

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 29th November, 1932.

	PAGE.
Question: Water supply, Wadderin	2036
Standing Orders amendment, report of Committee	2036
Personal explanation, Minister for Lands	2036
Messages from Lieut-Governor	2038
Bills: Sale of Wheat	2037
Brands Act Amendment, 3a.	2037
Financial Emergency Act Continuance, 3a.	2038
Health Act Amendment, as to recommitment.	
Standing Orders suspension, 3a.	2036, 2041
Traffic Act Amendment, returned	2041
Tenants, Purchasers, and Mortgagees' Act	
Amendment (No. 1), returned	2041
Swan Land Revesting, returned	2041
Loan, £2,176,000, all stages	2075
Appropriation, all stages	2076
Loan Estimates	2041

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

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, WADDERIN.

Mr. J. I. MANN asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many farms are served by the Wadderin water scheme and what is their acreage? 2, What is the amount of rates paid? 3, What is the amount of rates due? 4, What is the total amount of water used (a) on farms, (b) on town property? 5, What is the total cost of construction? 6, What is the annual cost of upkeep, interest, and sinking fund?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, (a) Number of holdings, 94; (b) acreage rated, 111,305. 2, Paid to the 30th June, 1932, £6,217. 3, Due on the 30th June, 1932, £6,851. 4, (a) 10,877,000 gallons; (b) 3,546,000 gallons (town and railways). 5, £65,819, including £36,720 cost of head works on which interest and sinking fund is not charged. 6, Totals—1st July, 1927, to 30th June, 1932:—Operating expenses, £2,644; interest, £5,266; sinking fund, £1,909; total, £9,819. In addition there is an annual expenditure of £2,754 paid by the State, representing interest and sinking fund on the cost of head works.

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT.

Report of Committee.

Mr. Richardson presented the report of the Standing Orders Committee.

Ordered: That the report be received and read.

Report stated—

Your Committee has the honour to report that it met on Thursday last to consider further amendments to the Standing Orders. Besides making amendments, your Committee has approved of the alteration of the practice in regard to the introduction, first and third readings of Bills. In the future, Mr. Speaker will, instead of calling upon a Minister (or member) moving for leave to introduce a Bill to move his motion, himself put that question to the House, also the subsequent question "That the Bill be now read a first time." The Minister, in whose name the motion appears on the Notice Paper, will, if the motion for first reading be opposed, have the right to speak in support of the motion. After the motion for first reading has been agreed to, the Minister (or member) shall move the motion "That the Bill be printed and the second reading made an Order of the Day (for a subsequent day)." On the Order of the Day for the third reading being called upon, Mr. Speaker will, in like manner, put the question "That the Bill be now read a third time," without a motion from the Minister (or member) in charge of the Bill. This will, of course, be governed by the fact that no notice has been given of the recommitment of the Bill. The Committee recommend to the House a small amendment of Standing Order 107 to provide that, instead of questions to Ministers being read aloud by the member in his place, they shall be handed to the Clerk at the Table. At the sitting to which the question has been set down, Mr. Speaker will call directly upon the Minister to answer the question. This will obviate the practice of Mr. Speaker calling first upon the member in whose name the question appears. Other amendments are suggested that, it is hoped, will bring the Standing Orders more up to date, by the deletion of some, and the amendment of others, that have never been given effect to since their adoption in 1891.—Sydney Stubbs, Chairman.

Ordered: That the report be printed and its consideration made an Order of the Day for the next sitting.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Minister for Lands and the Imperial Government.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.36]: On the 1st November when I was speaking on the Land Estimates, in reply to an interjection by the member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy). I stated that the Imperial Government did not make any contribution towards the Fairbridge Farm School. I find that my statement was incorrect, seeing that the Imperial Government pay 5s. a head up to 350 children per annum. The Commonwealth

Government and the State Government each pay 3s. 6d. per head up to a maximum of 300 children. In addition to that, so I am informed by the British representative of the Imperial Government, Britain contributed £5,000 towards the capital cost of establishing the farm school and a further £20,000 from another special fund as well. I desire to make that explanation in fairness to the Imperial Government.

Hon. P. Collier: I did not know those facts, either.

BILL—SALE OF WHEAT.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands and read a first time.

BILL—BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Third Reading.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE

(Hon. P. D. Ferguson—Irwin-Moore) [4.39]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. COVERLEY (Kimberley) [4.40]:

I was unavoidably absent during the progress of the Committee stage when the Bill was under discussion, and I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for Agriculture for postponing the third reading in order to provide me with an opportunity to refer to one particular clause. Paragraph (c) of Clause 5 introduces a new principle regarding the earmarking of cattle. In the original Act no such provision appears, although the earmarking of sheep is dealt with. If the clause is persisted in, it will impose a hardship on the pastoralists, particularly those in the North-Western and Northern parts of the State. The pastoralists there deal in cattle only. In the original Act, certain appliances are specified for use in earmarking sheep, but the provision does not apply to the earmarking of cattle. If paragraph (c) of Clause 5 is agreed to, it will mean that pliers will have to be used for earmarking cattle, and the marks are to be of the specified size, namely, not to exceed one inch in length and five-eighths of an inch in width. If the Government persist with that proposal, it will mean that the pastoralists in the North as well as in the South-West, will be forced to purchase pliers for the earmarking of cattle. Growers

can ill afford to go to that expense at the present time and the Government are not justified in imposing any further pecuniary hardship on the pastoralists, particularly when we consider the hard times they are experiencing and the low prices obtained for cattle. The bulk of the earmarking of cattle is done with a knife, which is permissible in accordance with the parent Act. If the Bill be passed in its present form, that practice will be illegal.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is at the present time.

Mr. COVERLEY: I cannot find anything to that effect in the Act. There is a provision applying to sheep, but there is nothing in the Act to compel pliers to be used for the earmarking of cattle.

The Minister for Agriculture: Have you read the amending Act of 1907?

Mr. COVERLEY: Yes, I have it before me and I cannot see anything in it that applies to the earmarking of cattle with pliers. If that is the law to-day, it is not observed, because no pastoralist uses pliers for the earmarking of cattle. It is done by aborigines with their pocket knives. If the Government attempt to enforce aborigines to earmark cattle to the size specified in the Bill, I am afraid a great many people will be summoned under the provisions of this legislation.

Mr. Hegney: Don't they use their teeth?

Mr. COVERLEY: Very few aborigines would have sufficient intelligence to enable them to confine the earmarking to the size specified in the Bill. One cut might be all right, but the next cut might be twice the stipulated size. The Minister would be well advised to recommit the Bill and delete paragraph (c) of Clause 5.

MR. CHURCH (Roebourne) [4.42]: I do not wish to say much on the question raised by the member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley). Very many pastoralists have used pliers alone for the earmarking of cattle for years passed. I have done so for the last 30 years.

Mr. Coverley: You have no cattle, but only half a dozen milking cows! What are you talking about?

Mr. CHURCH: The use of pliers represents the only safe method, and if I were the Minister, I would decline to delete para-

graph (c). He should stick to the use of pliers and nothing else for the earmarking of cattle.

THE MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. P. D. Ferguson—Irwin-Moore—in reply) [4.43]: The member for Kimberley (Mr. Coverley) is under an entire misapprehension regarding this matter. I think he must have read the 1904 Act and not the amending Act of 1907, the provisions of which are perfectly clear. The object of the amending legislation passed in the latter year was to prevent cattle duffing.

Mr. Coverley: They don't do that in the North.

The **MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE**: The point about it was that when a pastoralist or any other cattle owner registered an earmark for his cattle, it was definitely understood that he would use pliers for the earmarking of his cattle. The Bill before the House now provides that the earmarks shall not exceed one inch in length and five-eighths of an inch in width. It is possible that if an earmark is registered that size and we allow the use of a knife for earmarking purposes, the knife could be used as to entirely obliterate the registered mark. To prove that the member for Kimberley is under a misapprehension, I quote Section 27 of the Act of 1907, as follows—

All earmarks shall be made by a punch or pliers only, and not otherwise; and no ear or any part thereof shall be removed, cropped, cut, sliced, or split by means of any other instrument than a punch or pliers used to make a registered earmark or a cullmark or an age mark.

I am given to understand by pastoralists of the North that they do use pliers and that they object to the use of the knife. As a matter of fact the pastoralists represented by the member for Kimberley have three representatives in another place, where this measure was introduced, and not one of them raised any objection to the provision. They were quite satisfied with the clause, which was inserted at the request of the pastoralists' representatives, namely, the Pastoralists' Association.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Council with amendments.

MESSAGES FROM LIEUT.-GOVERNOR.

Messages from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read, recommending appropriation for the purposes of the following Bills—

- 1, Loan, £2,176,000.
- 2, Mine Workers' Relief.

BILL—FINANCIAL EMERGENCY ACT CONTINUANCE.

Third Reading.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [4.48]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Question put and a division taken with the following result—

Ayes	23
Noes	20
					—
Majority for	3
					—

AYES.

Mr. Barnard	Sir James Mitchell
Mr. Church	Mr. Parker
Mr. Davy	Mr. Patrick
Mr. Doney	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Griffiths	Mr. Sampson
Mr. Keenan	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Latham	Mr. J. H. Smith
Mr. Lindsay	Mr. Thorn
Mr. H. W. Mann	Mr. Wells
Mr. J. I. Mann	Mr. North
Mr. McLarty	(Teller.)

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Munslie
Mr. Corboy	Mr. Nulsen
Hon. J. Cunningham	Mr. Panten
Mr. Heguey	Mr. Sleeman
Miss Holman	Mr. F. C. L. Smith
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Troy
Mr. Keaneally	Mr. Wansbrough
Mr. Marshall	Mr. Willcock
Mr. McCallum	Mr. Withers
Mr. Millington	Mr. Wilson
(Teller.)	

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Angelo	Mr. Coverley
Mr. Brown	Mr. Raphael
Mr. J. M. Smith	Mr. Lamond

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT.

As to Recommittal.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [4.43]: I move—

That the Committee's report be adopted.

MR. PIESSE (Katanning) [4.53]: I move an amendment—

That the Bill be recommitted to consider the reinstatement of Clause 10.

I was not present at the last sitting of the House when the Bill was considered in Committee, and therefore was not able to voice a protest against the deletion of Clause 10. This clause will affect the welfare of a large community resident in a country town, a community who are not able to embark upon a system of sewerage such as has been carried out in more largely populated centres. The clause was inserted in the Bill in another place and much consideration was given to the principle contained in it. The request for its inclusion emanated from a road board in a very important town, but the advantage to be derived from it would be available to other towns in various parts of the State. In the interests of public health and up-to-date sanitation, the Minister would be well advised to reinstate the clause. In the town I have in mind, 11 occupiers pay £230 annually for the removal of waste water, and that waste water could be carried away more cheaply by the construction of a small sewerage system. The cost of the system would be in the vicinity of £1,250, and while it would prove a convenience to the town, it would also provide a certain amount of work.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [4.57]: I desire that Clause 2 be recommitted for the further consideration of paragraph (c). In dealing with the clause the Minister merely mentioned infectious diseases referred to in paragraph (c). Reference to soap was omitted. Paragraph (c) reads—

by inserting the word "soap" after the word "tobacco" in the definition of "drug."

That does not appear to be of much importance, but investigation shows that it is a serious matter. Regulations are generally framed after a measure has come into operation, but this Bill will make operative regulations that have already been gazetted. I understand it has been impossible to launch a prosecution under the regulation dealing with soap making, but that the passing of this Bill will make the regulation operative. The difficulty is that a member will not then have the ordinary remedy of being able to move for the disallowance of

the regulation, because it will be in force. The regulation reads—

General Standard for Soap. Soap is a product derived from the action of a solution of alkali on fats, oils, or resins. It shall contain not less than 59 parts per centum of fatty acids, of which not more than one-third may be resin acids. It shall contain not more than one-tenth of one part per centum of free caustic alkali, and not more than three parts per centum of carbonate of soda. It shall not contain any other substance except water, perfume, and permitted colouring matter.

Soap-making would ordinarily be one of the easiest industries to launch, but if the regulation becomes operative, practically nobody will be able to start in the industry unless he employs a qualified chemist. I do not think that is altogether what we want to provide, to say that no one in this State shall start in the soap business without employing a qualified chemist. At present very little soap is being exported from this State.

The Minister for Lands: A fair amount is exported now.

Mr. SLEEMAN: During the past few years the quantity has been considerably decreased. The official figures from the Customs Department show that in 1929-30, 345,700 lbs. of soap, valued at £4,898, was exported; in 1930-31, 107,467 lbs., valued at £1,511; and in 1931-32, 77,877 lbs., valued at £883. From 1929 to 1932 the soap exported from the State dropped in value from £4,898 to £883. I have been told, and believe, that the poorer class of soap exported from this State went to the Islands. At present, that class of soap is being manufactured in the Eastern States, so the trade has been lost to Western Australia. We do not want to lose trade that rightly should be ours. The Minister will agree that we should retain as much of that export trade as possible. Some action should be taken to conserve that trade to ourselves. The Bill will have the effect of making the soap combine stronger and it will be very difficult for any person to start in the soap industry in this State. I want the Bill recommitted for the purpose of further considering paragraph (c) of Clause 2.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [5.3]: Members had full opportunity to discuss this Bill when it was before the House on Thursday last. As a matter of fact, the very argument sub-

mitted by the member for Fremantle convinces me of the necessity for the inclusion of the word "soap" in the interpretation clause. If we export an article, I suggest to the House we should at least export an article true to name. There is not likely to be any obstacle placed by the Health Department in the way of a person who desires to manufacture soap for export. The department is a Government institution and will assist, as far as it possibly can, persons desiring to manufacture articles in Western Australia. I admit the question was not raised when the Bill was before the House, but the reason for the inclusion of the word was so that persons would not be sold substitutes. We therefore clearly define what soap should contain. In fairness to people who buy an article, we should at least give them the same protection as we give them in the case of other manufactured articles. The hon. member suggests we might include tobacco: but we should have the authority to say that soap shall contain the right quantity of necessary ingredients. There will be no hardship imposed. The Leader of the Opposition was considerably pestered last year because of the poor class of soap that was being put on the market. He drew attention to a large parcel of soap that had been brought to his room on one occasion, in order to show the poor class of soap that was being put on the market, for the purpose, I would suggest, of misleading the public.

Mr. Sleeman: But now the business goes to the Eastern States.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If we are importing a poor class of soap, we shall be able to restrict or prevent the sale of it. I feel sure the member for Fremantle has not been approached by the soap manufacturers in his own electorate.

Mr. Sleeman: We want to stop the combine from getting a bigger grip on the industry.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If the manufacturers had approached the hon. member, no doubt they would also have approached me. This is the first time I have heard of opposition to the provision, which is designed to protect the purchasing public. I think the hon. member might give the matter very serious consideration before he has the alteration made.

Mr. Sleeman: You said a large quantity is still being exported.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: A considerable quantity was exported during the past year. Very little has been exported from the State outside of our primary commodities. What we desire to do is to give employment to our workmen, but if we export a soap not true to its name, we shall very soon lose the market that is available in the Islands. The manufacture of soap does not require the services of a chemist at all, as the hon. member must know. Resinous matter is not useful in the manufacture of soap and we should limit the quantity of it which can be used. Again, a very large quantity of caustic would soon not only rot clothes, but would also probably set up very severe skin irritation. I am of opinion that we can depend on the advice given to us by our Principal Medical Officer and the Health authorities. They have no desire to prevent the manufacture of goods that can be sold not only in Western Australia but exported. With respect to the question raised by the member for Katanning (Mr. Piesse), I tell the House that the clause he suggests would be almost unworkable. We say that Clause 9 of the Bill will provide for all that is required. Clause 9 gives permission to Health authorities to instal a sewerage system in a prescribed area. I am not convinced by the case submitted by the hon. member. It is a very long clause and the advice that I received is that it would be almost impossible to work under it. It might be all right for the people of Katanning, who may enter into some kind of agreement. There is no objection to saying that the local authorities may enter into an agreement with a number of their ratepayers, nor do I think the House would object to that, and in that agreement they could set out what the conditions are; but I would draw the attention of members to some of the provisions of subclauses 5 and 6 of Clause 10—

Any amount payable to the local authority under any such agreement shall be and remain, until paid, a charge upon the premises to which the agreement refers, and on all the owner's estate and interest therein, as if the agreement had contained an express charge to that effect, and the personal obligation to make the payments stipulated for in the agreement, and to perform and observe the terms thereof shall be binding not only on the original party but on every subsequent owner of the premises, but so that no person shall be liable personally for the making of any payment or the discharge of any obligation which shall accrue due or arise after he has ceased to be the owner of the premises.

