

appeals only by special leave. In the past it has frequently happened that paltry matters have been litigated right to the Full Court, sometimes greatly to the detriment of one of the parties, who was unable to stand the expense. At the present time a litigant might have judgment given against him in the local court in a matter involving some trifling amount. He has an absolute right of appeal to the Full Court and, if he wins, he is entitled to receive costs, which may amount to anything between £30 and £40. That is wrong. In petty matters it should be possible to reach finality speedily. Even where the amount involved is small, there might be an important principle at stake, and it should be possible for a litigant who claims that an important principle is involved to obtain leave of the court to appeal. In that event the court would probably say, "We agree that an important principle is involved, although the amount at issue is only a few pounds. We shall allow you to appeal, but you will have to pay the costs." That might happen in a case where a powerful corporation had sued some apparently poor person for a small sum. Judgment might be given against the corporation, who would desire to appeal. The Full Court would probably hold that, while there was a principle to be determined, if the powerful corporation wanted to drag the poor person into the Full Court, where he could not afford to go, they would have to pay the costs. It is thought the alteration proposed in this Bill will prevent a lot of unnecessary and frivolous appeals, without causing any hardship or defeating the ends of true justice. When the Bill is in Committee a new clause to amend Section 111 will be moved. It is purely a technical one concerning the extension of the powers of the Supreme Court on appeal. Anything else in the Bill will be explained when the Bill is in Committee if members will be good enough to give me prior notice of their queries. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Is there any provision for limiting the cost?

The MINISTER FOR COUNTRY WATER SUPPLIES: No.

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

House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 16th October, 1930.

	PAGE
Question: Lawyers and clients	1093
Bills: Stamp Act Amendment (No. 2), 1A.	1093
Stamp Act Amendment (No. 3), 1A.	1093
Reserves, 1A.	1093
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment (No. 1), report	1100
Parliamentary Allowances Amendment, 2A.	1100
Salaries Tax, 2A.	1104
Winning Beta Tax, 2A.	1105
Stamp Act Amendment (No. 1), 2A.	1106
Land Tax and Income Tax, 2A.	1106
Loan Estimates	1093
Messages from the Governor	1100
Annual Estimates: Votes and items discussed	1106
Lands and Surveys	1106
Immigration	1125
Town Planning	1127
Medical and Health	1127
Attorney General	1132
Licensing	1134

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

QUESTION—LAWYERS AND CLIENTS.

Mr. SAMPSON asked the Attorney General: 1, Is he aware that an Act to protect the public in their financial dealings with lawyers has been approved in New Zealand, and that a similar Act is under consideration in Victoria? 2, Having in view different instances where moneys entrusted to certain Western Australian lawyers for investment have been misappropriated and clients ruined, will he advise whether it is his intention to introduce a similar measure? 3, If so, when?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Yes. 2 and 3, The matter is now under consideration.

BILLS (3)—FIRST READING.

1. Stamp Act Amendment (No. 2).
2. Stamp Act Amendment (No. 3).
Introduced by the Premier.
3. Reserves.

Introduced by the Minister for Lands.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1930-31.

Message from the Governor received and read, transmitting the Loan Estimates for the year 1930-31 and recommending appropriation.

In Committee of Supply.

The House resolved into Committee of Supply for the purpose of considering the Loan Estimates; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Vote—Departmental, £134,252:

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [4.40]: In the past one has always brought down the Loan Estimates feeling a good deal of pleasure in asking the Committee to authorise the expenditure of a large sum of money on necessary works throughout the State. To-day the position is entirely different when the Loan Estimates are going through, because it is difficult to know where to turn to get the money. It has frequently been said that government is finance and finance is government, but to-day the Government have not as much finance as we have been accustomed to. At such a time there are two points we have to remember: One is the limitation set to our ability to borrow; indeed, our ability to borrow was terminated when we entered into the Financial Agreement. The other point is that, when we try to borrow, we have to look to our ability to pay interest. This must be kept in mind in the future. It is unfortunate that we should have this to think of at a time when the need for development is greater than ever it has been. Actually, our national income should be increased from the £25,000,000 that we have been accustomed to get from the soil, to £30,000,000, even on the falling prices. But we cannot now borrow the £4,000,000 per annum, which has been our average borrowing for a number of years past, and so we must increase production from the soil if we are to maintain our standard of living and provide the income necessary for the sustaining of the industries established within the State. The national income, of course, is made up of all that we produce in the State, from primary industry principally, and a little from manufacturing. Whereas in the past we were able to borrow a considerable amount against our national income, to-day the Treasury is bare, and the last farthing has really gone. Moreover, the Federal Government's borrowing ability has been wiped out. Such money as may be borrowed must be borrowed with the concurrence of the Loan Council, and at their re-

