and he dealt with the matter to some extent. The whole debate has hinged round the question of the possibility of a new State being created. If Western Australia is to be developed as it ought to be, the State must be divided. It cannot be successfully administered from the City of Perth. Had the original capital of Western Australia been situated at Broome, there would have been very little development in the South-West. The development would have been in the North; the South would have been neglected on account of its distance from the capital. The whole development of Australia has proceeded from the capitals, because the capitals, being the political centres, became the commercial and manufacturing centres, and the population congregated there and spread out from them. If Geraldton had been the capital of Western Australia the development in the vicinity of Geraldton would to-day have been

as great as it is in the South-West. If we had a population of 40,000 people in Geraldton to-day, the development of the Victoria district would have greater than the development in the districts around Perth, because the land is better. If we had a population of 40,000 people at Broome, the development of the Kimberleys would have proceeded apace. The only way in which Australia can be developed is by the establishment of governments at the ports, and from those centres the population will spread out and develop the country. Whether members living adjacent to Perth like it or not, this sort of thing will happen sooner or later. All this talk about the development of the North represents so much pretence and so many empty platitudes because the Government of Western Australia are not capable of developing even the South-West. They may spend a few pounds in the north in the creation of a settlement at Carnarvon, but it is bound to fail, because it is too far distant from the centre to be sympathetically administered. The Government may create departments in the North-West, but the North cannot be developed from Perth, because of the distance. For a population of a little over 300,000 people to talk about developing one-third of the continent of Australia is utterly ridiculous. The Government cannot give decent attention to the areas in close proximity to the capital. We in the Murchison district are as a voice crying in the wilderness. We get no consideration whatever from the Government. Yalgoo is at present experiencing the greatest mining revival of many years, and the Government have no knowledge of it. The Minister, when spoken to, said he thought the place was dead, asked what was doing and said he was glad to hear it. When Ministers visit these localities they leave again as soon as they can. Their itinerary is fixed and they must get away. Notwithstanding the remarks of the member for Pilbara, whose constituents are largely squatters able to live in Perth, the development of the greater part of the North can only take place by the formation of a new State and a new administration. The job of developing the South-West is too big for the present Government; they had better hand over the North to a Government who can encourage and direct its activities.

[The Deputy Speaker took the Chair.]

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [8.50]: I am sorry I cannot join with the member for Kimberley (Mr. Durack) in calling for this expensive return. I have carefully read the "Hansard" report of the hon. member's speech and I do not think he has given justification for the preparation of an expensive report, merely to support what is part and parcel of his platform, the new State movement. It is true, as the member for Mt. Magnet said, that this State is large and unwieldy, and the time will come when effect will be given to the provision in the Constitution permitting of the creation of smaller States. But to-day it would be impossible to find two

men in the public life of Australia who could agree on the manner in which Western Australia should be subdivided. If ever there was a legitimate claim for subdivision, it could be advanced by the Eastern goldfields. For the better part of a quarter of a century the Eastern goldfields have been denied their legitimate port and outlet and the means of communication to secure the essentials for the industry. The member for Kimberley said—

If this is so I think we are talking in platitudes when we talk of the great possibilities of the North-West. If this is true, we must pursue some other policy.

Surely the hon. member must know that one of the things operating against even the medium development of the North-West is our shockingly bad land policy.

Mr. Mann: What is wrong with it?

Mr. LAMBERT: It has almost as many faults as the hon. member; I do not think there is a good point about it. The Government some little time ago perpetuated a wrong by virtually alienating the pastoral leases for another 21 years. The time had then arrived to make a clear review of the land policy, but no regard was paid to that important matter. The sole desire was to rush through an amending Bill in order to hold up big areas amounting almost to principalities which might have been developed on better and more systematic lines. The member for Kimberley advanced very little argument in support of his request for a stocktaking of the North to demonstrate its potential wealth to the world. Members should have some regard for the cost of this return. If the new States movement had taken that practical turn which would call for a constitutional review of the governments of Australia, the hon. member would have been justified in asking for a stocktaking of the northern portion of this State. But he must know that British communities are slow to act, particularly when a constitutional change is involved. This is evidenced in our relationship to the Federal Government. We know the shocking anomalies existing under the Federal constitution to-day, but no matter what cries might emanate from the different State legislatures, the Commonwealth Government have remained deaf to the need for constitutional reform and have denied us that need of justice we as an autonomous State deserve. Those who have been in public life for any length of time know the sacrifices this State made in entering the Federation, and would be loth to take a step which would further jeopardise its interests. That our interests have been jeopardised by the creation of the Commonwealth is obvious to everyone. At present we have a Royal Commission endeavouring to demonstrate to the rest of Australia the sorry plight of this State as a result of Federation. The very existence of the Royal Commission shows that we realise our responsibility in the matter. We should first urge justice for the State of Western Australia. It is for us to show, not that it is

impossible to develop this State, but that we are not going to allow our territory to be bartered away as the Northern Territory was bartered away, merely to be controlled from the seat of the Federal Government. The member for Kimberley should realise that the new States movement is not yet within the sphere of practical politics. Having regard to the present financial position of the State, one ever-growing deficit and the need for money for developmental purposes, we have no money to spare for this object. I can understand the desire of the members for Geraldton and Mt. Magnet to have included on the return the portions of the State represented by them; but after calm reflection I think they will be convinced that no good purpose could be served by the Government committing the country to the big expenditure which would be necessary merely to show the amount of money expended by way of interest and sinking fund and the amount of revenue earned by the North. The motion is iron-bound in its terms. It calls for exact data. It asks for—

- (1) The value of all assets belonging to the State, in that portion of the State north of the 26th parallel of south latitude, standing in the Government records at the 30th June, 1921.