(6) The obligations of the local authority under any such agreement shall be enforceable by the owner for the time being of the premises as if they had been entered into with him.

That provides that a sewerage system might be installed for the benefit of one person, who would have to enter into an undertaking to pay the cost thereof, by way of an annual charge for interest and sinking fund. If the system is connected with another property, then the owner of that property has to bear 50 per cent. of the cost. Eventually, when other properties are connected, the person who originally had the system installed would arrive at the position when he would be getting the cost paid by the other owners. Unless some better argument is brought forward than that which has been submitted to-day, I suggest that the House do not agree to the recommitment of the Bill.

Amendment put and negatived.

Question put and passed.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Minister for Lands, ordered that so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the Bill to pass through its remaining stages at this sitting.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Council with amendments.

BILLS (3)—RETURNED.

- 1, Traffic Act Amendment.
- 2, Tenants, Purchasers and Mortgagees' Relief Act Amendment (No. 1).
- 3, Swan Land Revesting.
without amendment.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1932-33.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from 23rd November. Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Vote—Departmental, £70,683 :

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [5.15] : There is very little in these Estimates of a debateable character that one might profitably discuss. Although our Loan expenditure for last year amounted to £1,380,000,

unfortunately our net public debt increased to the extent of £3,144,000. That is due to our large deficit which had to go into our Loan indebtedness. It is unfortunate that this State, in common with the others, is in such a financial position on account of its revenue Estimates, for whilst our net public debt increased by more than £3,000,000, the actual Loan expenditure was £1,380,000. Had the total loan expenditure, debited against the State, of over £3,000,000 been incurred on works of a developmental nature, we would have had some asset to show for it. Possibly a fair proportion of the amount would have been spent on works of a reproductive character. As it is, whilst our public debt has increased by over £3,000,000, even assuming that the £1,380,000 of Loan money was all expended on wealth production or reproductive works, there is still that difference between the two figures for which the State has no tangible asset, and nothing that will give a return either towards interest or sinking fund in the years to come. That is the unfortunate position this State and the other States have found themselves in during the past few years. The floating debt of this State at the end of June, as the Treasurer has stated, amounts to more than £8,000,000. That is a very large sum. The floating debt of Australia as a whole amounts to £82,000,000. It is a very serious position that there is this amount at call, as it were, on short-term Treasury bills. I think £37,000,000 of the £82,000,000 is held in London or overseas. I suppose that the Commonwealth Government, in association with the Loan Council, have realised how important it is that a start should be made with the funding of that floating debt. The time seems to be opportune for this, having regard to the London money market where our stocks are comparatively high, higher than they have been for many years, and the fact that the rate of interest is very low. I think the bank rate of interest in England to-day is only 2 per cent. I do not remember that it has ever been down as low as that. No doubt the Commonwealth Minister in London is watching the position closely. In the best of circumstances it will take some years to fund such a large amount as £82,000,000. We cannot hope that even a quarter of this sum can be funded at one time. It will have to be a gradual process, but will

greatly relieve the anxiety of the Loan Council and of the controlling authorities of the Commonwealth Bank. It must be a great source of anxiety to the Commonwealth Bank Board to have such a large floating debt. I believe about £45,000,000 is in Australia alone. No doubt that is the reason why the chairman of the board was anxious to float a loan of £20,000,000 so that a portion of the floating debt in Australia could be cleaned up. It is desirable that it should be cleaned up because, as the Premier knows, the amount is being increased every day.

The Premier: Every day.

Hon. P. COLLIER: This year the estimated deficit for all the States is, I think, £9,000,000. At the end of the financial year that money will be added to the floating debt. It is piling up to an enormous extent, and makes the position very unsafe. Some attempt should be made to get a portion of it funded so that the amount of £82,000,000 shall not be increased. It is very high at present, and ought to be reduced at every available opportunity.

Hon. J. C. Willcock interjected.

Hon. P. COLLIER: All the Governments in Australia are positively in the hands of the bank. I have no doubt that Sir Robert Gibson is anxious not to increase the floating debt. It is a responsibility for the bank to have this money practically at call. I notice that the total expenditure last year on water supply and sewerage and development of agriculture accounted for £1,000,000 of the £1,380,000. Of the estimated expenditure this year, namely £1,955,000, those two items, together with railways and tramways £267,000, total £1,700,000, leaving a very small sum available for all other requirements. I do not question the amounts set down. No doubt the Treasurer has given the matter very careful consideration, and found he is unable to do with a less amount for the three items I have mentioned. On roads and bridges the sum of £2,000 is to be spent. I do not know that we have ever had a year when the expenditure on such works has been so small, and fortunately so. That is due largely to the fact that we have had special grants from the Commonwealth, not loans, for expenditure on roads, and it has relieved the Loan Estimates this year and also last year, of what in former years was a considerable sum. In the first year

of the Commonwealth grant, we had to find pound for pound. I think, largely by the efforts of the member for South Fremantle (Hon. A. McCallum), the contribution by the State was reduced to 15s. In one year I recollect having to find about £300,000 from Loan money as our share of the expenditure associated with the Federal Aid Roads Grant.

The Premier: It was £286,000 on the 15s. basis.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It was all wrong. If the Commonwealth Government considered it an obligation of theirs to provide money for road purposes, that money ought to have been free, as it is to-day. It may be argued that it was not a function of the Commonwealth to come into the picture and provide for this work. Having decided to do so, however, the restrictions they placed upon the expenditure, not only of their own money but of the contributions by the States, whether pound for pound or 15s. in the pound, were altogether unfair, and resulted in a considerably higher cost of administration than would otherwise have been the case.

The Premier: They got their share by special taxation, whereas we had to borrow ours.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. They had plenty of money at the time, and it came from revenue derived from special taxation. No doubt the large sum of money they were raising for these grants from revenue was in a large measure responsible for the increase in special taxation.

Hon. A. McCallum: They imposed special taxation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and it enabled them to pay the money and show a profit on the deal.

The Minister for Works: In one year they made a profit of £460,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, and made good fellows of themselves in addition. There was every inducement for the Commonwealth to embark upon this kind of assistance when they could make a profit out of it.

Hon. J. C. Willcock: And we could not spend the money unless it was called a Commonwealth grant.

Hon. P. COLLIER: In the beginning it was desired that every one of the roads that were built out of these funds should be identified as, "This road was made by

Commonwealth grants." It was a sort of propaganda all over the Commonwealth.

The Minister for Works: They were to be known as Federal aid roads.

Hon. P. COLLIER: So that at election time the Federal candidates, when travelling round the country electioneering, would be able to point to the notices on the gum trees and all over the place, showing what had been done.

The Minister for Works: There was nothing new about that: they copied it from America.

Hon. P. COLLIER: By a special tax, the taxpayers were finding the money, and the Commonwealth were making a substantial profit out of the deal.

The Premier: In those days we had to keep the roads in repair for 20 years.

Hon. P. COLLIER: We protested against this form of advertising, and succeeded in keeping the notices off the roads. In fact, we refused to do it. That was part of the agreement which was not carried out.

The Minister for Agriculture: Did they come within the category of unsightly hoardings?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No doubt they did. Of course, the State Governments had every incentive to make the best possible use of the money, and spend it in the most economical way, and in parts of the State where it was mostly needed. The expenditure should not have been subject to the approval of the engineer who was here to represent the Commonwealth Government. I see there is to be expended on railways during the year an amount of £267,000. Looking down the list I notice there are not any new lines. I am not surprised at that, because it is hardly a time when we can go on extending our railway mileage since we have so large a mileage working at reduced speed, as it were, with not sufficient for it to do. But I suggest to the Government that in these times we might utilise the unemployed labour, to which sustenance is being paid, to carry out earthworks wherever possible. I believe this is being done on the authorised railway from Boyup Brook to Cranbrook; I saw somewhere that a number of sustenance men are employed there. If we are ever going to build a line, that is useful work; not like spending money on clearing land which, if it be not brought into use immediately will, in the course of a few years, revert to its original state. Earth-

works carried out for the construction of new lines will not deteriorate; in fact they will improve, because they will set and harden. Then if ever the time comes when the rails can be laid, the earthworks will be all ready for them. The bar to the completion of any railways just now is the cost of rails, which is so very high. But this is the time, while we have so large a number of unemployed, that they might be put on to railways which it is proposed to build when the time is again opportune; not on some lines which, although they are authorised, I do not believe will ever be built. I do not propose to name them at the moment, but there are one or two lines in that category, and so I hope the Government will exercise discretion and leave alone those lines not likely ever to be completed.

Mr. J. J. Mann: Hope deferred maketh the heart sick.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The line to which the hon. member refers is one on the earthworks of which I would have put unemployed men two years ago; I mean on the authorised section of that line, not on the proposed new section. Undoubtedly the hon. member has been neglected in that regard. I do not know why the Government should overlook all the beautiful country stretching from the Great Southern towards Fremantle.

The Minister for Lands: You should be careful.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. I will get "Hansard" to make a special note that this was drawn from me by the interjection of the member for Beverley. Water supply and sewerage, £720,002, is a comparatively large sum having regard to the total, but I have no doubt it is required. The information given on the Estimates is not very clear as to what portion of this is to be expended on the hills scheme, the new scheme. The Minister for Works is aware of the serious position that lies ahead, within a few years time, in regard to the water supply for Perth. It was remarked on the Revenue Estimates that the position cannot be met in the course of a year or two, that the scheme will occupy from four years to seven years to complete, although no doubt water will be available progressively year by year. It is unfortunate that this expenditure should be necessary these times, when the comparatively small amount of loan money is so urgently needed in wealth-producing direc-

tions. Although the water is essential to the city and will, I suppose, pay interest on the capital expenditure, still it will not serve to increase our wealth production in any way.

The Premier: It will mean increased taxation.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is a necessary convenience, but it will increase taxation on the ratepayer and will not increase the goods or commodities or wealth of the State in any way. So, as I say, it is rather unfortunate that it cannot be avoided. These are times when every pound of money that we have, whether loan money or revenue, should be expended in a direction of producing something, increasing the wealth of the State, developing the State, and not on conveniences or things of that kind. Because even though prices be low, unless we are able to increase our production we, as a State, must go out of existence. It seems rather a contradictory statement to make but, even though we produce at a loss, we must keep on producing if the State is to survive. So all the money available should be expended in that direction. For the development of the goldfields the amount set down, £26,500, is very small, but it might be said that the goldfields are able to look after themselves. I saw in this afternoon's paper that the price of gold is now nearly £8 per ounce. It is a wonderful figure of course, and the goldfields generally are responding to the enhanced price of gold, for the activity and buoyancy of the industry is greater than it has been for many years past. Few people outside the goldfields realise the great part the increased price of gold, together with our increased gold production, has played during the last few years in helping the State over its difficulties. Bad as things have been and are, they would have been infinitely worse: all avenues of trade and commerce would have felt their difficulties to a much greater extent but for the increased price of gold and the increased gold production.

The Premier: There is no doubt about that. There would have been a far larger number of unemployed.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, the number of unemployed would have been doubled, because there are 2,000 more wages men employed in the mining industry now than there were a few years ago. And that does not take into account the many hundreds scat-

tered all over the goldfields areas prospecting and working on their own account. There has been an increase of 2,000 in wages employees alone. And, of course, wages are paid every fortnight and the money is put into circulation immediately. Unlike the agricultural and allied industries whose returns come in only once a year, the gold mining industry pays wages every fortnight, thus fertilising other industries from week to week. And then there are all the other industries providing for the wants of those engaged in gold mining, and there are the tradesmen, the butchers, the bakers, the grocers, all ministering to the gold mining industry. So that industry is employing a very great number of people and undoubtedly has been a real godsend to the State in the times through which we have been and still are passing. But even though the price of gold is so high, it does not overcome the difficulties of many hundreds of men engaged in prospecting and who are without necessary facilities for treating their ore, or without a water supply. And not all of them are on gold. Many of them are not getting anything, while others are carrying on on low values. So I hope that wherever the field warrants it, this amount set down on the Estimates will be exceeded if necessary, whether for the provision of water supplies or for the erection of batteries to provide crushing facilities. I notice there has been a very great demand on the Mines Department during the last two years to provide crushing facilities for the prospector, because of the large number of men that have gone out and the rush of ores that has come upon the batteries. Of course the department has to be cautious in erecting batteries until they know whether this rush of ore is going to be continuous, for a few years at any rate. I hope that wherever possible those necessary facilities will be furnished to those engaged in this very lucrative industry which is doing so much to help the State over its difficulties. In addition to the total amount, £1,955,385 set down on the Loan Estimates this year, there is the special grant of £145,000, mentioned by the Treasurer, for other forms of relief. It means that for the year the amount available will be £2,100,385. It is a considerable improvement on the money that has been available during the last three years, and should help us on to a better state of things. It will be needed, of course, in order to relieve the position of the unemployed, more particularly as the primary producers

will not be able to employ so many men this year. Of course all those engaged, whether in the pastoral, the agricultural or the timber industry, our principal primary industries, are right down to the minimum in point of employment. They have not the money, and that means a greater demand on our Government to find work for the large number of men displaced because of the depressed condition of the pastoral and agricultural industries.

The Premier: And timber too, of course.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes, the timber industry has never been at such an extremity. For many years the industry used to employ upwards of 3,000 men, whereas to-day it is down to a few hundred employees. With wheat and wool and timber as they are, the outlook unfortunately is very bad for those unemployed. So I am glad this little extra amount of loan money, as compared with last year and the year before, is available this year for the purpose of finding employment. I see that the Loan Council at its last meeting decided to raise 22 millions for the year, being six millions for ordinary loan work and seven millions for unemployment, while the other nine millions is to go to meet the deficits. No doubt our deficits are a great load to us all over Australia; otherwise that nine million pounds would have been of distinct advantage. Last year our deficit amounted to £1,557,896, whilst at the same time we had only £1,380,000 available for expenditure. Therefore the £9,000,000 which will be required to meet the deficits of all the States this year will be no asset. If the money were available for development or other purposes, it would be much better for the States and for the Commonwealth. I have nothing further to say on the general discussion on the Loan Estimates. The money available is very limited, and there will be great difficulty in making it go as far as one would like it to go. There are one or two items that perhaps require explanation, but they can be dealt with later.

MR. HEGNEY (Middle Swan) [5.46]:

Before the vote is passed, I would again bring under the notice of the Minister for Water Supply the position of the residents at Swan View. During the past few warm days they have again been complaining to me about their difficulty in getting a proper

water supply. Therefore, I ask the Minister to give consideration to the matter. Some six months ago I submitted it to the under-secretary for consideration, but although an admission was made that an extension would have to be laid, the reply was that funds were not available. If it is at all possible, I hope the Minister will try to do something to make funds available to relieve the situation. It is certainly acute. The residents are paying for the water they get, but they are anxious to secure a more ample supply, which they are unable to obtain because of the very small diameter of the pipes that convey water to the district. Water is very necessary to these people, particularly in the middle of the summer. It is essential that they should have an adequate supply. Another matter I have mentioned before is the extension of the Beaufort-street tramway. I notice that a small sum is put on the Loan Estimates for rails and fasteners. I have been urging for the past two years that the Beaufort-street tramway should be extended to Salisbury-street, a distance of about one-third of a mile from the present head of the line, in order to give transport facilities to the residents there. I would impress upon the Minister, and also upon the Treasurer, now that he is present, the necessity for making funds available for the extension of that line from Dundas-road to Salisbury-street. There are no bus facilities at the head of the line, nor is there a taxi service running in the district. The locality is beginning to go ahead. Many houses are being erected, and the majority of the people who live there have to come into Perth to work in the various shops and factories to earn their living. At present they have to walk from half a mile to a mile in order to get to the tram, and that takes up a considerable part of their time. The tram service is certainly a fairly good one, but there should be a duplication of the line, so that the time occupied in travelling may be lessened. The residents were agitating for the tramway extension during the previous Government's term of office, and I understand that one of the land companies at that time was willing to contribute £1,000 or so towards the cost of extending the line. The fact remains that there is a big population in the district that would be served by the tramway extension. Many young married people are living there, and, naturally, are now bringing up families. The women

have to push perambulators, both in summer and winter, for half a mile or a mile before they can reach the head of the tram-line. I have no doubt, the population in the district will increase very rapidly as Perth goes ahead. There are excellent building sites available, and the distance is only three miles from Perth. Proper transport facilities should be made available to the people living there. Something should also be done in connection with the draining of the Bayswater area. It is now some ten years since a drainage scheme was considered. Plans were prepared for the purpose of draining both Maylands and Bayswater. The scheme was estimated to cost £150,000 for Maylands and £42,000 for Bayswater. A drainage rate was struck, and many people have been paying a drainage rate for the past ten years. Nearly £1,000 has been contributed by way of drainage rates in the Bayswater area, but so far no drainage works have been commenced. There is some excellent land in the Bayswater district which could be put to good use if it could be drained before the warm weather sets in; but the water hangs about too long and in consequence sours the soil. The people, therefore, cannot work the land. If there were a proper drainage system, the people could support themselves to a large extent on their land, on the small allotment system, but the greatest problem they have to face is the question of drainage. I hope this matter will be considered, because even if a grandiose scheme were not initiated, something could be done in a small way. It would give immediate relief and would be the means of providing work for residents of the district. I know that something is being done in the Maylands district, but I bring the matter under the notice of the Minister with a view to his seeing whether something cannot be done in the Bayswater district. There is not much else in connection with the Loan Estimates that one can speak upon, but I bring those matters before the House and before the responsible Ministers because they are certainly of great importance to the people concerned.