quest by the Federal Treasury. Our right to borrow has been surrendered to the Loan Council.

I hope that presently our Under Treasurer will go East to consult with the Federal Treasurer. Mr. Simpson will then make an endeavour to obtain cash to replace some of the trust funds we have used to spend on loan works. In the loan expenditure to the 30th June last there was a shortage of £3,500,000; that is to say, we have spent £3,500,000 more than was raised for us, some by way of advances in London by the Federal Government on the borrowings from our own trust funds. I have already explained that in the past we were free to do our own borrowing. We then used such funds, and particularly the overdraft in London, replacing it as we could by borrowing when the market became favourable. Also the Under Treasurer will consult with the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank regarding temporary advances. Those, I think, can be arranged, and will help us to carry on some of the works. We can overdraw our banking account here by £700,000 but it will be necessary to arrange for further finance pending the borrowing of additional sums of money. Government finance is largely influenced by trade, particularly by outside trade. The earning power of the moneys invested in the railways and other utilities depends entirely upon trade activities. There is very little connection between Government and private finance. It seems to me that private finance will become easier long before the finances of the Treasury. It was customary to use such balances as we had at our disposal to meet shortages under revenue and Loan expenditure. That cannot be done now. It works in this way: The Forests Department had a credit balance at the Treasury at the end of June of £54,000. The Conservator informed me that he had this sum to spend. He has a great many men engaged in work in one way and another. I asked him where the money was, and he told me it was at the Treasury. I said he would only find an entry there, because the £54,000 would not be available to him. There was an item of £293,000 at the 30th June in connection with loan repayments. That money was also used on loan works prior to the 30th June. Under the Financial Agreement all repayments of loan moneys must be made to a

special account and re-appropriated by Parliament. It will be noticed that whilst our borrowings may be limited to £2,750,000, I have included £250,000 for loan repayments so that certain work may be carried on. It is impossible to touch such expenditure until that refund has been made. There are the entries at the Treasury but not the money. There is another entry, "Sale of Government property £322,371." That is in the same position. The amount asked for to meet new expenditure is £2,237,752. To clear last year's loan suspense expenditure a sum of £200,543 is required, making a total of £2,438,295. I hope before the year is out we shall be able to get a little more money. Out of what is raised and what we may add to this limited sum, I am asking for authority to carry out certain works. Last year's loan expenditure was £3,693,052, and the total of the present Loan Estimates is £2,438,295. It is extremely difficult to get loan money at present. It will be found that many of the usual votes have disappeared. Loan expenditure must earn interest and sinking fund within a reasonable period of the completion of the work. That is absolutely essential if we are to meet our interest bill. If our loans had to be renewed on the present market price, our interest bill would automatically go up by £1,000,000 a year. I hope before any considerable amount of our loans falls due, the rate of interest will have decreased. The limitation of loan moneys will affect works that require an annual vote from the Loan Fund. The Leader of the Opposition will appreciate the position when I mention improvements to opened railways, on all of which a considerable amount has been spent during the last two years. The electricity supply is a responsibility that we undertake and that we have to honour so far as we can.

There is also the question of the metropolitan water supply, sewerage and drainage and the expenditure thereon within the metropolitan area. These responsibilities render the position very difficult. Money cannot be found, and we cannot provide all the water supplies and do all the other work necessary within the metropolitan area. I would point out that the people of that area find the interest and sinking fund on such money is as expended on their account.