The member for Kimberley must recognise that that represents a colossal and expensive job.

- (2) The reserve by way of depreciation and sinking fund against the cost of those assets, if any, and the amount.

There is a portion of our sinking fund standing against those assets, and it would have to be carefully ascertained and accurately apportioned.

- (3) The amount of depreciation and sinking fund so provided for, if any, allowed for in valuation of assets as per No. 1.
- We know there is a sinking fund in connection with our loans.

- (4) The total revenue derived by the State from all sources in that portion of the State north of the 26th parallel of south latitude for the 10 years ended 30th June, 1921.

That, too, is a good big job, calling for much work and expense.

- (5) The revenue derived in the two years ended 30th June, 1921. (6) The cost of upkeep, working expenses, cost of collection of revenue, and all other revenue expenditure for the 10 years ended 30th June, 1921.

Hon. members will see that this is going to be a very extensive return. It is a return which can have no other purpose than to help the new States movement. I believe the member for Kimberley and the prime movers in that movement will get a rude shock when they learn the cost of administering our North, and the revenue derived from it. Seeing the great wealth which the North possesses, I think it would be regrettable to make the figures known, because it would open the eyes of the people to the backward

policy we have pursued since responsible government. If the blame could be laid at the door of successive Administrations, it would be a strong argument in favour of creating another State in that portion of Western Australia. With the mover and the member for Mt. Magnet I believe the time must come when this State will prove too unwieldy for administration from the present seat of Government. I would urge the member for Kimberley to accept the view that our first responsibility is to define the relationship between ourselves as an autonomous State, and the Commonwealth. This State cannot go on as at present, with the existing attitude of the Federal Government. There must be a clear revision of the Federal attitude towards the States, particularly as regards financial arrangements, if Western Australia is not to be forced by pecuniary considerations to bow to unification. I do not subscribe to many of the doctrines regarding unification which are enunciated throughout Australia. I believe that given proper stability, which the remoulding of the financial provisions of our Commonwealth Constitution should yield, we have here in Western Australia all the necessary elements for development. But while we are starved financially, this State cannot pursue a courageous path of development. Passing from that aspect, I would urge the member for Kimberley, if he really wants a reasonable return—to which I acknowledge North-Western members are entitled—he should ask for an approximate return of the assets of the North-West beyond a certain latitude, and figures of revenue and expenditure for the last 10 years, without going into details. Such a return would show that that portion of the State, as it is to-day, has the elements necessary for a separate autonomous State. Such a return would not involve the Government in a large expenditure. I do not believe the mover, even if he could, would force such an expenditure if it would serve no very practical purpose. I am with the mover in asking for an approximate return, giving the assets within £50,000 or £100,000, a margin which would make no difference from a practical standpoint. The return should also show revenue and expenditure for the last 10 years, by way of proving that even on that sparsely populated portion of Western Australia a claim exists for control by separate authority. I am sometimes astonished by the little regard some members exhibit for the expense involved when they ask for returns of this, that, and the other thing, almost of dog fights, in various parts of the State.

Mr. Pickering interjected.

Mr. LAMBERT: The hon. member interjecting has been prominent in demanding returns which served no other purpose than that of occupying a good big space in our morning newspaper.

Mr. Pickering: I do not think you are right in that.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not know that those returns have served any other purpose.

Mr. Pickering: That is some purpose, at all events.

Mr. LAMBERT: I would rather see the hon. member figuring in the newspaper than see some of the returns he calls for displayed there. Hon. members, in the exercise of their prerogative to call for returns, should have some regard for expense. There is much information I myself would like. I would be glad to have a return of the amount of money paid by the taxpayers on our Eastern Goldfields, portion of which I represent. I believe such a return would give the world striking testimony of the small proportion of money derived from that source which has been rightly and legitimately expended. I believe it would show that the Eastern Goldfields could righteously claim that the Government of this State have pursued a policy of treacherous centralisation, depriving the Eastern Goldfields of that communication the lack of which to-day is largely responsible for the decay in the mining industry which is so painfully evident. The member for Kimberley would get a good deal more consideration and sympathy if he would restrict himself to asking for a return which would serve all practical purposes, without involving such huge expense. If the Treasurer could endorse the statement that such a return would cost no great amount of money, I believe the motion would have the full backing of this Chamber.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremante) [9.14]: It is surprising how those who denounce parochialism, and complain of not getting fair treatment, are the very members to defend parochialism of their own and to ask for special consideration for their particular district. Why should the North-West or the Geraldton district be singled out for special consideration in the matter of returns beyond any other part of the State? I understand that the agitation for new States had its birth on the Eastern Goldfields many years ago.

Hon. T. Walker: The Eastern Goldfields were actually promised separation.

Mr. McCALLUM: According to the information I have, those who were then in authority here were told pretty plainly that if they did not advocate Federation, the Eastern Goldfields would be granted separation from Western Australia. That is how the agitation for the division of Western Australia was born. Now, what claim has the North-West for special consideration more than the Eastern Goldfields have? The Eastern Goldfields have done far more for Western Australia than the North-West has done. The opening up of this State, the placing of this State on its feet, everything that Western Australia has to-day, is due to the goldfields of Western Australia, the Eastern and Murchison goldfields. Yet those who are now speaking against parochialism and against centralisation are asking for something that is extremely parochial, something affecting their own particular districts.