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [5.56]: The Leader of the Opposition has very accurately stated the parlous condition of the State from a financial standpoint. He does not see much hope of improvement while prices remain as they are at pre-

sent. That, I think, is believed by all people who know the facts. From time to time, however, we hear statements, especially by interested parties, and by the Premier himself, to the effect that we have turned the corner.

The Premier: I do not think you can say that I used that term.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I have heard it more than once. That may be a way of helping people or encouraging people to face the difficult times through which we are passing. It may give them hope for the future. What is needed more in this country, however, is not a waving of hands and a pretence that things are all right, but facts, and not platitudes. If people were told facts and understood them, we would not have those occurrences from day to day which cause loss to the community. To-day we have a quantity of wheat being held up by farmers: that is not going to help the farmers, so far as I can see. It may assist to a more reasonable and fair expenditure of the amount that the Prime Minister has provided for assistance to the wheatgrowers, but it will not help in securing a better price for the wheat. It is extraordinary to me that these people are not told the real facts of the situation, because they must know that if the whole of the 45,000,000 bushels of wheat that Western Australia has produced this season is thrown into the ocean, it will not make much difference to the wheat market. People should be told facts. Certain interested parties say that we have turned the corner. That is not stating facts, and it is unfair to the people. How can the people understand the position of the States and of the Commonwealth unless they are acquainted with the facts by the people who know them? Members ought to take advantage of this debate to let the people of the country know what the facts are. The Minister for Lands, when discussing my speech on the Address-in-reply—he spoke in the early hours of the morning—mentioned croakers. He said that he thought the croakers ought to be optimistic, but those who give the people facts, whether the facts depress the people or not, are not to be blamed, because they are doing the proper thing in the circumstances. The people should be told that there is no money to spend. If there were less talk about our having turned the corner,

the people would not be asking for so much or demanding so much. We know to-day that there is not the slightest indication that we have turned the corner. We hope that as time goes on there will be a material change in our prospects and an improved price for our commodities overseas; and that if we do not get back to the prices that ruled during boom times, we shall at any rate get back to intermediate prices. If we could get back to 3s. 3d. or 3s. 4d. for our wheat, and about 1s. 2d. for our wool we could say that the tide had turned, and that there was every prospect of our making good in this country. As the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier have pointed out, we are not paying our way in Australia. Governments have huge deficits. During the last three years the deficit for this State has gone beyond £3,000,000, namely, £3,496,000, and last year it was £1,557,000. All the States of the Commonwealth have deficits. The only Government in Australia that has not a deficit is the Commonwealth Government. We know the reason for that. They have opportunities for raising revenue that we do not possess, and they have not the same obligations or responsibilities that we have.

The Minister for Lands: They have every field of taxation open to them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Even including the Commonwealth Government, the whole of Australia has gone back to the extent of £82,000,000 in the last few years.

Mr. Wells: They did not pay their way when things were good.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Sometimes they did, and sometimes they did not. If they did not pay their way they were creating an asset. All the harbours, the railways, the public buildings, the water supplies, and general agricultural, mining and pastoral development that we provided represent an asset, but there is nothing to show for the £82,000,000. In this State we have a new park in the hills, and there are a few other things on which money has been spent, but there is nothing which represents any material asset.

The Minister for Works: There are a few other things.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The greatest proportion of the money that has been expended in Australia is being paid to people to do

something which need not be done immediately: I admit that the water supply schemes in the South-West are all right.

The Minister for Works: There are other things besides those.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Millions of money have been spent which have not created any material asset. We owe the banks £82,000,000, and shall soon owe them £100,000,000, and we have no material asset to show for the money. That sort of thing cannot continue. There may be a distinction between a floating debt and a funded debt. I suppose that one debt can be called up at any time, and the funded debt operates over a number of years.

Hon. P. Collier: A floating debt is one that we may have to pay at any moment, and a funded debt is passed on to posterity.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It does not matter what it is; it is a debt. Whether it be a floating debt or a funded debt, we have it upon our shoulders. It adds to our burden. We have materially added to our liabilities in the last three years, and we can show nothing substantial for the outlay. It has been said that the banks can make Governments default. I do not think they will do so. If they did they would pull the house down on top of themselves. No good would come out of that. The banks could call up the debts of all their clients, but that would not help them. I have heard statements about the disadvantages derived under the Farmers' Debts Adjustment Act, and the need for further legislation. If the banks could not get their money and legislation was on the statute-book to enable them to take action, no good purpose would be served. The legislation now in existence is only of value because of the goodwill or the conditions and the necessities of the moment. The banks do not call up these liabilities because they would destroy their assets. The merchants stick to the farmer and pastoralist because they are obliged to do so. If they took action against the farmers the assets would disappear.

Hon. P. Collier: They would reduce the value of the securities if they did that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: They would certainly get nothing. The legislation passed by the Government is in itself of no real value. It has, at most, proved helpful, and has assisted people to get together, although

they would have come together because of their necessities in any case.

The Minister for Lands: Those people who have sold land on time payment would have been all right without that legislation, because they had big deposits in many cases, and could have recovered possession of the land.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Many people would not have done that. Numbers of them did get deposits, but have acted in a very high moral manner in that they have not taken advantage of the situation. In the great majority of cases the legislation has been effective only because of the necessities of the moment. If the merchants, the banks, and the traders could have realised on their assets, they would have done so, but they did not do so because they were in the position of getting nothing or being obliged to carry on their clients. If the banks foreclosed to-morrow, we would be powerless, but the assets would be of little or no value to the banks. If they called up their overdrafts to-morrow, their clients could not pay any more than Governments could pay, and such action would only paralyse everything.

Hon. P. Collier: They could take possession of the securities, but could do nothing with them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: If they did take possession of the securities we would then have an opportunity of seeing how they would manage affairs, and they in turn would have a better understanding of the complex situation which Parliament is called upon to face. When reading the Auditor General's report, I discovered that the Premier had given to the Commonwealth Government £28,000 when he handed over to them the State Savings Bank. There was an unclaimed amount in the Savings Bank of £28,000, and the time had expired when the money could be claimed. The Premier went into that agreement so hurriedly that he gave the Commonwealth Government the whole of that money. He is constantly complaining about the way in which the Commonwealth authorities behave towards this State; and yet despite all his complaints on the subject and the references to his being so marvellous a financier, he hands over £28,000 which should have been kept in the country. Can anyone say that is good financing? It does not reflect much credit on the administration of the Premier when such a blunder as that can be committed. I should like to

hear more about the manner in which loan funds have been expended. I find that last year £133,000 was spent on railways and tramways. The Premier referred to the Meekatharra-Wiluna Railway and one or two others on which certain sums had been expended. He also referred to the expenditure on harbours and rivers of £71,000, including Geraldton and Bunbury, and to an expenditure of £480,000 on water supply, sewerage and drainage, and on the development of agriculture £588,000. He stated, too, that on the development of mineral resources only £27,000 had been spent last year. Having regard to the great value the mining industry is to the State, I say this was a piffling sum to provide. We know that the industry is preparing its way to-day and is helping the State very considerably. Notwithstanding this, no more than that paltry sum has been provided for its continued development. When the Premier goes to Kalgoorlie he patronises a few of the Nationalists, the Mayor and others, and says he will do this and that, and declares that the goldfields are a wonderful help. But all he can find to help the goldfields is £26,000.

Hon. P. Collier: He could not help being nice to the Mayor of Kalgoorlie who is so picturesque.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This year £26,000 has been provided, or £1,000 less than last year. That will not do very much good for the goldfields, where there is such activity in evidence, and where there are such splendid opportunities for putting men into work. I cast no great blame upon the Minister for Mines. He could not do very much with a sum like that. In fact, it may be claimed he has done very well with the money available and what more could he do? To-day gold is worth about £8 an ounce. It may be said that the industry is very prosperous, and does not need any help. This is the time, however, when we should provide facilities whereby people can employ more men and secure more gold. All the people on the goldfields are not in a good position. Many are working propositions to-day that could not have been worked a year or so ago. Shows are being worked which are only half the value they were a few years ago, but because of the high price of gold, those to whom they belong are able to make a living out of them. Many families have

gone back to the goldfields from the coastal areas, and are struggling hard to make headway. In many cases educational facilities have been removed from the centres to which these people have gone. Many are a hundred miles from a railway, are living in a primitive fashion, and are having a very hard time. The struggles they are going through are equal to those which any other people in the country are going through. Now is a splendid opportunity to provide facilities so that people may produce more gold. The whole world wants gold to-day, and is prepared to pay a high price for it. If we lose this opportunity it will never come again in our time. If other industries revive this will be an indication that there is a revival in world conditions, and gold will not be so much in demand. Gold is dear to-day because some countries have remained on the gold standard, and others must have that commodity to trade with and with which to pay their debts. They must get gold at any cost. That is why there is such a great demand for it to-day. Of course I am pleased to see the goldmining industry is having a prosperous time. The fact, however, that gold is worth nearly £8 an ounce is no indication that all the people in the industry are prosperous. Numbers of persons are working poor propositions, and being without crushing facilities, have to cart their ore hundreds of miles. In addition, they have a very high cost of living to contend with. A paltry sum of £26,000 is provided for the goldmining industry for this year, which shows the great faith the Premier has in the goldfields. I am not complaining about the amount spent on agricultural development. Many complaints have been made by members, however, regarding the group settlements. The member for Nelson wanted to know when the Government would give members an opportunity to discuss the report of the Royal Commission on group settlement. An opportunity to discuss that question occurs on the debate on the Loan Estimates, but members are strangely silent. I should like to know from the Premier how group settlements are proceeding. It is extraordinary how little information is accorded to us. The whole business seems shrouded in secrecy. The Group Settlement Department is administered by the Treasury, and not by the Lands Department or the Agricultural

Bank. All directions emanate from the Treasury, and yet the Treasurer gives us no information whatever regarding the development of the scheme.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I was discussing before the tea adjournment the need for information regarding group settlement matters and Agricultural Bank activities. The development of agriculture accounts for the expenditure of £636,000, which represents at least 25 per cent. of the amount covered by the Loan Estimates. We were given to understand that the position of the Agricultural Bank was parlous, and that thousands of farmers could not meet their obligations. In those circumstances, surely the consideration of the Loan Estimates provides the opportunity for the Government to invite the Committee to discuss the position of the Agricultural Bank and that of the settlers associated with the bank both in the wheat belt and on the group settlements. The Loan Estimates contain a vote of £56,000 for group settlement purposes. We would like to have from the Premier a statement, such as was made from time to time when the Collier Government were in power, indicating the activities under the Group Settlement Scheme, the expenditure and the accomplishments of the settlers.

The Premier. That item of £56,000 covers bank advances as well.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This year £500,000 is provided for the Agricultural Bank and £56,000 for group settlements. A Royal Commission was appointed by the present Government to inquire into group settlement matters because of the extreme dissatisfaction that obtained throughout the areas. That was remarkable because during the preceding three years there had been a change in the Administration. The initiator of the Group Settlement Scheme had taken charge. He is the genius who had initiated the scheme along certain lines and during the whole of the time I was in charge of the administration of group settlement matters, he had complained that I had departed entirely from his scheme, that costs were excessive, and that the dissatisfaction existing was due to bad management. He never failed to make those assertions. He said that the settlers were all right, the land was all right, the climate was all right, but the

administration was all wrong. What was wrong, now, that a third Royal Commission of inquiry was necessary? Apparently the administration of the gentleman who had conceived the plan was not very satisfactory. In fact, the whole of the settlers were seething with dissatisfaction. The Premier had promised all sorts of things and gave them very little. The worst of it is that he entirely misled the settlers during the time I was Minister for Lands because he was constantly making visits to the group areas in an endeavour to break down a sense of responsibility that I was endeavouring to build up. He even took advantage of the Governor's visit, which should have been of a non-party character, to tell the settlers that they were not being properly treated. He even went to the extent of going down to the group areas and asking people to write my administration down. That sort of thing is not done by men! At a time when there was every necessity for inculcating a sense of responsibility among the settlers, the present Premier, on no single occasion during his term as Leader of the Opposition, ever attempted to help to build up such a condition of affairs. He was always fault-finding, always bitter in his condemnation, and always wound up with the statement that we had no faith in the South-West, and with the quotation "God speed the plough." The trouble was that he left it to God entirely; he did not endeavour to assist at all. I want to know what was the necessity for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into group settlement matters, in view of the change that had been effected in the administration of the scheme? The Premier had an opportunity to put things right; he had the ball at his feet. He had made thousands of promises and had told the settlers that their interest payments would stand over and their valuations would be reduced.