I hope members representing the metropolitan area will realise that for the moment it is not possible to add to the work which means additional water supplies and other conveniences for their electors. The development of agriculture must suffer so long as there are these loan-raising restrictions. In these directions our responsibilities remain, but our means of meeting them have for the moment disappeared. I want to make it clear that even for work that is provided on these estimates, money may not be available. It will be available in a limited way, and works will be carried on, and some to completion. There are works which are nearing completion such as the Geraldton harbour and certain railways. We want to finish them so that they may earn interest. I am sure members will agree it is right that as much as possible of these funds as are available will be spent on wages. We shall buy as little as may be from overseas. We cannot afford to buy many rails or other expensive material from overseas or the Eastern States while loan money is so scarce. In February of last year the Loan Council thought that £24,000,000 would be raised in Australia. Our share of this was to have been £2,800,000. At the last meeting of the Loan Council it became necessary to reduce the amount to £15,000,000 and our share became approximately £1,750,000. To this, as I have explained, will be added the amount available from loan repayments account. Portion of the loan programme has already been raised. If the Loan Council can raise more money, all will be well with our loan expenditure; otherwise we shall have to reduce expenditure accordingly. The proposed expenditure this year is very largely for the development of the agricultural areas in order to overtake importations of food supplies. There are always commitments by the Agricultural Bank which have to be honoured. They usually amount to a large sum of money and represent authorisations for work to be carried out. I do not know what the amount is to-day but generally a large sum is never called upon. Farmers who have had authorisations may find, owing to the unfortunate outlook of the market, that the work cannot be proceeded with. We may have to cancel many of the authorisations as there seems to be no chance of using them. Notwithstanding that, certain funds will be made available under authorisations every

week. The proposed expenditure of £2,237,752 is made up of—

	£
Departmental	134,252
Railways, tramways, etc. ..	496,000
Harbours and rivers	143,000
Water supplies	227,000
Development of goldfields ..	31,000
Development of agriculture ..	1,099,500
Roads, bridges, etc.	107,000

Under the heading of "Development of Agriculture" we have asked for £1,099,500. This represents almost half of the total provision on the Estimates. This is made up of Agricultural Bank capital £820,000, soldier settlement £45,000, Industries Assistance Board £50,000, a total of £915,000; group settlement advances, etc. £120,000, roads and drainage £20,000, a total of £140,000; Lands Department, surveys, etc. £34,000, sundries £10,500, a total of £1,099,500.

The interest on advances by the Commonwealth for soldier settlement is to be reduced from December next to 5 per cent. There will be a consequent reduction of the interest which, under the Act, is to be charged to soldier settlers, to 5½ per cent. A reduced amount has been set down for group settlement. A great deal of the group settlement is passing over to the control of the Agricultural Bank. As a matter of fact, the bank is controlling most of the group areas now. The number of group holdings at present is 1,722, and the number assessed is 1,415. The valuation board are now engaged in making assessments and should complete their job by the end of November. A number of holdings have changed hands since the valuations were made. In one case a settler received £200 for his equity. There are on the group holdings to-day more than 23,000 head of cattle, 2,700 horses and 7,000 pigs in the possession of settlers. The field staff has been reduced by more than half. The result of the work in the South-West has been felt this year. I believe we shall produce enough butter to fill our requirements for seven months of the year, and a good deal of that which is required for the other five months. It is expected we shall be exporting butter within the next two years. For railways, tramways, etc., £496,000 is provided, the amount being allocated as follows:—Completion of Kulja Eastward line £60,000, Lake Grace-Karlgarin £75,000, Bridgetown - Jarnadup extension £30,000. The Kulja Eastward and Lake

Grace-Karlgarin lines are being built to carry wheat, some of which is now produced at a distance of 40 miles from the railway, an impossible distance to cart. Even with a big crop the cost of cartage represents an extremely heavy charge.