Mr. Durack: Inquiring for information regarding a coastline of 1,500 miles can hardly be called parochial.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is parochial. Can any argument apply to the North-West that cannot be applied say, to the Eastern goldfields? Can any argument apply to the Eastern goldfields that cannot be applied, say, to Esperance and so on? I may want an inquiry in regard to Fremantle. Let us ascertain what Fremantle can show. Then there are Bunbury and Albany, and we may have inquiries into Collie and Esperance. Why have specially favoured consideration for a selected part of the State?

Mr. Durack: It is not parochialism by any means.

Mr. McCALLUM: If it is not, I fail to understand the meaning of the word.

Mr. Durack: It will embrace two-thirds of the State.

Mr. McCALLUM: The hon. member is asking for something for one part of the State which he is not prepared to grant to the remainder of the State. Why not include in the motion every part of the State? Why is it worded to cover two selected parts of the State? There is no case made out for the North-West that cannot be made out with ten times the force for the goldfields of Western Australia.

Mr. Willcock: You have to be parochial to get justice.

Mr. McCALLUM: I do not believe that at all. If the case is strong you can command a hearing, and if you have the force of argument behind you, you can demand that those in authority shall listen to your pleadings and give consideration to the arguments you advance. It will amount to absolute waste of public funds if we agree to the motion. Where will it lead us and what will come of it? This will involve the expenditure of £7,000 or £8,000 before it is completed. The hon. member wants a valuation made.

Mr. Durack: It started with £100; now it is getting up to thousands.

Mr. McCALLUM: It will cost over £100 to print the report.

The Premier: I said hundreds.

Mr. McCALLUM: How will the valuation be made? It will be necessary to get men to tour the country, and then ascertain what public funds have been spent and what have been collected. I do not think the hon. member has given the matter any consideration.

Mr. Durack: Are not records kept down here? Is there no book-keeping?

Mr. McCALLUM: The Premier has told us that the accounts are not separated. Does the member for Kimberley imagine that the Treasury books are marked in latitude and longitude? Does he think that the Treasury staff rule off their books according to the degrees of latitude and longitude? Even suppose it were possible to get the information the hon. member desires to have, what purpose would it serve?

Hon. T. Walker: That is the essential.

Mr. Willcock: It will show exactly where we are.

Mr. McCALLUM: The hon. member knows where we are.

Mr. Willcock: In the mud.

Mr. McCALLUM: Then this motion will not help the hon. member to get out of it.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: If you know you are in the mud what good will it do to let everybody else know?

Mr. McCALLUM: If there is an earnest desire for the division of the State into smaller States, it cannot end with this motion. We must go further and divide the State into areas having regard to community of interests. The whole proposal as it is is a farce, and I hope the House will not agree to either the motion or the amendment.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam—on amendment) [9.22]: I told the House that it would cost hundreds of pounds to prepare this return. Hon. members have spoken as if the mover of the motion had merely asked for a return showing the cost of public works. That is not so at all. A great deal of detailed information has been asked for quite apart from the cost of harbours, meat works, etc. The hon. member desires to be told just how much revenue has been paid into the Treasury by the people living in the northern part of the State.

Mr. Pickering: Cannot you get some information from the Customs?

The PREMIER: Perhaps the hon. member can tell me how much has been paid in stamp duties in that part of the State to date?

Mr. Pickering: It is not my business.

The PREMIER: Nor is it mine. The member for Kimberley wants details of the revenue derived from all sources.

Mr. Corboy: It is absolutely ridiculous. He cannot get it.

The PREMIER: Of course not.

Mr. Willcock: I said we wanted an approximate idea.

The PREMIER: It would be a much simpler matter, if it is desired to take over a large part of the territory of Western Australia, to pay 1s. 6d. an acre, as the North-West proportion of the public debt. Would the hon. member pay 1s. 6d. an acre in his district? The House, of course, is entitled to all the information it can get, but it is impossible to get the books kept in such a way as to separate all the areas and show the expenditure on the particular part of the territory at any particular time. The north cannot say it has been neglected. We have spent a great deal of money in building and improving harbours and in other works. It must be remembered too that the people in the north occupy large areas of land. The position is totally different from that in the South-West, because there are so few people in the north and they are able to secure large areas at a cheap price. You cannot expect to do in million-acre holdings what you do with 100-acre holdings. I daresay that when we get the cotton fields blooming up there, the country will grow apace and the position

will be changed. Then there may be small holdings. I hope the House will not order the return to be prepared in the form in which it has been asked. I am willing to give all reasonable information that can be given. I do not mind giving information if it is to be used against the arguments advanced for separation. Of course I do not know how the people will vote, remembering that the seat of Government is in Melbourne. The Federal Constitution is what the people vote for.

Mr. Willcock: But we did not expect them to butt into sixpenny picture shows.

Mr. Angelo: If we cut up Western Australia into smaller States we will have bigger representation in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Perhaps.

The PREMIER: The amendment wishes to rope in Geraldton in the statement of revenue and expenditure. Geraldton, I suppose, would be part of the new State and perhaps the capital, but I think we might leave it to the people who represent the North to declare where the capital is to be and then determine the area to be covered by these requests. The capital might be at Meekatharra, because Geraldton would be too far south. Moreover Geraldton is unprotected. I hope the House will not agree to the amendment.