The Premier: Be careful! I never said anything of the sort.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That statement was repeated to me. I was told by settlers that at a meeting at Jardee the Premier definitely told the men that their interest payments would stand over and their valuations would be reduced. The Premier in those days was very active amongst the settlers and always endeavoured to hinder, never to help. That is my objection. He has utterly failed in his present administra-

tion. As he was in office at the time, there should have been no necessity for another Royal Commission, yet the Commission found that the position was very bad indeed. They recommended vital changes. I do not say that I agree with any of their recommendations at all. I repeat that surely there should have been no necessity for such an inquiry, seeing that the administration is now in the hands of the man who initiated the group settlement scheme, who knew what had to be done and had promised to do all manner of things that would bring absolute satisfaction. He has been in charge, but he has not achieved that result. In my opinion, the appointment of a Royal Commission and their subsequent inquiry represented an entire waste of money. I do not know that any one of their recommendations have been adopted. I am aware that there was some semblance of adoption of one recommendation, in that an officer has been placed in charge of group settlement matters in the South-West district. The recommendation of the Royal Commission, however, was that the man chosen for that position should be of outstanding ability. The man of outstanding ability has not been found. Certainly the officer who has been placed in charge is by no means of outstanding ability. His capabilities have been tested in connection with the Group Settlement Scheme, and have been found wanting. I should say that if Mr. Richardson were here, he would give his opinion of the officer who has been placed in charge. The officer was connected with the Group Settlement Scheme when money was spent like water. He has not the experience or knowledge that is necessary at the present stage of the scheme. He was formerly in charge of the Busselton district and wasted money. He must have known that things were not right, but he did not acquaint his Minister. That officer must have known the position and, in fact, he should have known it. He knew that money was being wasted, but he did not give the facts to his Minister. Yet that officer has been placed in charge of group settlement administration in the South-West. If members were to ask what that officer's qualifications were they could not be satisfactorily told. Yet that officer has been put over the head of others who have been connected with land settlement for many years, including responsible

officers of the Agricultural Department. I would instance Mr. Wardle. He was appointed to carry out the reclassification of the group areas and he did it exceedingly well. I have never seen a better classification; it was carried out in a masterly manner. Yet a man of that description is passed over without the slightest consideration, and an officer placed in charge who had already wasted thousands of pounds, who knew that that money had been wasted, and had never advised his Minister regarding the extravagant expenditure. Yet that officer to-day takes precedence over capable men who were his superiors in the Government service. Why that was done, no one but the Premier knows. He has not had a long association with the affairs of the State and what pull he has, God only knows. He certainly has a most extraordinary pull. I have already referred to the officer who carried out such a splendid classification of the group areas. It was a faultless classification, and those in a position to know the value of it marvelled at its completeness. I had never met that officer before, but after I walked over group areas week after week for the purpose of inspecting his classification, I came to the conclusion that his was a masterly effort. If there was one acre of poor country on a holding, it was duly classified. Yet that officer was passed over entirely. Where the other man came from, God only knows, and what pull he has, God alone knows. His previous association with group settlement administration was certainly not to the State's advantage. Yet he is put over the heads of men who are superior to him in knowledge and ability. In those circumstances, how can it be expected that the administration of the scheme will be satisfactory? Of course, I know the Premier will say that this particular officer is a wonderful man. On the other hand, the files will disclose the position, and will show that he must have known that money was wasted in the past. If he did not know, then he did not have the necessary knowledge. There can be only two reasons for his neglect to advise his Minister. He either knew and did not tell his Minister, or else he did not know. If he did not know, then he was not fit for the job. We appointed two men, Mr. William Forrest and Mr. Carter of Marybrook, to inspect the group areas and they

condemned the areas unsparingly. Yet the officer under whose administration the expenditure had been incurred, and which resulted in those condemnatory reports, is now in charge of group settlement matters in the South-West! I suggest members read Mr. Carter's evidence before the Royal Commission. He is a man of ability and knowledge of the South-West. The Premier perhaps can justify the appointment. I do not know of a worse appointment; it was one of those the Premier always makes. He has a tremendous flair for appointing his own pals to these positions. Look where you will, you see in positions men of very little capacity imposed on the suffering taxpayers of this country. I condemn utterly the recent appointment made in the South-West. It is extraordinary that we should have an officer of that character appointed, having regard to his previous wretched record. There is in the Busselton district another officer, not popular, but immeasurably superior to this man, one who always stands up to his jobs and tells the truth. I do not know his political views and I said I do not want to know them, he would have to do his job. He did his job. When the Premier came into office he announced a new policy. Of course it was only a sham policy; he spent thousands of pounds giving away seed and a few stock without results, and the money was wasted. The only point in which the recommendations of the Royal Commission have been carried out is in respect of the appointment of an officer for the South-West who has not the ability for the job. So I have no confidence whatever in the policy of the Premier.

Hon. P. Collier: Did they call for applications for the job, as they are doing for the post of Commissioner of Police?

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, nothing like that.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a job which is being fixed up, that of the Commissioner of Police.

The Premier interjected.

Hon. P. Collier: We shall see.

Hon. M. F. TROY: This man knew the facts, but did not let his Minister know. The other officers did not get a chance to apply for the job. This fellow was picked up and put into a position which, I know, he is absolutely incapable of filling. Where he came from, nobody seems to know. He has no record in the public service, and he has been here only a few years. During the years of extravagant expenditure on the groups he was making a name for himself. He

knew the money was being wasted, but he did not tell the Minister anything about it. Yet he is put in charge over all the other officers, some of them immensely superior to him. The Public Service Commissioner did not appoint him, the trustees of the Agricultural Bank knew nothing of the appointment, the man was appointed by the Premier. So I want to know from the Premier something about group settlement. There exists the greatest possible dissatisfaction with the administration. The improvements are not being maintained, the holdings are going back, the settlers are not paying their interest. When on one occasion the Agricultural Bank took steps to put a settler off his block because he was not paying his interest, the bank was forced to recede from their position. I do not know which was right, the bank or the settler, but I know the bank had to withdraw. On the other hand, settlers have been put off their holdings and this House has not been informed of it. A complete statement of group settlement ought to be made to the House. There have been little results from the work of the Royal Commission, and the expenditure on that inquiry was a pure waste of money. There was no necessity for it, because a dozen men in the House know all about group settlement and what is wrong with it. The Royal Commissioners found a great deal wrong in the administration, but they were not ungrateful, for they made one reference to what they seemed to regard as a success. Mr. Yeates, the chairman, disagreed with the other members entirely, and used a happy smile in referring to the want of initiative and the want of system. But the other two members of the commission, Messrs. Forrest and Broekman, said the group settlement had at least done one thing, in that it had established the dairy industry in the South-West. Yet in face of that they tell Parliament in their report that the settlers who are established in the dairy industry are bankrupt and in a hopeless position. How can an industry be established when all those engaged in it are in a hopeless financial position and down and out? That is the extraordinary sort of logic we got from the Royal Commission: they found the settlers had established the dairy industry but could not meet their obligations. I never sought to give evidence before the Royal Commission, for I knew more about it than they did. They could only take the state-

ments made to them by people interested one way or another. No body of men in a few months could hope to get the real truth about group or any other settlement, for they must first know the individuals in group settlement before they could afford to accept their statements. They had no opportunity to gauge the individual or the value of his evidence, and so their report is hopeless and of no use to the House. They were not in a position to know, and they could not get that contact which only a Minister can get. The Premier knows what is wrong with group settlement. Had he been but reasonably fair, he would never have had any opposition. I have had hundreds of letters of complaint from group settlers, but have replied to none of them. I have done nothing whatever to make the Premier's administration of group settlement difficult. In that respect he suffers in comparison with me, because he lost no opportunity to render difficult my administration.

The Premier: Nonsense!

Hon. M. F. TROY: It is a fact. Your own friends have told me of it, and condemned you for it, men who went to school with you. They were not supporters of mine politically, but they told me the facts about your unfair tactics. The Royal Commission said that everything was wrong with group settlement, and so I say the Premier should tell us exactly, how the group settlers stand. As I stated, I have refused to reply to complaining letters. If I were in charge of group settlement to-morrow, I would do the very best I could for those settlers that are doing their best, but I would not stand for the man who is making no effort. There are plenty of men down there making strong efforts, and they ought to be encouraged. But now the whole scheme is again in a turmoil, and there is extreme dissatisfaction. Very few of the settlers can pay their way, even after 10 years of settlement and after the writing-down of £4,000,000 capital on their properties. It will be said that the price of butter fat has something to do with that. But the price of butter fat is the same as it was before the war. And the group settlement properties in the South-West are much cheaper properties than any dairying properties either in New South Wales or Victoria. Yet after 10 years of settlement and the expenditure of six or seven millions, we find that even now the settlers are down and out and cannot

pay their interest. So I should like to know from the Premier just what is the position in the South-West and what the Government propose to do. During the Address, in-reply the Minister for Lands had the temerity to make the assertion that the expenditure and losses on group settlement were due to the mal-administration of Mr. Angwin and myself. The statement was made in the early hours of the morning when possibly the Minister was not normal. He did not state the facts. Announcing that he would give some figures, he said this—

To the 31st March, 1924, this State had advanced £940,789 for group settlement in a period of a little over two years. During the first 15 months of the Labour Government £1,280,219 was spent, and in the next 12 months £1,195,770. In the next year the expenditure was £1,260,883, and in the following year £911,339. The member for Mt. Magnet, who had so much control and who claims to have done so much more work than I have been doing, took control in 1927 and finished up in 1930. During those four years he spent £1,260,000, £911,000, £630,000, and £568,000, this last being the amount on the Estimates. For the period of two years just closed, amounts of £209,000 and £67,000 have been spent respectively. During the whole term no less than £4,600,000 was written off group settlement. It is no use blaming the Mitchell Government for the expenditure, because the expenditure took place during the time the member for Mt. Magnet was Minister or his predecessor was Minister.

It sounds very well, but the Minister did not state the facts.

The Minister for Lands: They are the facts all right.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Let us see how far they are right. To the uninitiated out at Greenhills or York they might appear to be right, but not in this House. The figures were probably right—I do not say they were not—but they prove nothing.

Hon. P. Collier: Nothing at all.

Hon. M. F. TROY: They certainly did not prove his case. I do not know whether the figures were right or wrong, but for the sake of argument I shall assume that they were right. During Sir James Mitchell's time, a certain amount of money was expended on the groups, and more money was probably spent during Mr. Angwin's administration, and certainly more was spent during my administration. The facts explain the reason for the increased expenditure. The scheme had operated for only a

couple of years under Sir James Mitchell. He always complained that he had not had a chance to put the scheme into operation. He also disclaimed that it was his scheme that Mr. Angwin and I administered. His scheme provided for the clearing of 25 acres, the erection of a house and the necessary buildings and fences, and the stocking of the holdings. All that work was to cost £1,000. Before he left office, however, the expenditure on many of the blocks had reached £1,250, and very few of the houses had been built. The area of 25 acres had not been cleared, no stock had been purchased, no fences erected and no equipment provided. Consequently it was quite natural that there would not have been great expenditure during his time in office. All the heavy expenditure occurred in the following years when the larger acreage was being cleared, when a greater number of men were being employed, when the houses were being built, the equipment provided, the holdings stocked, and the plots laid down under pasture. Many of the pastures laid down proved unproductive. Hundreds of thousands of pounds were expended on country that never produced anything. One can hardly believe it, but much of the country was under water for several months of the year, and no provision had been made for draining it. The Northcliffe flats were ploughed and put under pasture year after year, and when I took office I rode over the country and the water was up to the horse's girths. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) was there at the time. That explains the reason for the increased expenditure. Then the accumulated expenditure was also carrying interest. The present Premier laid down the rule that the money should carry 7 per cent. interest, which was paid out of loan funds. That principle was utterly wrong. All the accumulated expenditure carried that heavy rate of interest, and the interest accumulations were added to the cost. Consequently it will be seen that the figures quoted by the Minister for Lands were utterly worthless. He knew they were worthless. He knew that the heavy cost was not incurred in the first years of group settlement when the land was being settled. It was incurred in the after years. The addition of interest charges to the accumulated expenditure built up an immense sum. The figures quoted by the Minister may

have been right, but the reasons should have been given. They can easily be summarised—heavy expenditure, failure after failure, the whole scheme wretchedly conceived, pastures laid down on undrained land, settlement attempted on the poorest of land. We condemned 400 locations, and proof that our action was justified is found in the fact that the present Government have not reinstated settlers on those locations. There are a few exceptions, and the Government are paying the settlers on a few locations sustenance at the rate of £2 per week. It would be possible to absorb all the unemployed in the State by giving them each a cow, a few pigs and a house on one of the locations, plus £2 a week sustenance, but that is not the way to settle the country. Though the present Premier disagreed with our policy of condemning group areas, the present Government have actually removed the buildings and have not attempted to put other settlers on those blocks. Interest is still owing on £900,000 expended on properties that have since been abandoned, and the interest burden has to be borne by the taxpayers. The figures quoted by the Minister for Lands did not accurately represent the position. The expenditure during the term of the Collier Government was not incurred without good reason. The trouble was the unsatisfactory manner in which the whole scheme had been originated. Every Commission that has inquired into group settlement has commented upon the unsatisfactory conditions that marked the inauguration of the scheme. The chairman of the recent Commission on Dairy Farming in the South-West made particular reference to it. He gave a military simile and referred to the blunders of land selection and faulty administration. The next administration will again have to shoulder the burden, because the whole scheme of group settlement is adrift. The member for Sussex (Mr. Barnard) made an extraordinary statement when speaking on the Address-in-Reply. He said that if the report of the previous Royal Commission had been adopted, there would not have been so much waste.

Hon. P. Collier: The first Royal Commission?

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, the Commission of which Mr. Walter Harper was chairman. The present Premier condemned that

Royal Commission, and now the member for Sussex has the impertinence to tell us that if the report of the Commission had been adopted, everything would have been all right. One of the representatives of the South-West Province, Mr. W. J. Mann, made a similar statement in another place, though he, too, had previously condemned the Commission. The present Premier condemned it utterly and absolutely. He said the Commission did not know what they were talking about. The Minister for Lands said that the administration of Mr. Angwin and myself had been responsible for the group settlement losses. The Minister was a member of that Royal Commission and he presented a minority report opposing the views of his colleagues. The Minister had not the courage to tell the facts—I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at the moment. He is a man of practical mind, and he must have appreciated the force of what was stated by Mr. Harper, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Johnson and others who sat on that Commission. Those gentlemen were unanimously of opinion that the group settlement scheme had been badly based, and required reconstruction, but Mr. Latham was then associated with Sir James Mitchell, and he presented a minority report. There is not a word in the minority report of any value whatever. That was only to be expected: he was playing, as he often does, the part of a political Black Man Friday to the Premier, and the report did him no credit at all. Anyone reading the reports must realise that the Commission, with its practical mind, was right.

The Minister for Works: If that were so, why did not your Government give effect to the report?

Hon. M. F. TROY: We did.

The Minister for Works: That was three years afterwards.

Hon. M. F. TROY: No, the report was presented during Mr. Angwin's administration, not long before he left office. I should say it was not quite 12 months before he left office. The Minister for Lands, who now talks about maladministration on our part, brought in a minority report in opposition to the constructive report of the Commission. The Commission proved to be correct, and Mr. Latham was wrong. To give Mr. Latham credit, he did not write the report. It was written for him, and he merely

signed it. That is the gentleman who now criticises the administration of my time. He did not even write the report; it was not his report. He did not want to let his pal down. I do not blame him for that, but in face of the facts, he ought not now to criticise. I should like to know what the Premier proposes to do regarding the settlers at Lakes King, Camm and Carmody. The Minister for Lands condemned us for incurring expenditure in placing settlers on the land at Lakes King, Camm and Carmody. He said the preliminary investigations for the 3,500 farms scheme had cost £105,000, and previous to taking possession of their blocks the settlers were promised a railway. He added that the settlers had gone out and now their position was perilous. Then he proceeded—

I shall not say that there is not a considerable area of first class land in that district, but the fact remains that some of the settlers were placed 70 miles from a railway. It was no use putting people out 60 or 70 miles from a railway, especially at that time, if one knew what was ahead of this State.

No one know what was ahead of the State when those settlers went out there. They only went out following the practice of settlers in this State for many years. They went out ahead of railways, as 90 per cent. of the settlers in this State have done.

Hon. P. Collier: For the last 20 years, settlers have done that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. Although the Minister condemned that area, he has not removed the settlers from it. He has removed twelve settlers, but the Minister recently admitted, after having visited the area, that the settlers were producing magnificent crops. Evidently he does not now consider that the condemnation of the area was justified. I should like to know from him whether he has become satisfied with the possibilities of the area since he made the speech I have quoted. The Collier Government were condemned for putting settlers in that area. The present Premier blamed the then Government for their handling of the 3,500 farms scheme. He accused the then Government of playing with it and of having no intention of going on with it. He complained that the Collier Government had dangled the scheme before the eyes of the people.

Hon. P. Collier: He condemned Dr. Teakle.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes, and said that Dr. Teakle's statement regarding salinity was nonsense.

The Minister for Lands: Dr. Teakle was not in that area at the time. He was outside the rabbit-proof fence.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I am speaking of the 3,500 farms scheme.

The Minister for Lands: I am speaking of Forrestania.

Hon. P. Collier: That was part of the scheme.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister himself said it was part of the scheme. In condemning the scheme he referred to Forrestania as part of the scheme, so he cannot now say it was not part of the scheme. Because Dr. Teakle condemned some of the land, and because we took notice of Dr. Teakle's advice, the present Premier condemned Dr. Teakle. "Bunkum," he said, "who would take notice of a scientist about these matters?" We did not proceed with the scheme. We proceeded with the ordinary land settlement at Lakes King, Carmody and Camm, for the reason that I gave the other night. Sir Charles Nathan and Mr. J. Gunn approved of it as part of the scheme, but we did not go on with the whole scheme, because investigation showed it would have been unwise to do so. Now, the Estimates provide for the expenditure of a certain amount of money on railway construction, and the Leader of the Opposition this evening made a plea that some of the men out of work should be employed upon earthworks for new railways. He admitted it was difficult to get rails, owing to the fact that we had to import them, but he said the earthworks and other preliminary work could be proceeded with pending the time when we could get the rails. These people should not be refused a railway.