The Wiluna railway to date has cost £394,587. There is a balance still to be provided, but that will have to stand over until finances are easier. The heavy mining machinery is now at Wiluna, and crushing is expected to start in April of next year. Then we may expect that the earnings of the railway will be more than they have been up to date. So far they have just about covered running costs, and thus the Treasury this year is left to provide interest, about £25,000. The traffic is at present being carried by the Minister for Works. I hope that when gold production at Wiluna is in full swing, the line will pay its way. One hears satisfactory reports of the position at Wiluna, the only trouble being that the gold is not being won at the moment. I understand that with the new methods of development at Wiluna, when crushing starts the tonnage crushed will be considerable. The expenditure by the mining company has been enormous, so that the preparations for crushing a considerable tonnage must be fairly advanced. We have set down £100,000 for rolling stock, which will be necessary owing to the ever-increasing harvest; £79,000 for rails and fastenings, of course, a very small amount comparatively; £50,000 for improvements to opened railways,—a good deal of money having been spent on improvements during the past few years; we can go easy for a time; £15,000 for water supplies; and £30,000 for three new lines, Boyup Brook-Cranbrook, Brookton-Dale, and Yarramony. The ex-Minister for Works failed in his duty when he said he had command of enormous sums of money.

Mr. McCallum: If so, I am not singular in that regard.

The PREMIER: I think the hon. member is. Work on the Fremantle and Geraldton harbours is naturally curtailed. Sixty-four thousand pounds is provided for Fremantle, and £50,000 for Geraldton, as compared with £100,000 and £97,446, respectively, last year. The trouble with harbour works seems to be that one never does fix the total amount to be spent. At Fremantle money has been spent during all the 25

years I have been in Parliament, and I dare say there was considerable expenditure before that time.

Mr. Willcock: Yes, 10 years before that time.

The PREMIER: I believe there are harbours which have existed for 200 years and on which there is still expenditure. I suppose it will be so here.

Mr. McCallum: It is a good sign.

The PREMIER: Yes, if it means trade increase. The member for Roebourne (Mr. Teesdale) is not here to-day, but he will be glad to learn that provision has been again made for the Point Phillip jetty, as well as for sundry minor works in outer ports. We can only provide £63,850, equal approximately to half the amount spent last year, £128,230, for metropolitan water supply. The amount covers the cost of another bore and extension of mains. Of necessity, work on the sewerage system has been heavily curtailed. If funds are available further areas will be connected with the system. The system must be completed. The people of the metropolitan area meet interest and sinking fund, but the responsibility for the works will remain with the Government until the works are handed over to some form of authority created for the purpose of controlling them—I do not know whether it should be the local authority or some special board. Since this State entered into the Financial Agreement, our borrowing has been seriously curtailed; and therefore these works ought to pass from the control of the Government to that of some form of local authority. Water supplies in agricultural areas have absorbed a good deal of money during the past few years. Last year the amount spent was £54,415. This year the expenditure required is estimated at £100,000, including additions to the Harvey irrigation scheme. I may explain that in view of the inclusion of those additions the amount available for other irrigation works this year will not be equivalent to the £54,000 spent last year.

There are some improvements and minor extensions to the goldfields water supply this year, as there always must be; and the cost is estimated at £20,000. A much greater amount is required by this undertaking. The balance of the work, £12,000, is available to the Minister for Works for country water supplies, including £6,000 for stock routes and a like amount for water supplies

for towns. I desire to call attention to the reduction of the Vote for mining development. The amount is reduced from £89,516 last year to £30,000 this year. Of this reduction £45,000, which in the past represented water concessions to the mines on the Boulder line, will be found from the Government Property Sales Fund. For the past eight years this charge has been a debit to the Vote for mining development. It was never right that the amount should be charged to loan. In any case, we have agreed that loan money shall be spent only on works capable of returning interest. For the last eight years £360,000 has been debited to loan, on which the State is paying interest. It is unfortunate that just at this stage the Government should have had to increase the cost of water to the mines, because there is evidence of considerable improvements in the methods of treating ore and mining generally at Kalgoorlie, and one would like to encourage the more enterprising of our people who have spent considerable money, particularly the Lake View and Star, in reducing the cost of treating their ore. Unfortunately the position is such that we can no longer debit to Loan account any part of the cost of supplying water to the mines. There is £30,000 provided on these Estimates because there are various commitments which we shall have to honour. On those commitments I hope we shall be able to collect interest. Hon. members will find an item of £100,000 representing capital for the Workers' Homes Board. The State Saw-mills have a great deal of timber which cannot be sold at the moment and may have to be held in stock for a long time. There is a shortage of houses in the country, and many builders are out of work. Therefore the Government thought this would be a good time to build cheap workers' homes in country towns. There will be no money to find for timber, and it will be possible to erect cheap cottages for workmen in various parts of the State. At Geraldton the people are not keen on having this cheap form of house. That I think unwise, because for £250 a perfectly good house can be erected. The rental is cheap, and the house is comfortable.