Hon. T. WALKER (Kanowna) [9.30]: There seems to have been a want of thought in the compilation of this motion for a return.

Mr. Pickering: It is pretty full.

Hon. T. WALKER: It is not full at all. There have been indicated several ways in which it could be amended, particularly by the member for Geraldton (Mr. Willcock). This seems to be an all-round general proposition that would require a small army of geniuses to supply the requisite information. How lightly some members think of questions of this kind can be gathered from the statement of the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo), where he says, "Let us pass the motion and, if the Government find it is going to cost them a lot of money or it is very inconvenient to carry out, let them drop it." That is the serious view which some members take of their services in this Chamber, to pass something which entails an impossibility and, having passed it, leave it to the Government, and if the Government like to drop it, they can, and that will be all about it. That is playing with Parliamentary responsibility. If both the amendment and the motion were withdrawn and something framed on the lines suggested by the member for Geraldton, I could understand the Government agreeing to it; but as the motion stands it is absolutely impossible to supply the information. The hon. member knows that he himself is seeking in the North for assets which may be worth millions. He is a member of a company which believes the North has an undercurrent of oil, a little buried sea of that precious source of wealth. He is going to get that put down as an asset. There are, I have not the slightest doubt, immense min-

eral deposits in the North-West not yet touched, which cannot be estimated; yet they are assets of the State.

The Premier: Thousands of miles of mineral country.

Mr. Durack: We are speaking of tangible assets, not of imaginary assets.

Hon. T. WALKER: They are not imaginary; they are real; they are there. Is there one who can attest the value of the assets of the North-West as encountered by every fresh exploration? Every new investigation declares the North-West to be more and more valuable.

Mr. Durack: Then why don't we get more money to go on with it?

Hon. T. WALKER: Suppose the hon. member carried out his ideal to-morrow, drew a line from the Pacific Ocean to the border of South Australia and said, "All north of that shall be a new State," where is he to get immediately his money to run a country like that with the population that is in it at the present time? How is he going to run a State such as that under existing circumstances? Let us go carefully. Within the last 10 years the North-West has been most generously treated in proportion to the distributable wealth of the State. The State has focussed on the North-West.

Mr. Angelo: Not in proportion to what the State has got out of it.

Hon. T. WALKER: That may be, but then no part of the State has been treated in proportion to what has been got out of it. Have the goldfields been so treated? Of course not. They have had their share, and all the time the State has been focussed on the development of the North-West.

Mr. Durack: Do you call £20,000 for the development of the North a fair proportion?

Hon. T. WALKER: What is your population? The hon. member is representative of a class of settler that occupies areas for the breeding of cattle alone, areas which would be each a kingdom in Europe. He has made a fortune. He is only one. There are several who have become, not exactly millionaires, but close upon it by the bounteous wealth of the North-West. And he is not only greedy enough to pocket all the rich bounties of nature from there, but would come down to the Treasury and ask the Treasurer to empty its wealth into his pocket! These are the benefactors and patriots of Western Australia! That is what is wanted by these cattle kings who would settle the North-West, not with people, but with bullocks and cows.

Mr. Durack: Give us the money with which to try to settle it.

Hon. T. WALKER: Money, money, money, that is all he wants! Money, money, money! He has no bigger heart, no higher ideal than money. Yet the North-West has made his fortune. True, it is impossible to do all that any of us could wish for the North-West. There is no one in the Chamber but would desire to see the North-West flourish,

with large cities, not only on the coast but in the interior also.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. DURACK: Yet you object to the expenditure of £100 to produce a return!

Hon. T. WALKER: Because the hon. member does not ask for a return which is possible and reasonable. He asks for a return of the value of all the assets, including his cows unpaid for in the North-West, and the depreciation of all those assets. We have not yet ascertained for governmental purposes the real assets of the North-West. All I know is that many pastoralists of the North-West have prevented settlement; have absorbed the wealth of that territory and sought to keep it for themselves, to the exclusion of closer settlement and more industrial development. It is impossible to get this return. I would willingly support it. Nobody desires decentralisation more than I do, if it can be done, but I do not want impossibilities. I do not want to send the officers of the Government on a fool's errand. They could not get this information.

Mr. DURACK: Are there no records?

Hon. T. WALKER: Yes, but records that would not satisfy the hon. member, and would not obey this proposed order. It is impossible. Therefore I hope the House will reject both the amendment and the motion. Then, if at any time the member for Geraldton likes to put into phraseology the suggestion he has made for a return, I will support it.

Mr. CORBOY (Yilgarn) [9.40]: I oppose both the amendment and the motion. It is time a protest was entered against the habit of calling for returns with so little thought as has evidently been bestowed on the matter on this occasion. One moment's consideration of the form in which this motion has been submitted would have convinced the mover that it was impossible to supply the information asked for. If the information is desired for the purpose of furthering the movement for smaller States, some more laudable method of increasing interest in that movement could well have been adopted. On examination of the motion, I think the hon. member himself would admit it could have been drafted in a much more satisfactory way. First of all the hon. member desires to know the value of all assets belonging to the State north of the 26th parallel of south latitude, standing in the Government records on the 30th June, 1921. Only one meaning can be given to that. The motion says "all assets." In other words, the hon. member wants an investigation which will necessitate assessing the value of, and recording and putting up in the form of a return, every little tinpot building in the North-West belonging to the Government, every road and little jetty, every light-keeper's dinghy. Every asset of the Government has to be set down in a return. I wonder that any member should have the temerity to ask