The Minister for Lands: There would be 60,000 bags of wheat in that area.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I do not know. I have received a letter from Mr. M. J. Johnson, the secretary of the association at Lake King, in which he tells me that the settlers are very satisfied with their land and that they have magnificent crops, but that they urgently need a railway. As I say, the Loan Estimates provide for the expenditure of a certain amount of money on railway construction. Why not proceed with the earthworks? The land is all right; the

climate is all right; and the settlers are all right. All that is needed is a railway. Whilst I admit the money cannot be found to purchase rails, at least the unemployed can be engaged upon the earthworks in preparation for putting the rails down later on.

The Minister for Lands: When do you anticipate we shall be able to buy the rails?

Hon. P. Collier: How could anybody have an idea of that? It might be next year or 10 years hence.

The Minister for Lands: Of course it might.

Hon. P. Collier: If we get round the corner it might not be very long.

The Minister for Lands: Who said that?

Hon. P. Collier: Everybody supporting your party is saying it.

The Minister for Lands: I heard some of your party say it.

Hon. P. Collier: It is coming from your side.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Premier: We all wish ourselves round the corner.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister for Lands asked me when I anticipated the rails could be purchased. I refer the Minister to his statement in connection with the railway north of Yuma. He practically promised a railway to the people there.

The Minister for Lands: I did not suggest anything of the kind.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I hope you did not.

Hon. P. Collier: I have a reply of yours in which you practically promised a railway to them.

The Minister for Lands: I did not.

Hon. P. Collier: You did.

The Minister for Lands: I did not.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I have the Minister's reply cut out. I think it was a wrong statement for him to make.

Hon. P. Collier: He said the rails were there.

The Minister for Lands: I said it might be possible to get the rails.

Hon. P. Collier: You said the rails were there.

The Minister for Lands: I did not.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, you did.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I read the Minister's statement in the Geraldton paper. He did convey a promise, and a hope, to the people that they would get the railway.

Hon. P. Collier: It was more than a hope.

Hon. M. F. TROY: He said the rails were available.

The Minister for Lands: I say that statement is not true. I did not make it.

Hon. P. Collier: It appeared in the paper. I was there the week after you were, and had something to say about it. We beat you, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: It was an utterly wrong statement to make. The Minister should not have gone to a district and held out the hope to the people there that, because a railway was being taken up elsewhere the rails could be used for a railway to that district. The Minister may have been hard pressed at the time to support his colleague. However, I take his word that he did not make the statement, but I will show him the paper, and he can make a correction.

The Minister for Lands: I never made such a statement.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The people at Lakes King and Carmody should have the promise held out to them. If not for a railway, then that the earthworks for a railway will be constructed. If they see that work being done, they know they will have a chance of getting a railway within a reasonable time. If within the next two years things do not improve in this State, there will not be any produce to carry over the existing railways.

Hon. P. Collier: We will not be building new railways, but closing down the present ones.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. It will not be possible to carry on the producers in this State. I hope the Premier will give us some idea of what he proposes to do in connection with the wheat areas. What does he propose to do to overcome the dissatisfaction that exists among the wheatgrowers? Let the Premier tell us what interest has been paid by the settlers during all these years and whether it is the intention of the Government further to reduce capitalisation, as I understand he promised to do.

The Premier: I did not promise that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The settlers themselves told me so. At the last election, I was told by settlers that you had promised a further reduction.

The Premier: I did not.

Hon. M. F. TROY: You promised them the earth. It is only justice that you should now do something for them. You are the

most criticised man in the South-West part of the State.

The Premier: I do not rejoice in that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I think you deserve it. I hope the experience will do you good, and that when you are in opposition again you will try to help the administration and not take the opportunity of making things more difficult for them, especially when you know they are doing their best. Furthermore, I hope you will refrain from inspiring statements in the Press condemning the administration. The Premier played a very poor part when I was Minister for Lands. He is given to platitudes, making misleading statements, waving his hands and so forth. He failed because he was not practical. How can one expect practical results from a man who puts settlers on banksia country and sand areas? Certainly he has failed and consequently the settlers are entirely dissatisfied. When he was in opposition he might have assisted the Government then in power, instead of adopting an attitude for which I sometimes think he must be sorry. I propose to conclude where I started. I have spoken about the dissatisfaction existing in the State to-day and about the disturbed mind of the people. That is evidenced by the present action of the wheat-growers. I do not wonder that the wheat-growers are holding meetings and passing resolutions to keep their wheat back. At the same time, I think it is quite futile for them to hold it back, but can one wonder at the attitude of the farmers? They have been producing at a loss for some years and now find themselves heavily burdened with debt. They are exasperated when they find that they cannot get a fair price for their produce, and the exasperation drives them to action which, normally, they would not contemplate. Whilst I consider their action is futile, I do not object to their bringing to bear as much pressure as they possibly can on the Federal Government. I do not want to make things difficult for the present Government by saying they ought to assist farmers, because I know they have not the resources. I will be candid and admit that. I do not want to embarrass the Government. I wish to be perfectly fair to them. The method by which Mr. Lyons is assisting the wheat-growers is, however, in my opinion, puerile. In the first place, the assistance is inadequate. That

may be excused, because it is probably all the Federal Government can spare: but they are throwing a few million pounds to the farmers as they would throw a bone to a hungry dog, in a take-it-or-leave-it way. Mr. Lyons and Mr. Latham, the Federal Attorney General—I am not now referring to the Minister for Lands—

The Minister for Lands: You had better make that perfectly clear, or I will get blamed for it, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I will make it perfectly clear. It is not Mr. Latham, the Minister for Lands, but Mr. Latham, the Federal Attorney General. Neither Mr. Lyons nor Mr. Latham favours a bonus. I am not altogether in disagreement with them. I would rather not give bonuses to any industry if it could be avoided; but in this case some help must be afforded the farmers. The Federal Government, however, instead of distributing the money fairly amongst all the farmers, have made distinctions which must cause the greatest possible dissatisfaction amongst the farmers.

Hon. P. Collier: I think the State Government ought to refuse to distribute the money.

The Minister for Lands: Wait until we are asked to do so.

Hon. P. Collier: We are told we shall be asked to do so. You ought to refuse to do it on the basis the Federal Government are laying down.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Federal Government are providing this money for the necessitous farmers. It will be a very difficult matter for any board that may be appointed to select the necessitous farmers.

The Premier: It will be difficult to find the exception.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Sometimes the necessitous farmer may not be the most deserving farmer.

Hon. P. Collier: Very often.

Hon. M. F. TROY: What will happen, if that policy is pursued, is that the most undeserving will get the assistance. The undeserving farmer will be helped, while the deserving farmer will be pushed off his holding.

Hon. P. Collier: And you will have to keep the undeserving farmer all his life.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Could anything be more ridiculous than the proposal of the Federal Government, or of the party which dominates the Federal Government, because the party must dominate the Government to some extent. Humorous as it is to members

on this side of the House, we note Senator Johnston intends to move an amendment in the Senate insisting that the money shall be fairly distributed. Upon whom is he depending to carry the resolution? The Labour Party, the party he called enemies a few years ago.

Mr. Panton: A few weeks ago.

Mr. Corboy: They told the farmer to beware of the Trades Hall, and then they rely on the Trades Hall.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is their peculiar politics. They are associating with their enemies, and are alienating those who should be their allies. We have this hope at least, that at the next elections they propose to cut the political throats of their present allies. I hope that the Federal Government will be compelled to distribute the few million pounds they have provided in a reasonable and fair manner. I trust the farmers will keep at them until they have distributed equally the money, whether it is £1,000,000 or £2,000,000, amongst those who are deserving of it. I support any action the farmers may take. Their hold up action is, in my opinion, futile. It will never get them anywhere. However, I support their agitation to compel the Commonwealth Government to distribute this money fairly and equally amongst them all. The Premier did not say, when introducing the Loan Estimates, that we had turned the corner, but on many occasions he has referred to the matter. A few days ago he spoke of the inquiries for land that had come from the Eastern States for the 800 or 900 farms in the hands of the bank. He said these things were very comforting. I never saw a man so easily comforted. He need not go to Victoria or any other State for settlers. There are 10,000 men here who would go on the land if there was any hope of their making a living in that occupation. Everybody desires to get a home of his own at any cost, whether he lives in this State or any other. I do not think we have turned the corner. If the prices we are now getting for our primary products continue for another two years, we shall be an exhausted community. We shall not be able to pay anything to anybody. The Government are imposing heavy taxation. There is no hope that we shall be able to pay the interest on the money that is now being raised. We are unable to pay off the floating debt to the banks, nor are we able to overtake our de-

ficit. We are only paying what we are able to pay, because we are putting our hands into the people's pockets as deeply as possible, extracting the last coin we can from them. That sort of thing cannot last for long. We are trying to live up to a certain standard. We are endeavouring to maintain that standard, and also to carry the intolerable burden of war debts. We cannot do these things on present prices. Our only hope is that the oversea nations, which have asked the United States to postpone their war debts, will in the last resort declare that they cannot pay their debts. I have always insisted that people should pay their debts as long as they can make the necessary sacrifices to do so. There comes a time, however, when they cannot meet their liabilities. We know how the old world stands in relation to its debts to the United States. We knew that that day of reckoning would come. In Great Britain the authorities said they would pay their debts to the last penny, but even there, payment cannot be made. If the nations cannot pay, we here cannot pay, although we are paying up as long as we possibly can. Unless a trade revival takes place, which does not seem very possible, there is only one thing to anticipate, namely that the nations will break down under the burden.

Hon. P. Collier: That is a certainty.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That is our only hope of getting relief. They cannot then blame us if we, too, break down. The only doubt about the thing is that the breakdown might not end as happily as we think, but that is another chapter. I do not see any turning of the tide in this country or any turning of the corner. I know interested parties talk about it, but it has not happened. If the war debt is abolished, the whole world will improve. We can then raise our heads and look for new times, and a new hope will spring up in the community.

MR. CORBOY (Yilgarn-Coolgardie) [8.35]: There are two parochial matters to which I desire to refer. The first of these is the reticulation of the Yilgarn area. I regret that no provision has been made in the Loan Estimates for that work. The Premier is well acquainted with the position as it has existed there for the last 10 years. Unfortunately, it is intended that it shall

continue for at least another 12 months. During the 10 years over which that area has been settled, the Agricultural Bank has discouraged settlers from putting down their own water supplies, because they are so close to the goldfields main that when reticulation is provided there the money the settlers would have spent in providing their own water supply would to some extent be wasted. It is time a definite policy was now adopted towards that area. In one sense it was unfortunate that the settlers were so close to the main. Had they been some distance away, provision would have been made long ago with the money that was then available for the Agricultural Bank to provide the necessary water supplies. The holdings are now highly developed, and are well fenced, and would have been stocked long ago. The district would have been a very important wool and lamb-producing centre, and other lines would also have been grown there. The settlement has, however, been hampered for want of water. The policy of the bank has been to suggest that the settlers are bound to get their water from the main, but the Government, year after year, have been unable to find the necessary funds to effect the reticulation. I assure the Government that any assistance the settlers can render will be given in the way of carrying out the reticulation, if the Government will provide the necessary materials. I understand that it may be just as difficult to find pipes for water supplies as it is to find rails for new lines. If it is thought by the Government that the present position will continue, namely, the difficulty of providing materials for the reticulation of this area, let them make a pronouncement to that effect, so that the Agricultural Bank may provide the necessary funds to enable the settlers to instal their own water supply. I appeal to the Government to tell the settlers definitely what the possibilities are for water supplies in their districts, and to do that during the life of the present Parliament. Through circumstances over which the settlers have no control, they have all their eggs in one basket. Unfortunately, they are almost all wheatgrowers only.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is very good sheep country.

Mr. CORBOY: Yes, but there is no water for stock. This is greatly hampering the further development of the district. The

Minister for Agriculture was in the locality quite recently. Strange to say, although this is called a dry area, five or six weeks ago we were marooned for two days because the whole district was bogged.

The Minister for Agriculture: It is the wettest area I have been in for a long time.

Mr. CORBOY: The Minister knows the difficulties which confront the settlers there, and I appeal to him to do his best to influence Cabinet to give some consideration to this question as early as possible. I do not blame the Managing Trustee of the Agricultural Bank. Year after year he has looked to the Government to find the necessary money for the reticulation of this area, and he has taken the view that it would be foolish for him to provide £100 for each settler to enable him to put down a dam, if the Government were going to lay on the water to each block from the goldfields water scheme. The blocks are highly developed. There are many thousands of acres of magnificent feed going to waste every year. The land is also becoming dirty. Weeds of various kinds are making their appearance everywhere, because there is no stock to keep the fallow clean. One of the best farmers in the district finds that his land is in such a state that it is almost impossible to work it, not because of bad farming practice, but because of the seed of the weeds that blows from adjoining abandoned blocks or from Crown lands in the neighbourhood. His fallow is being ruined and he can keep no stock which would clean it up. The Leader of the Opposition and the ex-Minister for Lands have both referred to the question of utilising the unemployed in the construction of earthworks for proposed railways. When a few nights ago we were considering the Estimates of the Lands Department, I congratulated the Government on having proceeded with the survey of the Southern Cross Southwards railway, through the mining settlement. I, too, would like to plead that the Government should follow up that survey, and utilise some of the money that is available for the relief of unemployed in carrying out the necessary earthworks, following the survey of that line. Even though it is impossible to get rails just now, we could make the necessary provision to have everything ready for the laying of the rails when we can get them. It would be much sounder to make the necessary preparations for giv-

ing railway facilities to those settlers, and prepare for the day when we should be able to buy the materials, rather than to fritter money away as it has been frittered away in some instances. Most members of Cabinet are acquainted with the area I am speaking of. The Premier knows it, as does also the Minister for Agriculture and the Attorney General. The settlers to whom I have referred have done magnificent work. They were sent into the district to recover their health, after working on the mines in Kalgoorlie and Boulder. In the majority of cases their health has materially improved. They have done an immense amount of work. The Agricultural Bank has established them according to sound farming practice. It insisted on their following every inch of their country before they sowed their crops. Having been started off under the best farming practice, the settlers have developed their blocks to the highest possible standard. They cannot now get any further advances for improvements. Some of the settlers are 36 miles from a railway. The necessary survey has now been carried out, and I appeal to the Government to follow that up with earthworks. Even if we can do no more at present, let us prepare for the day when we shall be able to do more. Let us prepare the track and provide such facilities as will expedite the laying down of the rails when they are procurable. The settlers concerned are producing great wealth for the country, and ought to be given a chance to carry on without the enormous handicaps they have to contend with, namely, the transport difficulty, in addition to the impaired health from which so many of them are suffering.

MR. SAMPSON (Swan) [8.45]: I regret that the Loan Estimates provide for the expenditure of £5,000 only in connection with the electric power station at East Perth. I cannot learn from the Estimates just how that money is to be expended, but I presume it is for replacements.

Mr. Corboy: No, it is for the expenses attached to sending an officer to London to sell the power house.

MR. SAMPSON: Then it may be money well spent.

Mr. Corboy: You should not complain about the small provision if you want the power house to be sold.

MR. SAMPSON: It is necessary that the provision of electric current should be extended to the outer suburban areas, and I hope the Government will be able to give consideration to that question. The work will be reproductive in the proper sense of the word. The long period during which no rain falls in certain parts of the State makes it essential, if land is to be worked profitably, that water supplies shall be provided. The only way that can be done is by the extension of the cables to the outer suburban areas so that electric pumps may be used to provide the necessary water supplies. Many settlers are unable to carry on to-day because of the absence of those facilities. In the circumstances, I appeal to the Treasurer to give consideration to the requirements of the people I have in mind. Great is their need, and in many instances failure is attributable to inability to secure water supplies. I do not desire to speak at any length on the Loan Estimates, but I thought it my duty not to allow them to be passed without stressing the necessity for the provision of electric current in the outer suburban areas for the purposes I have indicated, and I trust consideration will be given to that matter.