Mr. Willcock: If the municipalities have a high value, they get more revenue.

The PREMIER: I am sorry the member for Geraldton disapproves of the idea.

Mr. Willcock: Individuals will be able to make application, irrespective of any public authority.

The PREMIER: I hope so, because I understand there is a shortage of houses in the country, and these are cheap houses.

Mr. Angelo: How far north will the scheme extend?

The PREMIER: To within two miles of Carnarvon. Carnarvon is so well-built a town that one hesitates to ask its residents to accept houses such as those here in view.

Mr. Angelo: You might give them a chance.

The PREMIER: The Government may do that. I hope we shall be able to erect some of these houses at Herdsman's Lake, in the metropolitan area generally, a few at Harvey, and a few in each of the country towns. Some years ago the Government constructed houses of this type, and they have all been occupied ever since. The Government would not undertake the work if it entailed any cash outlay, because these Loan Estimates do not include any work that will not earn interest within a reasonable time. Last year's loan expenditure amounted to £3,693,052, made up as follows:—

	£
Departmental	204,241
Railways, etc.	846,352
Harbours	242,465
Water supplies, etc.	312,730
Development of Mining	91,312
Development of Agriculture	1,654,302
Roads and bridges, etc.	317,597
Other undertakings	23,953
	<hr/>
	£3,693,052

The principal avenue of expenditure last year was, as usual, the Development of Agriculture vote. Of that sum, the main item was additional capital, amounting to £849,849, for the Agricultural Bank. The expenditure on group settlements accounted for £554,100, while on roads and drainage in connection with group areas, a further £66,970 was spent. Provision was made for soldier settlement purposes amounting to £46,313. The Loan Suspense Account was drawn on by the Industries Assistance Board to the extent of £150,344. Last year the following railway lines were completed:—Albany-Denmark extension; Ejanding-Northwards; Kalkalling-Bullfinch. A com-

mencement was made with the construction of the Lake Grace-Karlgarin line and the Bridgetown-Jarnadup extension. Although the Meekatharra-Wiluna line has not been actually completed, and work has been suspended for the time being, traffic is being carried on by the Public Works Department. Further expenditure on the railways consisted of—

	£
Rails and fastenings	167,744
Improvements on opened railways	85,409
Water supplies on new lines	13,224
Surveys	11,963

Improvements in connection with the tramways, principally for duplication and extension of lines and the construction of cars, represented a further expenditure, under the railway heading, of £24,388. In connection with the electricity supply, the following expenditure was incurred:—

	£
Minor extensions and services	43,294
Duplication of the Armadale main	12,471
Balance of cost of Fifth Unit	9,976

Here again I may explain that the Government are to-day faced with the cost of adding another unit to those already installed at the East Perth Power House. As hon. members know, that involves considerable expenditure, although the work pays. While there is a slight profit, it is a matter of inconvenience if, year after year, we have to add, at very considerable cost, additional power units. I feel certain that this will continue as long as Perth grows and industry expands. As hon. members are aware we supply current not only for lighting and household purposes, but power for industry as well. In connection with our harbours, the principal works undertaken during the year involved the following expenditure:—Fremantle harbour, £100,000; Geraldton harbour, £97,446. In addition £25,700 was spent on a dredge purchased for work in connection with improvements to the Swan River. The cost of the work at Fremantle, which had been proceeding for some time, was charged temporarily to Suspense Account. We allocated portion of that debit to the expenditure vote, but there still remains a balance in the Suspense Account. In connection with the metropolitan water supply, there was spent last year £128,230, while £94,149 was expended in connection with the sewerage and drainage of the metropolitan area. The balance of the expen-