for the expenditure of State moneys and the time of State servants in getting out such a return. Later in the motion we find, "The total revenue derived by the State from all sources in that portion of the State north of the 26th parallel of south latitude for the 10 years ended 30th June, 1921." I wonder did the hon. member consider what he was asking for when he framed that motion? I put it seriously to him, that it is quite evident it would be impossible for either the Government or any private business concern operating on similar lines, to give that information. Does the hon. member think, for instance, that the Taxation Department keeps a separate set of records for every district in the State, and especially for those north of the 26th parallel of south latitude? Does the hon. member think all the fees collected by the police in the North have been kept separately in the records of the Police Department and of the Treasury during the period mentioned in the motion? I put it to the hon. member, that what he is asking for is exactly similar to my asking him for a return showing the amount he has derived from every separate sheep in his flocks.

Mr. DURACK: I could give it as from every separate station.

Mr. CORBOY: No doubt, and the Commonwealth could give the amount derived from every State, which is a parallel. The hon. member complains that we refuse him £100 for the purpose of getting out this return. I state quite seriously that, from my association with the Government departments, it would cost—

Mr. TEESDALE: It has cost nearly that in talk already.

Mr. CORBOY: I am sure the money would have been well spent had we had, from the hon. member who interjected, a contribution to the debate. All the wealth possessed by the hon. member would not pay for getting out this return, let alone the miserable hundred pounds that has been mentioned.

Mr. DURACK: You know more about this than does the Premier.

Mr. CORBOY: I may be repeating what the Premier said.

Mr. DURACK: It will cost only a hundred pounds or so.

Mr. CORBOY: On reflection the hon. member will admit that it is impossible to obtain the amount of revenue received during the past 10 years from any particular part of the State.

Mr. DURACK: Apparently that is so.

Mr. CORBOY: If it were otherwise, the hon. member and his colleagues would be the first to complain about the increase in the number of civil servants. Only to-day a member has asked for the number of civil servants employed in a particular part of Western Australia. Members are continually cavilling at the number of people employed by the State. If information such as this had to be kept by Government officers, it would need three-quarters of the

population of the State to do the work. If the information could be obtained, the cost of getting it would outweigh its value. Those who are sponsoring the new States movement must have a very weak case, and very little faith in it, when they ask for such paltry information as this.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle—on amendment) [9.47]: The amendment extends the scope of this motion from the 26th latitude to the 30th latitude, and also to the 121st longitude. I do not know why the whole of the State was not embraced. Members would then only need to refer to the returns that are published and audited in order to obtain the information they require. What have the people of Bulla Bulling to do with the people of Broome or Derby in respect to the formation of a new State. The amendment almost includes Menzies. What connection is there between that town and the far north? It only serves to show what a difference of opinion there would be even if it were considered necessary to divide Western Australia into smaller States. Some would want the Eastern Goldfields tacked on to Broome, and others on to Esperance, whilst the greatest number would want the goldfields tacked on to Fremantle. There is nothing in the motion to guide any officer in preparing a return that would be of any interest to those who are advocating the redivision of Western Australia into smaller States.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is now discussing the amendment.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The amendment proposes to extend the area embraced by the motion, in order that there may be an expression of opinion from the other parts of the State to be included. Why should Geraldton be included with Menzies?

Mr. Willecock: The development of the State should have been carried out along that line.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Many of these railways that are covered by the amendment are not as satisfactory to the State as they might have been. In the first place we must be unanimous in regard to the redivision of the State. Secondly, we must see that there is a sufficient number of people in each area. The wealth that is contained in the additional areas will not strengthen the case of the advocates for a new State as proposed by the motion. We all hope that oil will be discovered between latitudes 26 and 30, and if it is discovered, the whole State should receive the benefit. The gold production embraced by the original area will not greatly add to the wealth of the additional area. The amendment will make the position more difficult than it was before. Doubtless the time will come when the State is divided into two or more parts, but we are not ripe for that yet. I see no necessity for the amendment. At any rate, the period mentioned in the

motion will not represent a fair view of the case. Since 1914 the whole world has suffered as a result of the war, and is still suffering. Very little money has been expended in these areas, nor has it been available for that purpose. I trust the amendment will not be carried.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [10.0]: I did not know this motion would cover so wide a range of subjects. I had intended to move an amendment to make it apply to the 34th parallel, but that would include the whole State and I thought it would be out of order. There are only two arguments in favour of the motion, firstly on the smaller States issue, and secondly on the question whether sufficient money has been spent in the north compared with the revenue collected therefrom. I have always opposed the smaller States movement. The lessons we have learned from Federation are such as to discourage Western Australia from doing anything that will bring about a worse position of affairs than exists to-day. There is no doubt that Western Australia has suffered considerably since entering Federation. That position will be aggravated by the smaller States movement.

Mr. Johnston: We might get more representation in the Federal Parliament.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: You might not.

Mr. PICKERING: Through unification, we would lose the sovereign rights the State possesses at present, and rights which Western Australia holds dear indeed. I oppose the motion on that ground.