MR. WITHERS (Bunbury) [8.47]: I shall not delay the Committee for long because I recognise the necessity for the Loan Estimates being put through. I appreciate the fact that the Estimates contain provision for the expenditure of £20,000 on work at the Bunbury harbour. I trust that the Estimates will be passed by the Committee without delay and that the Premier will act promptly in putting the work in hand at Bunbury. It requires urgent attention. Last year I referred to the condition of the harbour, and went so far as to have an inquiry held into the whole position. Even so, the inquiry was not satisfactory, and to-day the harbour is in need of most urgent attention. The silting up has progressed to such an extent that immediate dredging is required extensively. I refer to dredging apart from that which is being carried out to-day to provide one berth. This week another boat had to pass Bunbury because there was not the requisite depth of water available alongside the jetty to permit of berthing. That emphasised the necessity for providing not only the berth that is being dredged now,

but additional accommodation to enable boats to take the goods that should rightly be shipped from Bunbury. I hope the expenditure of the £20,000 provided on the Estimates will be the minimum, because of the £500,000 originally provided for the construction of the Bunbury harbour, an unexpended balance of about £29,000 still remains. In those circumstances, I hope the Treasurer will be able to find more than the £20,000 for necessary work at Bunbury. The reconditioning of the road to Roelands quarries and the railway on the breakwater will absorb a considerable proportion of that amount before the actual work on the harbour can be started. The Minister for Works showed me the plans of the proposed harbour improvements and I am satisfied that if the work is carried out Bunbury will benefit appreciably as a result. I am sorry no provision has been made on the Estimates for the drainage work at Glen Iris. I referred to that matter when speaking on the Address-in-Reply and I had hoped that the Loan Estimates would contain some item that would enable the work to be carried out. I have received an appeal from one of my constituents who is making an application for compensation because of damage done to his property over a period of years on account of the constant flooding of his holding. Had that work been provided for in the Estimates, it would have involved the expenditure of from £6,000 to £10,000, and it would have meant that instead of men being sent long distances from Bunbury under the relief work schemes, employment would have been found for them nearer home. I hope the Premier will tell us whether he intends to apply sustenance conditions to the work in connection with the Bunbury harbour, or whether the men will be employed on full time.

The Premier: It will not be possible for us to provide full time work with the present number of men we have on our hands. We must divide the money among the people as best we can.

Mr. WITHERS: I regret that the men will not be employed on full time.

The Premier: So do I.

Mr. WITHERS: While I regret that, I realise that the provision made in the Estimates will relieve the position of the unemployed at Bunbury, and that they will

be able to secure work nearer home. I trust that the Premier will lose no time in pushing on with the Bunbury harbour improvements.

MR. J. H. SMITH (Nelson) [8.52]: I am glad to note that the Loan Estimates contain considerable provision for works relating to the South-West. I am pleased that at last something tangible is to be done in connection with the Bunbury harbour, which is the key port for the South-Western areas. It is the natural outlet for our timber, fruit and wheat industries and it is satisfactory that the Government have made provision for the expenditure of £20,000 on harbour improvements at Bunbury. I hope the Government will make an immediate start with the work because, with the provision of proper berthing accommodation, it will avoid the necessity for sending our fruit an extra 120 miles to Fremantle. I trust that while the Government are about it, they will make proper provision for cool storage facilities and for anything else that is necessary to complete the harbour equipment. It is pleasing to note that the Government intend to extend the railway from Jarnadup to Northcliffe. I want to impress upon them, however, the necessity for extending the railway a further 15 miles to Westcliffe, to which the member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. P. Troy) referred. That additional length of line is essential to give the Westcliffe settlers an opportunity to make good. The lack of railway facilities in the past precluded the Northcliffe settlers from succeeding in their efforts. It is bad enough in these times to carry on when the settlers are close to railway facilities, but it is much worse when they are cultivating their blocks 40 miles from the nearest siding. I notice that £10,000 is provided for the Manjimup-Mt. Barker line. That item has been on Loan Estimates for a considerable time past, but the money has never been expended. I assume that the Government have made up their minds to spend that money on a survey of the railway, because the Railway Advisory Board went through and strongly advocated the construction of the line. It is the policy of the Government to clear land and they have started at the Mt. Barker end and have pushed the work out to the Frankland River. I understand it is to be continued beyond there. The railway requires to be surveyed and the men

could then be put on to the construction of earthworks so that when money became available, the rails could be bought and the lines constructed. It is satisfactory to know that the Government have 500 men engaged in work in connection with the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook line. It is said that the Government intend to run a road train for the time being. We have yet to find out what a road train really means, but I understand the object is to save the cost of rails. That will be all right for the conveyance of dairy produce, fertiliser and wool, but it will be of no use for timber consignments from the belt 30 miles out from Boyup Brook. Provision amounting to £30,000 is made for the railway, and I hope the Premier will recognise the necessity for the construction of the line from Boyup Brook at the earliest possible moment. If the rails are not available, I trust he will employ the men on building bridges and doing the necessary earthworks so that the line can be completed when money is available. If that work is carried out, it will provide facilities for people who have been in that area for 40 or 50 years and will grant them their long-wished for dream. I am grateful to the Government for what they have done and also to the Collier Government for what they did in setting the ball rolling. Our dreams are almost fulfilled, and I want to impress upon the Premier the absolute necessity of the work. If rails are not serving any purpose at all in another district, they could surely be used where they will serve a good purpose. Later on we shall have an opportunity to discuss the ramifications of the Group Settlement Scheme when the Royal Commission's report will receive consideration. The report submitted by the Commission is a very fine one. I know it will be dealt with sympathetically by members and that something effective will be done. The Commissioners made a particularly fine job of their work, and I trust that much good will result.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM (Kalgoorlie) [8.58]: While I agree that the wheat-growers are in a most parlous position and that primary producers generally are hard up against it, I think the Premier will agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition regarding the one bright spot in connection with primary production—gold mining. In view of the fact that the price of gold to-day is approximately £8 per ounce,

the time is opportune for the Government to do everything possible to encourage the gold mining industry.

The Premier: We are paying £150,000 on account of gold. I refer to the exchange.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am pleased with that.

The Attorney General: You think it should be £300,000.

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM. As a result of that expenditure, the Government have done a considerable amount of good.

The Minister for Mines: Can you tell me when the time has been ripe not to do anything?

HON. J. CUNNINGHAM: I have no complaint to make at all. I want to draw the attention of the Premier and the Minister for Mines to the fact that within the last six months the Government saw fit to lease a battery, which they designated a public battery at Kalgoorlie. From complaints I have received, it would appear that it is a worn-out plant, incapable of doing the work it is supposed to do. Recently when a parcel of 80 tons was taken to the plant for treatment, 15 tons only had passed through at the end of eight days. I do not think that is altogether encouraging. I do not think the plant is rendering the best possible service; as a matter of fact, there is ample room for improvement. By making the plant serviceable the Minister will be doing something in addition to what he has already done to assist the industry. Recently a prospector approached the man in charge of that plant with a view to having a crushing put through, but was told there was no chance of getting his ore treated within the next four months. So I say the plant is not doing its work. It would be interesting to know the initial cost of that plant, the cost of making repairs as the result of a series of breakdowns, and the treatment costs of the ore. If those figures were looked into, the Minister would come to the conclusion that since he has already committed himself and his Government to provide crushing facilities at Kalgoorlie, a new treatment plant should be provided. People are hampered in having their ore put through, and not only hampered but disappointed. Leaseholders and prospectors are often backed by business people, and so in existing circumstances those people are held up for their cash. It is not only the prospector who is interested, but all those connected

with mining. I advise the Minister to look into this matter, for the plant is very unsatisfactory and the people are waiting, disappointed. They give the Minister for Mines full credit for what he has done. No doubt he did it in good faith, being of opinion that the plant, when leased and reconditioned, would render the necessary service. But that is not so. Since gold is now worth £8 per ounce, we should seize the opportunity to push on with development work and win as much gold as possible, so as to get that added value. There are other mining matters worth mentioning. There is the Lawlers goldfield, from which £3,000,000 worth of gold has been won. However, present-day prospectors cannot go there, because there is no battery available.

The Minister for Mines: There are two batteries there.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Yes, both like that at Kalgoorlie. It is useless to put stone through obsolete and ill-conditioned plants that will not recover the gold from the ore. Prospectors will not, and cannot be expected to, go to such plants. It should be the Minister's business to see that prospectors can carry on their operations on a field from which so much wealth has been won. The Leader of the Opposition remarked that every opportunity should be given for providing miners with water. Take Ora Banda: I know the Minister has this matter under consideration, and he might remind me that it was brought under my notice when I was in charge of the goldfields water supply. But conditions have altered.

The Minister for Mines: Very considerably altered, and we have given instructions to connect Ora Banda with the goldfield-water supply. We have given instructions to commence the job.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: I am very pleased to hear that, and I congratulate the Government on having put the work in hand.

The Minister for Mines: You had better put that in writing.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The Government have received assurances from the leaseholders and prospectors as to the quantity of water that will be used, and the probable amount of revenue that will accrue to the department. Those assurances I, as Minister, could not get. So the present Government are in a more fortunate posi-

tion. The Premier, through his Minister, will know that there will be a certain amount of revenue available at the end of the financial year. I was unable to get those assurances, even from the manager of the biggest mine operating in the district. The Premier, of course, must have some idea as to where he is going to get his revenue as the result of the capital expenditure incurred in connecting Ora Banda with the goldfields water supply. I am pleased to learn that he has that assurance and, through his Minister, has authorised the construction of the work.

The Minister for Works: The Minister has not that assurance yet.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Well, evidently the Minister has great faith in the district in consequence of the additional amount of work accomplished, the number of new lodes that will be opened up, and the increased gold production confidently to be expected as the result of the installation of a water supply. I want the Government to carry on additional expenditure and push the industry as far as possible because, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, we are receiving from the industry wealth which is of material advantage, not only to the men in the industry, but to the State as a whole, and to the Treasurer who, naturally, is desirous of securing as much revenue as he can get.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—in reply) [9.7]: There is not much that I need say. The Leader of the Opposition was perfectly right in saying we cannot buy imported goods just now. Members probably are aware that group settlement was taken over by the Agricultural Bank some time ago, and is now being run by the bank as part of the bank's business. I do not remember having ever done anything that would render difficult the administration of group settlement while I was out of office. I should like to say, however, that I spent in my first year and the last two years combined £1,561,000, as against £5,563,000 spent during the six years of the previous Government, interest being responsible for £1,010,000 in their years and £61,000 in my first three years. A great deal of work has been done, and the result in production is not altogether unsatisfactory: as a matter of fact, in the

Busselton district, where three tons of butter per week was produced before we had group settlement, the weekly output to-day is about 50 tons. The member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) said no buildings had been erected in my time. As a matter of fact, £265,000 was expended on buildings in my first term, £429,000 in Mr. Angwin's time and £79,000 during the time the hon. member was in control. During the three years from the inception of group settlement until we left office, and during the two years that have elapsed since we returned to office, £1,561,000 has been spent. Altogether on group settlement during the six years we were out of office £5,565,000 was spent. Of course, of that amount £1,000,000 was for interest. The work of managing group settlement is now with the trustees of the Agricultural Bank, and it is right that it should be so. I think the ex-Minister for Lands is entirely wrong in his estimate of the worth of Mr. Pullen. I was sorry to hear the hon. member's criticism of that officer, for he is certainly a capable man, and was promoted by Mr. Angwin to be the head of the migration branch.

Hon. P. Collier: That is quite a different sphere.

The PREMIER: He is a very fine officer.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I did not find him so.

The PREMIER: I do not know anything about his work under the ex-Minister, but so far as I know, it has always been satisfactory. Mr. Pullen is certainly a capable man, and I am sure will fill the position he now occupies to the satisfaction of the Bank.

Hon. M. F. Troy: The bank had no hand in it.

The PREMIER: I regret the criticism of Mr. Pullen, who is not here to defend himself, but I know he is a thoroughly competent officer, and so too is Mr. Vickery, and many other officers of the department.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Where did Pullen get his experience?

The PREMIER: He had experience before he came here, and he has had 10 years' experience in this country.

Hon. M. F. Troy: How did you pick him up?

The PREMIER: I did not pick him up at all; he is far too heavy for that. I do not wish to enter into any argument with

the hon. member. I hope we have all done our best while having anything to do with group settlement or any other settlement, but I do wish the hon. member would refrain from saying on every possible occasion that I made his administration difficult. I do not think the hon. member ever spoke to me on group settlement during the time he was Minister. As a matter of fact, he established the Muresk Agricultural College in my district without mentioning to me that he had a thought of doing so.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I did you a good turn there.

The PREMIER: But there ought to have been a very much better feeling between us than there was. The group settlers are now under the Agricultural Bank, and they came under the bank as the result of a Bill my friend, Mr. Angwin, submitted to the House. The settlers are not paying their interest as they should do, but certainly they are doing very much better than they were, and I think they are settling down to their work. These are times of very low prices, but if the hon. member will turn up the published figures of imports in the "Quarterly Abstract," he will see that the importation of foodstuffs has very materially decreased during the last two years, by, I think, £1,600,000. Something was said about the settlement at Lake King and Lake Carmody. The hon. member knows far more about the origin of that settlement than I do. It was expected that a railway would be built out there; in fact, a scheme of railways under the Migration Agreement. The plans were prepared for a big scheme of railway building, but everything was laid aside on account of the report of Dr. Teakle. Although the settlers had been sent out there, when the report came along, it was no longer possible to build the railways under the Migration Agreement. It had been promised by the Migration Commission sitting in Melbourne, and when they found the report on salinity was made, they withdrew their partial approval, and so the railway has not been built. I believe the crops there this year are very good.

[Mr. Panton took the Chair.]

Mr. Wells: I saw them a fortnight ago and they were wonderful.

The PREMIER: While we are assisting those settlers with cartage over the long distance, and must do so, we can do no more for them at the moment. If it be safe country, as I hope it will prove to be, although I am bound to confess that reports of Dr. Teakle are very much against it, I trust the day will come when we shall be able to open up the country, because it is good country except for the doubt created by the investigation. I think that the Federal Migration Commission went far enough in the matter to commit themselves, at any rate morally, to the building of that railway, and I am still hopeful that we may be able to induce them to face the responsibility of helping to finance its construction. A great deal of money has been spent in testing the country and clearing the land there and further afield, and that expenditure will be quite useless until a railway is built. Regarding the miners' settlement, the line has not been authorised. A survey is being made but nothing further can be done in the matter until Parliament has been consulted. It is quite possible that we shall get a road train that will help considerably with areas situated as is the one south of Southern Cross. It is quite possible that we shall be able to transport wheat by road very cheaply, and if it be possible, we shall be saved the cost of constructing a railway. The matter is being inquired into and I think there is little doubt that a road train will be able to do the work.

Item—Salaries, Immigration, £350.

Mr. SLEEMAN: When speaking on the Revenue Estimates some weeks ago, I mentioned the case of a certain family. The Minister said he expected to be able to send them Home at an early date. I understand that he has since been in touch with the Commonwealth and has been turned down. I should like to know whether any of this money could be spent to send the family Home.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I cannot find any money for the purpose under this item. I took up the matter with the Federal authorities and had rather a cold reception. To-day I had the file before me and have again sent it to the Treasurer. After we have obtained information as to the lowest possible price for sending the family Home, the matter will be further considered.

Mr. Sleeman: Will you be able to get passports.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I think so.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Railways and Tramways, etc.*, £267,000:

Item—Rolling stock, Railways, £20,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: What rolling stock is to be constructed out of the £20,000? Evidently the Estimates were prepared before the report of the select committee on the Bulk Handling Bill was received. Having regard to the estimated cost to the department for rolling stock if bulk handling becomes an established fact, £20,000 will not go far. Is provision made in the £20,000 for rolling stock for bulk handling? If not the Minister will have to get an excess. While it is not unusual to get an excess, generally an excess is for a very minor amount. This, however, will involve an excess of—

Mr. H. W. Mann: Half a million.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Not for the next six months. For the rest of the financial year an excess of probably £50,000 would be required.

Mr. Kenneally: The present Minister will not be concerned after the next six months.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am not saying anything about that.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No provision is made for expenditure on rolling stock to meet the possibility of the introduction of bulk handling.

Hon. A. McCallum: I do not think you will need any.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I said possibility, not probability. There is a slight margin which the Leader of the Opposition will understand is helpful to a Treasurer. We are providing approximately £13,500 to construct a new type of sheep truck, which we hope will overcome some of the difficulties attending the transport of sheep to market.