diture in connection with water supplies was—

	£
Agricultural	54,415
Goldfields	16,987
Other country supplies	18,339

This year we shall not have a considerable amount to spend on road construction. Last year we spent £260,953 of our own money under the Main Roads agreement and we received from the Commonwealth Government, £755,107, so that we spent over £1,000,000 on the main roads last year. This year the amount will not be more than £384,000, with the Commonwealth grant. Many men who found employment on the roads last year cannot possibly hope to find so much work on the roads this year. Loan expenditure on such work is barred by the arrangement we have made with the Federal Loan Council to spend loan funds on works that will return interest within a short period; and apart from that, there are no loan funds available even if that bar were non-existent. Last year £15,018 went to provide fresh capital for the State trading concerns and £8,935 was advanced to the Metropolitan Market Trust. The latter amount carries interest and will be repaid. There were other minor items of expenditure, as well as the usual departmental charges. On the whole, I think we can fairly claim that last year the loan expenditure was largely on work that created permanent assets, from which we may expect a return of interest. I have already explained more than once that there are solid and valuable assets representing every penny of the money we owe to those who hold our bonds. The loans raised during the last financial year amounted to £2,933,752, made up as follows:—

	£
Commonwealth loans	2,091,096
Under Migration Agreement	112,922
London Treasury Bills	729,734

The total amount raised under that heading was £759,300 less than the expenditure, and this was made up from overdrafts, Commonwealth advances and so on. In other words, last year our loan requirements were short raised by £759,300. I remind hon. members that the accumulation of £3,500,000 goes back for several years during which our loan requirements were short raised, and of that amount, last year's short raisings represented £759,300. Of the Commonwealth

loan of £12,415,490, which was raised in June, we received £336,000 before June 30th last. During this financial year we will receive £1,750,000 from the Commonwealth, not necessarily in one amount, and the payment will, of course, be contingent on flotation. Our total loan indebtedness as at 30th June, 1930, amounted to £70,153,862. We have paid £15,000,000 off that debt to date. That money represented our own funds and with that payment of £15,000,000, we have decreased our loan indebtedness to an extent in excess of what all the other States of Australia have done in the aggregate. It will be agreed therefore that our loan position is very comfortable. Naturally we have lost loan funds in many ways. It could not have been otherwise, spread over all the years we have been borrowing. Some of the works or utilities for which we borrowed loan funds in the past have now ceased to be of use. In any case, in paying off £15,000,000, we have repaid more than has been lost on account of loan expenditure ever since we inaugurated that policy. That is entirely satisfactory. Works on which we have spent our loan funds will be capable of earning interest and sinking fund charges, particularly when we have increased our population appreciably. The expenditure of that money has made our present population possible and it is reasonable that we should expect our population to expand and thus return more to the Treasury to be paid off our loan indebtedness. The railways, in which has been invested the largest proportion of the loan expenditure, showed a deficit last year of £496,004. This position should be improved during the current financial year. The point to be remembered by hon. members is that our total loan indebtedness is definitely covered by the sinking fund provisions under the Financial Agreement. Here again is one small advantage we gain from that agreement. The Federal Government have undertaken to pay $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. on account of sinking fund requirements in connection with any new loans, and in addition one-eighth per cent. on account of old loans. That amounts to a considerable sum each year. The point I want to make clear is that every penny of our loan indebtedness is covered by the sinking fund, which will in time wipe out our entire loan indebtedness. I am afraid not many of us

will be here then, but when that happy day dawns the then Treasurer will be in a satisfactory position.

Hon. P. Collier: Why be pessimistic? It will be only 58 years hence!

The PREMIER: When the Treasurer wakes up that day he will find his interest and sinking fund charges bill considerably reduced.

Hon. P. Collier: Yes, he will be a happy Treasurer in those days.

Mr. Angelo interjected.

The PREMIER: Perhaps the hon. member is right, but if the present tightness of the money market persists, he will find it difficult to raise money against the prospect of paying off the loan indebtedness.

Progress reported.

MESSAGES.