Mr. Johnston: Then you are opposing Dr. Earle Page.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not care whether I am opposing Earle Page or any other page. I am satisfied the interests of Western Australia will be better served by retaining our present boundaries. We have more dignity in the Federal Parliament now, than would be possible if the State were divided into six smaller States as suggested by Dr. Page. Under such conditions that would be the end of Western Australia as a State and the interests which we hold so dear would be sacrificed. As to the reason advanced that we have not spent as much money in the North-West as we should have done—

The Minister for Agriculture: That applies to Busselton too.

Mr. PICKERING: It applies to every part of the State, except the metropolitan area.

Mr. Johnston: We have all been exploited.

Mr. PICKERING: There is no doubt about that. The arguments used by the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) astounded me, particularly when I heard him dilate upon expenditure that had been incurred in the country at the expense of the metropolitan area. To use a vulgarism, I was "flabbergasted" when I heard him making those references.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not say it: as at the expense of the metropolitan area.

Mr. PICKERING: When we consider that the money spent in developing the State, including the goldfields areas, has been spent in the interests of the metropolitan area, his attitude is astounding.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We have been making sacrifices for you.

Mr. PICKERING: I should have thought that the member for North-East Fremantle at least would recognise that the vast sums of money spent in connection with the ramifications of the railway system have been spent with the object of attracting everything that the State produces to the port of Fremantle, where the greatest benefit has been gained as the result of this lavish expenditure in Western Australia.

Mr. Munsie: Do not railways go to Bunbury and Albany?

Hon. W. C. Angwin: And Busselton?

Mr. PICKERING: There were port-to-port rates, which benefited the outer parts considerably. Those rates have been taken away, however.

Mr. Munsie: Why do you stick to the Government that took them away? You must have believed in them, if you still support the Government.

Mr. PICKERING: I do not know that it was this Government. I am under the impression that it was the Labour Government who took them away.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, it was not. It was done at the request of other ports to stop the shipping going there.

Mr. Johnston: This return will solve that problem.

Mr. PICKERING: Not so far as the port of Busselton is concerned. Bunbury, I know, has suffered from this aspect too. I can understand the member for North-East Fremantle opposing anything that will interfere with the interests of the port of Fremantle. I object to the return which is called for, because it covers many aspects which it will be quite impossible for the Government to furnish. I trust that everything will be done to conserve the interests of the State as it is to-day and that no return which will assist in the movement indicated by the member for Kimberley, will be forthcoming.

Mr. DURACK (Kimberley—in reply) [10.6]: I had no conception when I introduced the simple motion for a return that the discussion of it would occupy so much time. I am surprised at the attitude adopted by some hon. members, particularly the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker.) His remarks to-night have entirely exemplified the truth of the statement in the telegram which was addressed to the smaller States conference at Albany, wherein it was pointed out that the people in the South had no conception of the difficulties under which we are suffering in the North.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Is the hon. member quoting from "Hansard" of the present session?

Mr. DURACK: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then he is out of order.

Mr. DURACK: My attention has been drawn to the fact that the people in the South do not appreciate our difficulties in the North and that has been exemplified to-night because the objections to the motion have come mostly from southern members. I regret that the Premier has not been able to accede to the request for the return. I did not think there would be much difficulty in getting the figures. I am glad to know that I am borne out in that impression by the member for Kanowna who practically said that the figures were available and that they could be procured without any difficulty in some shape or form. I have no desire to cross swords with the member for Kanowna, but I am astounded at the volte face he has taken to-night, compared with his attitude in November, 1918, when he spoke regarding a motion moved by the member for Gascoyne (Mr. Angelo) along similar lines. I would like to read the remarks of the member for Kanowna in reply to the contributions put up by the member for Gascoyne on that occasion. The speech by the hon. member was rather lengthy and it was an eloquent address in emphasising the necessity for getting information such as that I have asked for in the return. He said in the course of his speech—

Our whole State must be developed. It is purely with a view to that development that attention is necessary to make the North-West a component part of Western Australia, and not an associated section which might well be separated from us without causing a heart's pang to those who live here.

Hon. T. Walker: I agree with that still. It is you who are trying to isolate the North-West.

Mr. DURACK: Again the member for Kanowna said—

I cannot conceive that we have not available upon the books of the State, at the present time, most of this information in one form or another. Possibly a collation of figures may be required, and a little attention to tabulation; but we have, I think within comparatively easy access, most of the information that is desired.

Hon. T. Walker: That is not your question to-night.

Mr. DURACK: How does the member for Kanowna make his statements in 1918 square with those he has given utterance to-night? Then he goes on—

The collection of it may cost a little, but I venture to think that if we get that information, it will be well worth the money we shall have spent in obtaining it. Expense is not going to exhaust the Treasury. The information I venture to affirm will be an eye opener to the whole of our Commonwealth.

Yet to-night he said that he did not favour the expenditure which was involved in getting out this return!

Hon. T. Walker: I never mentioned expenditure.

Mr. DURACK: In 1918 the member for Kanowna said that this information would provide an eye opener for the whole of the Commonwealth. He said—

It will turn to our North-West, to that great country now practically lying idle, or given over to cattle and sheep and the wilderness, the eyes of all those who have an enterprising spirit within them at all. This return calls for information that was practically covered in the motion which the member for Kanowna so eloquently supported on the occasion I refer to.

Hon. T. Walker: I endorse those remarks to-night. There is nothing there that relates to your return!

Mr. DURACK: The Colonial Treasurer on that occasion, as the present Colonial Treasurer does now, put up an objection that if the return served to attain the object of the mover, he would be quite willing to agree to it but he did not think it would do so. On that occasion the member for Kanowna interjected—

I think the return would be extremely valuable to every citizen of this State, and, indeed, to every citizen of the Commonwealth.