Hon. P. Collier: The immediate necessity is not sheep but wheat.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: There is room for a difference of opinion on that. The immediate difficulty from a railway point of view is sheep. We are leaving wheat until the necessity arises. We are providing £4,600 to continue the work of

fitting vacuum brakes to existing wagons and also for expenditure on super-heating locomotives. That leaves a margin of about £1,900 which may be drawn on for any construction of rolling stock for bulk handling. Then if the wish of the member for East Perth proves to be the father of the thought, the new Treasurer will be able to use the £1,900 for bulk handling and probably obtain the balance from the Treasurer's Advance, a very handy fund. The member for East Perth may know nothing about that, but the Leader of the Opposition knows something about it. If it is possible to buy a "Kangaroo" out of the Treasurer's Advance, it should be possible to buy one or two railway wagons. No provision has been made for bulk handling trucks. I have not been asked to make any such provision.

Item—Tramways, Perth Electric, £20,000.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: Will the Minister explain what is included in this item?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The expenditure is largely for the completion of some bogey cars that were partly constructed. We thought it would be well to complete them and get them out of the way. Unfortunately we have had to adhere to the old type because of the difficulty of introducing a new type. As there were only five bogeys to be completed, we thought it better to complete them. The balance is to provide trolley buses in lieu of relaying the tram track along Kensington-street. I have already explained that the cost of taking up the old rails and laying new ones to run the same service and earn the same revenue would be approximately the same as the cost of providing trolley buses over an extended route. The trolley buses would provide for the same traffic as far as Barrack-street, and give a new route along Wellington-street, past the Metropolitan Markets, and as far west as the Leederville Town Hall in Cambridge-street. For the same outlay we shall be able to provide the additional earning capacity, and it is believed that we shall earn enough to pay interest on the outlay and show a slight surplus. To relay the tram rails would mean sending the bulk of the money out of the State. The trolley buses will enable us to provide an equally good service over the existing route and a new service to an area that should be catered for.

Mr. H. W. Mann: When will the trolley buses be operating?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We do not know the date, but we expect they will be operating by the end of January.

Hon. A. McCallum: Are you building them here?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Not entirely. If we obtained only the chasses for the three buses, we would have to prepare from blue prints the necessary patterns and that would take some months. We have obtained one complete trolley bus and two other chasses. As soon as those chasses arrive, we shall construct the bodies.

Hon. A. McCallum: What will be the cost?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Speaking from memory the cost of the complete bus is £2,600, while each chassis costs about £1,800. If we built the bodies locally the estimated cost of the three buses would be nearly £1,600 more, but we are meeting the position by securing the one complete bus. On the recommendation of Mr. Taylor, we have obtained one complete bus and the two chasses, and subsequently any bodies needed will be built in our own workshops.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am surprised to learn from the Minister that the Tramway Department are building five of the old bogey cars. Whatever is wrong with the Tramway Department?

The Minister for Railways: What is right with them!

Hon. P. COLLIER: Prior to our leaving office, as far as my memory serves me, it was contemplated that additional cars should be built. I think I am right in saying that definite instructions were given to the department to build the new type of car, such as is in use in Adelaide and Melbourne. Notwithstanding those instructions, I find there are some newly built cars of the old bogey type on the track. Now the department are going to build five more of them.

The Minister for Railways: I think there is some difficulty in getting the motor required for the other type.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There cannot be.

The Minister for Railways: Yes, there is.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Why is that difficulty not experienced in Adelaide or Melbourne?

The Minister for Railways: Because of the difference in the gauge.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Surely the manufacturers of motors for bogeys for a wide gauge can make motors suitable for a narrow gauge.

The Minister for Railways: I am told there is a great deal of difficulty about it.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I cannot imagine why there should be. The old bogey car is now as much out of date for transport purposes as the bullock wagon formerly was. It must be costing thousands of pounds a year in running costs because these long bogey cars are still being used. They empty at one end at each crossing. The passengers pass leisurely along the corridor, yarning to a friend here and making appointments there. The car has seating accommodation for 40 passengers.

Hon. H. W. Mann: More than that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am speaking of the seating accommodation; probably there are 50 other passengers hanging on to straps. I have seen as many as 100 people in one of these bogey cars, and every one of the hundred has to leave the car before anybody can enter it. The extraordinary thing is that the people seem to be like sheep. In the busy part of the day, when a large number are at a stopping place waiting to enter a car, they stand in a ring around the exit, and the people getting off the car have to push them to one side in order to get through. The tram conductors might easily say to the people who are waiting and preventing the rapid exit of passengers, "Stand on one side to let the passengers out," but that is not done and the passengers have to jostle their way through the crowd. One can see a car standing at a crossing for five minutes while the passengers alight and the waiting people leisurely board the tram one by one. So far as my observation goes, there is not a tramcar of a similar kind in any other part of Australia. One has only to go to Adelaide or Melbourne to see the open spaces in the cars there. People can board or alight from the car with great rapidity. In fact, you must get on quickly or the car will not wait for you. Passengers can alight in a second or two from four or five different parts of the car. When I was in office, it was put up to me that it would be inconvenient to the conductors if the type of car in use here was altered, because they would not have time to collect fares and, consequently, many fares would be lost. Surely that is absurd. The con-

ductors in Adelaide and Melbourne are always on the footboard of the tram collecting fares, and if there was any leakage in that respect, the type of car used there would not have been adopted. The Tramway Department, however, seem to have made up their minds. Are they impervious to ideas? Are they determined to resist even the decisions of Governments? Will they retain the old-fashioned type of car, whether the people like it or not? I cannot believe for a moment that there is any difficulty in the construction of bogeys.

The Minister for Railways: They say so.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I cannot believe it. I am not sure of the gauge in Brisbane.

The Minister for Railways: I have not been to Brisbane.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I have, and I know Brisbane has a narrow gauge, similar to ours. I think it is passive resistance here on the part of the Tramway authorities, or, rather, the Railway authorities, because the bogeys are being constructed in the Midland Junction Workshops, and under the supervision of the railway engineers, not the tramway engineers. If one timed a car here over a given distance and a car in Melbourne over the same distance, I venture to say one would find that the time would be cut down by one-half in Melbourne. It is not only a question of loss of time, but of convenience. If a passenger is at the end of a long bogey car, he has to wait until the other passengers move slowly down, one at a time, Chinese fashion, because the corridor does not permit of two walking abreast. Mrs. Jones will say to Mrs. Brown, "I will be over to tea to-morrow afternoon."

Miss Holman: And Mr. Brown will say the same to Mr. Jones. "I'll meet you at the club."

Hon. P. COLLIER: I invite members to bring their powers of observation to bear at some of the principal stopping places in the city and note the delays that occur. In other cities the people are educated to board and alight a tramcar quickly.

Member: Or they will take you on or leave you standing.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Yes. It should be the business of the tramway officials to educate the public in that way. I wonder what people who come here for the first time from some of our other capital cities, or from overseas, think about our tramway

system and the lackadaisical, come-day, go-day, God-send-Sunday method in which our trams meander along the streets. It is all because these long bogey cars are still kept in use. If all the cars proposed to be built are not yet put under construction, I hope the Minister will immediately stop the work.

The Minister for Railways: They have been under construction for the last two or three years.

Hon. P. COLLIER: There were some under consideration when we were in office.

The Minister for Railways: They are the same ones.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is 2½ years ago and they have not passed the first crossing yet! I do urge that we ought to bring our tramway service up to date. People will soon learn to get on and off trams quickly. It is only a matter of a few months and the travelling public will be educated.

Mr. Sampson: How can the people board or leave the tram quickly where there is only one exit?

Hon. P. COLLIER: It is not the fault of the passengers or of the employees of the Tramway Department.

Mr. Corboy: They started that education to-day. Our tram started for Maylands and got half-way there from Perth when we had to wait to pick up the conductor.

Mr. COLLIER: Between the hours of 5 and 6 o'clock, when the big bogey cars are crowded and there are 30 or 40 passengers standing in the corridor, I have often seen someone in the centre of the corridor trying to get off. He has to struggle through the people in front of him and when he reaches the back platform, there is another crowd (I have counted as many as 15 on the platform) through which he has to force his way.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Sometimes he goes up to the front platform and finds he cannot get out that way.

Hon. P. COLLIER: That is so. We are over 20 years out of date. Why stick to this antiquated system? As I say, I hope that if some of the cars which it is proposed to build have not been already commenced, the Minister will give instructions that they shall not be proceeded with. There is not one of these old bogey cars on any other tramway system in Australia. We

are perpetuating the trouble by building new cars of the old-fashioned type.

Mr. H. W. MANN: I endorse much that has been said by the Leader of the Opposition about the bogey cars. The contention that conductors would not have reasonable control over passengers if the car had a side entrance is not sound. Anyone who travels on the long cars can see the conductor has no real control over the passengers once he leaves the back platform and endeavours to force his way along the alleyway to collect fares. People who desire to get off cannot get in touch with him. Passengers can get on a tram, travel past several streets, and get off again without his knowledge. I wonder what would occur if a tram car caught fire. The passengers in the centre could not get out because of the stampede that would follow at each end, and they would be roasted alive.

The Minister for Railways: Can you tell me what happened when one did catch fire, or when one was struck by lightning?

Mr. H. W. MANN: Of course the Minister sees no sense in anything.

The Minister for Railways: You know there has been no fire in any tram yet.

Mr. H. W. MANN: There have not been any accidents, but accidents may occur at any time. If side entrances were provided, it would be much easier to get out injured passengers.

The Minister for Railways: Evidently the hon. member wants to keep people from using our trams. He has not said a word about the buses.

Mr. Corboy: They are compelled to have emergency doors.

The Minister for Railways: At the end of the bus.

Mr. H. W. MANN: I am sure the Minister does not like the construction of the bogey cars, but, because he is in charge of the department, he feels it is his duty to defend the officers.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And they are holding up the motor traffic whilst they are being emptied.

Mr. H. W. MANN: I am sure no one would raise a greater protest against them than the Minister would if he were a private member. If we see a weakness in the system it is our duty to point it out. I should fail in my duty to the people I represent if I did not raise my protest.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I do not disagree with the suggestion that we should get a better type of tramcar than the bogey car, but I do object to the exaggerated language that is liable to drive people from a concern in which a considerable amount of the taxpayers' money is invested. The member for Perth asks what would happen if a fire took place. If he would tell us what did happen when a fire did take place on a service which we have been operating for 20 years, we would know how to answer his query. I do not want people to be scared of travelling on our trams. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that our bogey car is an unsuitable type. On the other hand the Sydney type of car is quite unsuitable for the streets of Perth, and I would not be a party to putting that on our system. I will obtain from the Commissioner of Railways a copy of the minute he put up to me. He said definitely that it was not practicable to get the type of motor attached to our narrow gauge chassis that is used on a broader gauge, so that we are not able to adopt the type of tram in use in Adelaide or Melbourne where the gauge is 5 ft. 3 ins.

Hon. P. Collier: In Sydney it is 4 ft. 8½ ins.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I agreed with the Commissioner that rather than have the cars, which are partly constructed, remain in the workshops when men are available to do the job and people are asking for additional facilities, it was better to put these five cars on the road. If we could with our narrow gauge obtain the necessary electrical equipment to enable us to adopt a car similar to that in use in Adelaide or Melbourne, we ought to do so, and I will ask the Commissioner to give me reasons why it has been found impracticable to turn out cars of the kind mentioned.

Hon. P. Collier: The main objection I found was the difficulty experienced by the conductors in collecting fares.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I would not agree to the Sydney type of car, where the fares have to be collected on the running board. We have not made any progress in construction during the last two years because we did not want to continue to put bogey cars on our tracks, and thus add to existing difficulties. In 1915 we brought out a type of car with a central

entry. That is better than the type we are using. It has a low step off the roadway, and a wide entrance to the centre, so that people can move readily to each end or from each end of the car. The officials have never attempted to introduce that system since. I do not know if that is because the department did not propose it.

Mr. Hegney: It is an upopular car.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It is a nice riding car, and I think it is especially popular with elderly folk. Our bogey cars have steps that are too high off the roadway before the passenger reaches the floor.

Mr. Corboy: They are altogether too high.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The five additional cars were gone on with, not because we liked the type, but because of the fact, as stated by the experts of the department, that there were difficulties in connection with the electrical equipment.

Item, Electric Power Station, East Perth, £5,000:

Mr. SAMPSON: Is it possible for power extensions to be made into the outer suburban areas? I notice there is an unexpended balance over from last year.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This item is for work already in hand. The balance will be required for additional facilities to accommodate new consumers. I do not think much will be available for the making of additional high-tension extensions, which are very costly. Many such extensions are required, and we ought to be in a position to supply them, but funds are required for other purposes. Unfortunately a fair percentage of the outlay will be required for material from overseas, and the money therefore would not be available for circulation as wages. We have to pare things down somewhere. I regret we cannot take more advantage of the possibility of supplying cheap current to outlying districts. If anything, it is of greater advantage to have cheap electrical current for industrial purposes out of the city area than it is to provide light within the city area.

Mr. Sampson: Many facilities are being forced on sustenance because they cannot produce anything under existing conditions.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We have made extensions in recent years, and

have found difficulty in getting people to understand that they could not be made without capital outlay, and that it is necessary for them to bring in a certain return. There should be evidence that a reasonable amount of current will be taken in order to pay interest and working costs.

Mr. Sampson: Some local authorities are prepared to guarantee the payments if the extensions are made.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is all very well until the extensions are made, when it is often difficult to find out who is responsible for the payment. Cwing to lack of funds we cannot meet all demands, and I am afraid many people will have to put up with the inconvenience they are suffering at present. The Treasurer cannot find any more money than is now available. We could spend £20,000 on extensions in meeting the demands for current.

Hon. A. McCallum: What about your capacity to supply the current? Is the station not taxed to its fullest extent already?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is another point. The question arises whether if we went on extending the system we would not have to face an even more difficult problem. If the demand increased too rapidly, we would find it difficult to meet it.

Hon. P. Collier: You would have been in trouble to-day, but for the falling off in demand for current.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: We shall be in trouble eventually. No additional unit could be obtained and put into a position to supply current under approximately two years. If the means already available for providing current to the metropolitan area were drawn upon to the fullest extent, the station would be without any stand-by. No station can safely carry on in that way.

Mr. Sampson: And the industries in Perth would have to close down.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: I take the view that whatever might appear to be lack of wisdom in expending a large sum of money in importing plant now, if we have any confidence in the future we ought to place as early as possible an order for an additional unit to meet the demand that will arise, as sure as night follows day.

Hon. P. Collier: I had a similar request made to me three years ago.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: One thing we lack in this country is appreciation of the fact that electricity is the best known power for industrial purposes. We have not taken proper advantage of it. In Great Britain, an electricity commission has been established with power to spend up to £30,000,000 to provide a network of generating stations to supply current to the most remote parts of the British Isles. That shows that Britain recognises that electricity is the most modern, cheap and convenient method of supplying power for all purposes. Members have heard of the Five Year Plan in Russia and the wonderful things that have been done in that country with electricity. Only within the last few days I read a report—it is to be found in the Parliamentary Library—of the Labour Convention at Geneva, during the course of which the British representative said that while the Russians were boasting of their Five Year Plan, the small British Isles had five times as much electricity available as they had in Russia.

Hon. A. McCallum: Five years ago Russia had hardly any electric power at all.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is the point. When they talk about percentage increases, and start from nothing and achieve something, it is obvious that 100 per cent. increase does not mean much. It is like a man who has one apple and procures another, thus showing an increase of wealth of 100 per cent. If that man had had two apples to start with and procured another, he would get just as much as the other man, but his increase would be 50 per cent. only. That is the relative positions of Britain and Russia.

Mr. Corboy: Is that the explanation of the unemployment in Britain? Is electricity displacing men?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Exactly the opposite. The increased production of electricity in the British Isles has had the effecting of reducing unemployment.

Hon. A. McCallum: That has been due to the national plan adopted in England.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes, by the establishment of the electricity commission with power to spend up to £30,000,000. In Western Australia we have a power plant that is generating current as

cheaply as any other station in the Southern Hemisphere with the possible exception of one in Tasmania where the current is developed under the hydro-electric scheme.

Mr. Kenneally: And yet people want to sell our power station!

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: And people want to buy our power station! We have a power station with possibilities ahead equal to those apparent in any other part of Australia. People are constantly demanding additional current.

Hon. P. Collier: We have that demand from a few miles away from the power house, and yet we cannot supply the current.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is the position. I have not attended recent meetings of the Loan Council, and do not know what the feeling is now. I know that within the sphere of influence of our power station we could supply a commodity that is not only convenient and cheap but one that would help materially a number of small industries scattered round the metropolitan area. The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson) knows of one instance in which the extension of those facilities meant the immediate difference between what one might describe as a struggle below the breadline to a position almost of affluence.