Yet the member for Kanowna says to-night that no good purpose would be served by furnishing the return. In 1918, the Colonial Treasurer, interjecting when the member for Kanowna was speaking, said—

My view is that this return would not give the hon. member what he wants, namely, an advertisement for the North-West.

Hon. T. Walker: It might not give everything that is necessary.

Mr. DURACK: That was the hon member's attitude then.

Hon. T. Walker: It shows I am still the friend of the North-West.

Mr. DURACK: To-night the member for Kanowna opposes the motion.

Hon. T. Walker: I am the friend of the State and I do not want to see the State split up.

Mr. DURACK: The member for Gascoyne interjected at the same time—

We practically want a balance-sheet of the North-West.

The Colonial Treasurer: A balance-sheet of what the State has spent and what it has received.

Later on the Colonial Treasurer interjected—

I am afraid that under this motion you would not get what you desire and what I desire.

Hon. T. Walker: One can, of course, spoil any motion. Apparently what is now needed is to make the motion say what is required. Let us make it clear that we want to know the exact state of the North-West.

That is what we want to know now. I regret that the member for Kanowna has altered his views regarding this question.

Hon. T. Walker: I have not altered my views at all.

Mr. DURACK: Probably the member for Kanowna forgets. We cannot stand still; we change with the times.

Hon. T. Walker: This is not a question of a change at all. If the member for Kimberley will permit me to say so, if he puts his request in the language suggested by the member for Geraldton, he will get my support. As it is, the motion is a silly one and an impossible one.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I think that is an offensive remark.

Mr. DURACK: I do not wish to stress this matter, but I could not help drawing attention to the emphatic support the member for Kanowna gave to this similar proposal in 1918 and contrast that with his attitude to-night. He concluded his remarks by saying—

I think the request should be granted because we are not doing ourselves justice as a State if we do not try to develop simultaneously every portion of it in the North-West and in the South.

Nothing more should be necessary in support of the motion. The Premier has said that the return would be costly. The sum was set down at a hundred or a couple of hundred pounds. I was surprised that on the score of a nominal sum of £100 or £200, any objection should have been taken at all.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: The Premier said hundreds.

Mr. DURACK: Well, say hundreds. I do not think members have any conception of the wealth of the North. I am getting rather tired of hearing about the greatness of the North. I admit it has all the possibilities of becoming a very great country, but it is not great except in its area. The population is limited. We have a smaller population to-day north of about Hedland than we had 25 years ago. If the North is great, let us, for goodness sake, make it great not only in name, but in reality. Establish the greatness in fact.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: We cannot do that unless we subdivide the land.

Mr. DURACK: The question of the division of the State and our position with regard to the Commonwealth has been raised. I am not going to be drawn into that. It is a question for future consideration. Quite likely we shall have to consider it later on. Perhaps I might have been induced to move this motion by the fact that the question of the division of States was in the air. I am not committed to a division of the State, and I am not to be drawn into that question at this moment.

Mr. Lutey: You were rather emphatic about it in moving the motion.

Mr. DURACK: No, I said the question was in the air. I am not committing myself now, but I shall go so far as to say that I think it an inevitable movement and a consequence which will follow. The Leader of the Opposition said he thought that the cost of getting out the return would exceed the revenue received during the last 10 years. I know he was not speaking seriously, but I venture to say he has no conception of the

wealth that is in the North. The other day I asked the Customs Department to supply me with the figures relating to the trade of Broome. I took out the figures appearing in our statistical records for the years 1906 to 1921, but I need not dwell upon them beyond saying that, with the exception of the one year, 1916, when Geraldton showed a great improvement, in every instance Broome ranked third amongst all the ports of our coast. It comes after Fremantle and Perth. I would like to quote some of the figures that members might realise the importance of the trade of Broome, and I shall quote the three years immediately prior to the outbreak of the war. In 1911 the imports into Broome were valued at £54,315 and the exports out of Broome at £220,878; the total trade was £275,193, and the excess of exports over imports, which of course is a great factor in considering the value of any country, was £166,563. The amount directly collected by the Customs for that year, not taking into consideration goods purchased in Perth and Fremantle, was £19,089. I ask members to dwell upon that. In 1912 the figures were: Imports £46,230; exports £229,804; total trade £276,034; excess of exports over imports £183,574; direct customs collected for the year £17,683. The figures for 1913 were: Imports £63,241; exports £249,891; total trade £313,132; excess of exports over imports £186,650; customs duties collected £18,957. The customs collections of Broome rank third amongst the 12 or 14 coastal ports of the State, and yet the member for Kanoona said we have been liberally treated by the Government in having been given a development vote of £20,000.

Mr. Munsie: That was contributed to the Federal Government and not to the State.

Mr. DURACK: I am aware of that. With regard to the development of the North, I had from an ex-Treasurer in 1902—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should have used that information in moving his motion. He can now reply only to the arguments advanced against the motion.

Mr. DURACK: One of the arguments against the motion was that the amount of revenue which the Government were receiving from the North would not compensate for the cost of compiling the return. I think I am right in replying to that.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That money does not come to the State.

Mr. DURACK: The Premier has told us that it would be impossible to get out these figures, but I have before me some figures prepared by the former Under-Treasurer, who made no mention of any difficulty with respect to getting them out. The Under-Treasurer had prepared certain returns, but owing to the urgency of other business, including the Budget, it appears he had to lay the work aside. Apparently it was laid aside, as is done with all matters concerning the North, and will not be worried about further. The Under-Treasurer did not imply that it was impossible to get out the figures. I have no desire to worry the House by reading

those figures, but I would like to call attention to some of them by way of reply to those who maintain that the cost of the return would exceed the revenue derived from the North. The wool clip for the ten years preceding 1920 represented £15,000,000, the gold yield about £680,000, the pearl shell production £2,047,000, pearls about £500,000, and sandalwood £2,827,000. Yet we are told that the revenue derived from the North would not cover the expense of compiling this return. I am absolutely astounded that such a statement should be made. I hope these figures will convey some information to members, and that they will not take exception to my very modest request. I limited my request to a period of ten years. The member for North-East Fremantle hinted at some desire on the part of the people of the North to evade their responsibilities by my asking for only 10 years. There is no intention of doing so. I restricted my request to ten years because I took it for granted that interest and sinking fund should have provided for cost for any period in excess of that. In the ten years prior to 1920 the Government spent on buildings, hospitals, schools, police quarters and the Wyndham Meat Works, but exclusive of jetties, a sum of £1,230,304. Remembering that that expenditure covers a period of ten years, members must admit that it is a pretty modest sum as far as expenditure goes.

Mr. Munsie: That does not include wells.

Mr. DURACK: No. Many of the departments up there are self-supporting. The member for Yilgarn said it was impossible to get a return relating to the amount derived from the taxation of pastoralists. The Under-Treasurer's figures show that the income of pastoralists and graziers liable for income tax in 1918 was £1,082,306. Evidently there was not much difficulty about getting those figures. Yet every member who has opposed the motion has stressed the serious difficulty of compiling this return.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: That does not mean the North-West only, does it?

Mr. DURACK: It specifically states the North-West. The Lands Department have collected from pastoral lessees a sum of £731,900, and the Under-Treasurer remarked, "I think it would be a safe estimate that £1,000,000 profits are annually derived by persons and companies from the North-West."

The Premier: That is only an estimate.

Mr. DURACK: I had no idea my motion would be opposed on the ground that it was impossible to get the information. I think that the Government need only to follow up the information which already exists in the department. It might be difficult to get the exact figures, but I have no desire for the exact figures. I want some approximation in order that we might know where we stand. It is believed—I do not say it is so—that we are not getting a fair return for the revenue being derived from that country. The member for North-East Fremantle said he would have been able to understand my request if

it had been confined to that alone. Surely the hon. member did not mean that! If he had read my remarks in speaking on the motion he would have seen.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member proposing to refer to "Hansard" of this session?

Mr. DURACK: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: He cannot do so.

Mr. DURACK: When we have wanted money we have always been met with the reply that it was not available. There is a feeling abroad that we are not having that amount of money spent in the north to which we are entitled. I only wish on behalf of the people there to find out what our position is. I am repeatedly asked for information of this nature, but am not able to supply it. This is the first time I have asked for such a return, and I am very much in earnest about it. The late Treasurer said in 1902, when money was just as tight as it is now—

The Premier: It was very plentiful then.

Mr. DURACK: Said that he was prepared to spend half a million of money in developing the North-West. I understand that the Minister for Works—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not replying to arguments advanced during the debate, but is breaking new ground. No hon. member can reply to him, and it is not fair to them.

Mr. DURACK: The member for North-East Fremantle implied that we were throwing dust in the eyes of the people.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: I did not refer to members representing the north, but to political parties.

Mr. DURACK: We have no desire to throw dust in anyone's eyes. I must of course abide by the decision of the House. The Government should certainly give us more consideration than we have hitherto received. I do not object to the amendment moved by the member for Geraldton, nor am I anxious for accurate figures, or information in great detail. I hope the Premier will be able to supply the information asked for if only in an approximate way.

The Premier: We can give you estimates. Amendment put and negatived.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	13
Noes	17

Majority against .. 4

AYES.

Mr. Angelo	Mr. Pleasse
Mr. Cheeson	Mr. Teesdale
Mr. Durack	Mr. A. Thomson
Mr. Harrison	Mr. Troy
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Willcock
Mr. Lutey	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Marshall	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McCallum
Mr. Corboy	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Denton	Mr. Money
Mr. George	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Hickmott	Mr. Pickering
Mr. Lambert	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Latham	Mr. Sampson
Mr. H. K. Maley	Mr. Munste
Mr. Mason	(Teller.)

Question thus negatived.

BILL—LIGHT AND AIR ACT AMENDMENT.

Council's Message.

Message received from the Council notifying that it had agreed to the Assembly's amendment subject to a modification.

House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 9th November, 1922.

Question: Public Works Department, Estimates	Page 1472
Bill: Closer Settlement, 2A., Point of Order	1472

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

QUESTION—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, ESTIMATES.

Hon. G. W. MILES asked the Minister for Education: Having regard to the discrepancies shown between the Public Works estimates and the actual cost of the Herdsman's Lake drainage scheme and the Beacon Point jetty, as set out in reply to my questions of yesterday, 1, Will the Government at once take steps to reorganise the Public Works Department? 2, Will the Government in future call for tenders for all public works costing over £1,000?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, Steps have been taken to prevent the recurrence of such discrepancies. 2, Yes, wherever practicable.

BILL—CLOSER SETTLEMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [4.37] in mov-