Mr. Hegney: Many small farmers would benefit if the current were extended to their districts.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That is so. The trouble is that we are held up because the Loan Council says that we must expend on wages the bulk of the money that is raised. There are other considerations that should be kept in mind. There is the matter of providing an essential commodity in the shape of power. Unfortunately we cannot afford to provide the facilities necessary. If we could get the money, I would be prepared to spend it on the power station now, knowing that it would be all to the good.

Mr. H. W. Mann: What would another unit cost?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Approximately £400,000, but the trouble is that the great bulk of that money would be spent in the purchase of materials overseas.

Mr. Sleeman: It would be a much better proposition than bulk handling.

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Comparisons are odious, but I would prefer to spend £400,000 on another unit for the power house than in other directions—and I have not mentioned bulk handling.

Mr. KENNEALLY: For years I have been drawing attention to the necessity for the extension of the power plant at East Perth. There has been a tendency recently on the part of members of this Chamber to advocate the sale of the power house.

The Minister for Railways: I have not heard anyone advocate that.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Either the Minister's hearing is bad or his memory is at fault. The sale of the power house has been advocated to-night.

The Minister for Railways: By whom?

Mr. KENNEALLY: The member for Swan (Mr. Sampson), and this is not the first occasion on which he has advocated the sale of the power house. The sale has also been advocated in the Press. The strange thing is that the very member who advocates the sale of the power house is the first to go cap-in-hand to the Government with a request for the provision of cheap current.

Mr. Sampson: Yes and he has failed every time during the last six years.

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am concerned about the position of the power house. I do not suggest that the Minister is behind the proposition, but it appears to me as though the decks are being cleared to justify any proposal that Mr. Taylor may bring back from England.

Mr. Sampson: It has been justified for a long time.

Mr. KENNEALLY: At one stage tenders were called; actually the piles were purchased for the work, and they are at East Perth now. That tender was not gone on with. I am not blaming any particular Minister, or any particular Government. In reply to the Minister for Railways, who pointed out that the bulk of the money involved in the provision of a new unit would be spent overseas. I acknowledge that his statement is correct, but we must not forget that if we are not able to provide the power that is necessary, we shall not be able to provide work for our people.

Mr. Sampson: The absence of electric current is preventing a lot of men from working to-day.

Mr. KENNEALLY: Yes, and possibly it is the absence of brains that enables the

member for Swan to advocate the sale of the power house.

Mr. Sampson: You should know something about brains!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. KENNEALLY: Here we have the station that is providing the current necessary for the running of our tramway system. We must remain stagnant because of inability to provide additional current, but at the same time we hear talk about increasing the number of trams and extending those facilities. We cannot extend the tramway facilities if we cannot provide the additional power.

Mr. Sampson: And Governments have failed to do so.

Mr. KENNEALLY: It is idle to advocate increased tramway facilities and at the same time, as the member for Swan does, advocate the sale of the power house.

Mr. Sampson: It is time someone did it.

Mr. KENNEALLY: The position is serious from that point of view. Year after year we spend £3,000 or £4,000 whereas, if we had the additional unit, the Minister, instead of spending £5,000 this year, could easily provide on the Estimates for the expenditure of £100,000.

Mr. Sampson: It is no use talking like that; where is the money to come from?

Mr. KENNEALLY: We know that everything is being starved, which will leave a nice position for the next Government to fix up.

The Minister for Railways: And what about those who called for tenders and then had to leave it over because they had not the money?

Mr. KENNEALLY: I am not referring to any particular Minister. No matter which Government is in office, the power house has to be extended in order to supply power to the people and their industries. If we do not make provision for that, we shall not have the power to meet the demand when the depression lifts. If a certain amount of money is obtained from the Loan Council, it would profit the Government to expend it in extending the power house and so provide the necessary power. If Western Australia had all the power required to operate her industries, she would be one of the first countries to recover from the depression, but that cannot be unless we extend the power house. Then that would kill

all this twaddle that comes from the member for Swan.

Mr. SAMPSON: After this long diatribe and wearisome repetition, the hon. member has seen the light to the extent of realising that another unit put into the power house would provide more employment. Evidently at long last the light is breaking in upon the hon. member.

Hon. P. Collier: Due to your persistent efforts.

Mr. SAMPSON: The hon. member has been told time after time that the Government cannot provide the necessary money. Some day perhaps the hon. member will realise that what I have been saying for months past is the only way out, which is that the Government should dispose of the power house, either to a private company or the local authorities, I do not mind which. Alternatively, if the Government could get the necessary money they would be justified in extending the power house.

Hon. P. Collier: Do you think the local authorities could find the money for the purchase of the power house?

Mr. SAMPSON: The Darling Range Road Board would be prepared to see what could be done. I complain of the total lack of extensions during the hon. member's six years as Premier.

Hon. P. Collier: Why, I spent £400,000 on it! I added a new unit to the power house, and I sent the main out through your district.

Mr. SAMPSON: Certainly the brickworks needed an additional cable. Had the money not been expended in that way, we would have had the current extended to Glen Forrest and other hill centres. I want the member for East Perth to look at this from the standpoint of the State. He must not be obsessed by the fact that the generating plant is in East Perth, but must rise above parochialism.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member cannot make a general speech, but must speak to the item before the Committee.

Mr. SAMPSON: The point is that another unit, I understand, cannot be put into the power house because the water available is so limited that it cannot keep the turbines cool. I join with the member for East Perth in hoping it will be possible for the Government to find this money.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—*Harbours and Rivers, £122,500.*

Item—Additions and Improvements to Jetties, Tramways and Rolling Stock in the North-West, £1,000.

Mr. CHURCH: I see no provision made for Roebourne, and I should like to know if there is any amount set aside for the survey to see where the proposed new jetty is to go.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, but there is included in this an amount for the provision of additional facilities at Onslow, and provision for other necessary improvements.

Hon. P. Collier: All in the Roebourne district.

Item—Bunbury Harbour Works, £20,000.

Mr. WITHERS: I understand that of this amount, £12,000 is for preliminary expenses for the railway quarry and other works. Yet I believe Mr. Tindale states it will be six months before any stone will be tipped. Certainly this is not going to create definite work during the next six months. When one sees the amount of money proposed eventually to be expended, namely, £255,000, I hope it will be possible to provide more than £20,000. If it going to cost £12,000 for appurtenances, the £8,000 will not go far. The deep water berth is estimated to cost £94,000. I know that the Minister has in mind an idea of getting apparatus to dredge the rock, such apparatus not being available in Western Australia.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Realising the seriousness of the position at Bunbury, I have tabled the file and plans for the information of members. The trouble at Bunbury is becoming more serious. We have been doing certain dredging in the channel only, but the whole harbour is gradually silting up. The engineer, Mr. Young, has put up a proposal to extend the breakwater in a northerly direction to stop the drift of sand that comes in at the entrance, and to build a groyne to stop the drift down the coast. The first cost is going to be £160,000 for the breakwater and groyne, and that does not provide for any further work. To provide a deep water berth of 30 feet will cost in all £255,000. It will be some years before that work can be completed. I was hopeful of being able to start the work early, but the engine and

trucks for carting the stone are at Geraldton. There is an opening in the reef at Geraldton, the wash through which affects the harbour, and £8,000 has been provided to fill up the gap with stone. When that work is completed, the engine and trucks will be taken to Bunbury. The £20,000 is for reconditioning the railway. The engineers suggest that 60-lb. rails be laid and certain bridges will have to be rebuilt. I hope that before the end of the financial year we shall be in a position to start tipping the stone.

Item — Fremantle Harbour Works, £50,000.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The estimate shows an increase over last year's expenditure. Is it intended to put more men on the work or employ the men at present engaged on full time?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is not intended to put the men on full time. At Fremantle we are reconditioning the North Wharf. A certain amount of loan money has been made available. Last year we expended £34,334, and this year the estimate is £50,000. The number of men employed is 295. We can employ more men and get the work completed more quickly.

Vote put and passed.

Vote — *Water Supply and Sewerage, £645,150:*

Item—Sewerage and Drainage, Perth and Fremantle, etc., £154,000.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Included in the drainage works contemplated is the drainage of Shenton Park. It would mean carrying an underground tunnel for a considerable distance, connecting, I should imagine, with the outfall sewer. Can the Minister give an idea of the estimated cost of the drainage of Shenton Park, or the need for doing the work at all? What is wrong with Shenton Park? It is a beautiful lake in the midst of the suburb, and there seems to be no need to drain it at all. Owing to the rise in the water level, the water has encroached on what was formerly a sports ground, but it has not caused any damage to property that I know of. In these days when money for essential works is scarce, the drainage of Shenton Park might well stand over, because the work cannot be considered urgent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Many people are under the same impression as the Leader of the Opposition. So far as the metropolitan area is concerned, the Metropolitan Sewerage and Drainage Department are responsible for all drains over eight inches. The local governing bodies are responsible for all drains under eight inches. Before a drainage area is proclaimed, the contour is taken and then the whole area is rated. This area will be rated later. At the present time Shenton Park is used as a compensation basin. Quite a large area of Subiaco is drained into Shenton Park; the water cannot go anywhere else. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned the outfall sewer. I think £26,000 has been spent on that already. It is part of the work that I have mentioned. The Subiaco outfall is principally for the purpose of storm water drainage.

Hon. P. Collier: And sewerage.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Three-fourths of the cost is charged to storm water and one fourth to sewerage. It is a very big main. It is not only to be used for the purpose of draining Shenton Park, but also a very large portion of the metropolitan area; for instance, Wembley, Jolimont, West Perth and several other districts.

Hon. P. Collier: Did you say Wembley?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes. That is another scheme. For some distance the pipe is 24 inches, but further on it is 56 inches. We are putting down a 56-inch pipe to take a 24-inch water supply. The reason that junction is put there is because another pipe will run north to drain the country from that point. Eventually, it will all be drained and all be rated. I agree that the department will not now get a very high return, but eventually, when the whole system is in operation, it will pay interest and sinking fund on the money expended upon it. The amount provided on the Estimates this year is £46,388, but that is not all for this particular job. There is the Maylands-Inglewood drainage to be provided for. There are extensions from South-street to Hampton-road, Fremantle, also from Ellen-street, Fremantle, and from Hampton-road to Parry-street, Fremantle. All the proposals put up by South Fremantle have been provided for in these Estimates.

Item, Water Supply in Agricultural and North-West Districts (including Drainage and Irrigation, and loans and grants to Local Authorities and Drainage Boards), £290,000.

Mr. WANSBROUGH: Is that to be spent on drains or on swamps?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The expenditure last year was £326,926. This year we propose to expend £290,000. In addition, the sum of £27,917 has been made available from the Commonwealth grant for winter relief of unemployment. The total amount available from the two sources will be expended as follows—

	£
Harvey irrigation, dam	31,500
Harvey irrigation, lining channels ..	9,000
Wellesley River, canalisation ..	3,050
Collie irrigation, Wellington dam ..	70,000
Collie irrigation, Wellington dam, drains and channels	70,000
Harvey River diversion	108,000
Waroona irrigation channels ..	6,000
Mayfields drain north of Waroona ..	12,000
Improvements—drains South Coolup	3,000
Tanks in agricultural areas—	
Gabbining Rock	5,000
Mollerin	2,500
South Holleton (Gibb Rock) ..	2,500

Vote put and passed.

Votes, Development of Goldfields and Mineral Resources, £26,500; Development of Agriculture, etc., £686,800—agreed to.

Vote, Roads and Bridges, Public Buildings, etc., £61,600:

Item, Workers' Homes Board Capital, £35,000.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I would like the Premier, if possible, to make more money available for these homes. Although not mansions, they are very much appreciated by the people who are successful in obtaining them. Is it possible to have a few more approved of, because it is a cheap way of getting shelter over the heads of people who are unable to pay rent and are being harassed by landlords.

The PREMIER: The member for Fremantle asked about these small homes and I told him that an amount was available

which was under the control of the Minister for Unemployment. It would not do to have too many of these houses in the one centre.

Mr. Sleeman: A good start has been made.

The PREMIER: Yes.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: A promise was made that an item would be placed on the Loan Estimates to allow of explanation and discussion relating to main roads. It does not appear.

The Premier: Could it appear?

Hon. A. McCALLUM: An undertaking was given that an item, even if it were only a small one, would be included, so that some information could be given and discussion allowed, but there is no item on the Estimates at all that will permit of any discussion on main roads.

The Premier: I did not promise that.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I think the Premier suggested it to the Leader of the Opposition, and it was concurred in by the Minister for Works. I raised the point in connection with the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. Hegney: The Minister agreed to do it.

The Premier: I did not.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I thought the Premier, who was in his seat at the time, spoke about it.

Premier: No.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I may be mistaken, but I know the undertaking was given. The position is that the control of the main roads has passed out of the hands of Parliament altogether.

The Premier: That always was so.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: There was always a substantial vote from Loan, and another vote from revenue. Now, Parliament has no opportunity to discuss main road expenditure. It has passed beyond our ken. When the matter was referred to on the Loan Estimates, we were given an assurance that a small item would be included in the Loan Estimates, so that the question might be discussed.

The Premier: I am sorry: I did not know anything about it.

Hon. A. McCALLUM: I suppose it is too late now, but I hope some means will be found to remedy the position that has existed during the last two years. Something like £300,000 is being expended on main

roads. Fancy that taking place without Parliament being given an opportunity to discuss it! Members do not know what is going on in their own electorates, and are not advised. I hope the Premier will see that the position is remedied in the future.

The PREMIER: I agree with the hon. member. I will get the Under Treasurer to make a note of the matter, so that an amount may be provided on the Estimates and the matter discussed.

Vote put and passed.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

BILL—LOAN £2,176,000.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10.45] in moving the second reading said: This Bill merely authorises the raising of money to carry out works that have been dealt with by Parliament. It is the authority under which the money can be raised. It does not of itself authorise any expenditure. The amount set down for works is £1,088,000. Of the balance, £1,073,000 represents the amount approved by the Loan Council to meet our estimated deficit, including the balance of last year's deficit not provided for on last year's Loan bill; and £15,000 is asked for to meet discounts, etc. Prior to last year, a revenue deficit was treated as an advance, and did not appear in the Loan Bill. Under the method of financing the deficit by the issue of short-term Treasury bills, and treating them as part of the public debt, it is necessary to secure authority for the expenditure involved. In connection with the Second Schedule of the Bill, certain authorisations carried forward from previous Loan Bills are not now required, and are being transferred to other items, and in this way an application for a further authorisation is avoided. This is the usual practice.

I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Richardson in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 6—agreed to.

Schedule 1:

Mr. WITHERS: Has any provision been made for the Bunbury harbour works?

The PREMIER: Yes, it has been made elsewhere. This is only the balance of the sum set aside for harbours and rivers.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules 2 and 3, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported, and the report adopted.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, ordered, That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the Bill to be passed through its remaining stages at this sitting.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.*Message.*

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read, recommending appropriation for the purpose of the Bill.

Standing Orders Suspension.

On motion by the Premier, ordered, That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as to enable the Bill to be passed through its remaining stages at this sitting.

First Reading.

Bill introduced by the Premier and read a first time.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [10.55] in moving the second reading said: The Bill merely appropriates the expenditure of money already approved by Parliament under Revenue and Loan Account. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

Remaining Stages.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 30th November, 1932.

	PAGE
Assent to Bills	2076
Question: Motor license fees	2077
Bills: Loan, £2,176,000, 1R.	2077
Appropriation, 1R.	2077
Financial Emergency Act Continuance, 2R.	
Com., report	2077
Justices Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2093
Mining Act Amendment, Com., report	2093
Road Districts Act Amendment, Assembly's Message	2095
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2R.	
Com., report	2095
Wheat Pool, Com.	2095
Cattle Trespass, Fencing, and Impounding Amendment, Assembly's Message	2095
Financial Emergency Act Amendment, 2R.	2096
Companies Act Amendment, 2R.	2026
Health Act Amendment, Assembly's amendments, dissent from chairman's ruling	2101

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Lieutenant-Governor received and read notifying assent to the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Financial Emergency Tax Assessment.
- 2, Financial Emergency Tax.
- 3, Government Ferries.