Messages from the Governor received and read recommending appropriations for the purposes of the undermentioned Bills:—

- 1, Parliamentary Allowances Amendment.
- 2, Salaries Tax.
- 3, Winning Bets Tax.
- 4, Stamp Act Amendment (No. 1).
- 5, Land Tax and Income Tax.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—PARLIAMENTARY ALLOW- ANCES AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.30] in moving the second reading said: There are several Bills dealing with salary reductions and taxation increases, and if the House will permit, I should like to make a few remarks setting out the reasons why this taxation is needed, and then briefly explain what provisions will be found in each of the several Bills. The adoption of that course will save time. Members already know full well why these Bills are introduced, and why the proposals are necessary, but still some explanation must be given. The Budget statement clearly

set out the financial position of the State. We have agreed to balance the Budget. There was really no merit in giving that undertaking, because there are no funds upon which we can draw to make good any revenue shortage.

Mr. Willcock: I should not like to have to pay the shortage at the end of the financial year.

The PREMIER: If we are short at the end of the year, perhaps I may call upon the hon. member. We must provide against any shortage by making savings or imposing additional taxation. Here are some amounts that must be covered this year, and that were not a charge against revenue last year:—

	£
Deficit	518,000
Interest on deficit	31,000
Additional interest	200,000
Exchange on interest payments transferred to London	100,000
	<hr/> £849,000 <hr/>

That amount must be covered by some means or other. A good deal will be covered by savings within the departments; a good deal, I hope, will be covered by improved financial results from the railways. Last year the interest shortage on railway operations was £496,000. This year we shall have a tremendous wheat crop to handle, and I hope a large amount of additional revenue will be received from the haulage of it. This, and the economies being practised in the railways, should enable the department to come near to balancing their accounts this year. It is unthinkable that the enormous amount of money invested in the railways can be allowed in future to do other than pay its way. It is impossible to call upon the taxpayers to make good half a million a year to meet the losses on the railways alone, to say nothing of another half a million representing the losses on other concerns.

Mr. Willcock: That is an entirely new policy, running the railways as a commercial concern, is it not?

The PREMIER: No, it is not.

Mr. Willcock: We have been running them in the interests of the producers for years.

The PREMIER: We shall continue that policy. Developmental lines cannot be expected to pay in the first year, but we shall have to ensure that development of the land

is arranged for previous to laying down any more developmental lines. It has to be remembered that spur lines, or developmental lines, add traffic to the whole of the system. Without them there would be mighty little wheat traffic over the main lines.

Mr. Willcock: From a purely railway standpoint, you would be better off without them for a year or two.

The PREMIER: From a purely railway standpoint, developmental lines cannot be expected to pay in the first year or two, but we shall have to alter our policy with regard to the construction of railways, because we shall have to provide for the fairly early development of the land adjacent to the lines. Trouble arises from the goldfields lines, the results from which are so much less certain. Regarding the Wiluna line, it was necessary to risk the cost of building it in the hope of opening up a magnificent goldfield. We realise that we took a risk in that instance. Our trouble is that we have nearly 1,000 miles of non-paying goldfields lines, lines built to carry the traffic when we were producing £8,500,000 worth of gold a year. That state of affairs, however, cannot be avoided.

Mr. Willcock: In other States provision is made for developmental lines.

The PREMIER: But that does not matter a jot; the money has to come out of the same pocket. In New South Wales railway finance is kept apart from ordinary revenue finance, but it makes no difference.

Hon. P. Collier: Except that it makes the Treasurer's Budget look better.

The PREMIER: That is all it does. It might be better if our revenue figures included, not the expenditure and the revenue of the railways, but the result of the year's operations. Then each year we could add the profit to, or deduct the loss from, the revenue total. I suppose more often than not it would be a matter of deducting a loss. Here we show revenue collections amounting to £10,000,000 a year. In a State with a very small population, that sounds a lot of money, but more than two-thirds of it is for services rendered, so that the amount actually contributed by the people in the form of taxation is considerably reduced. Perhaps it would be better to publish our finances in a form that would more clearly indicate whether investments were losing or paying, and show the people just what they are paying to the Treasury to meet ordinary

governmental expenditure. However, we have not adopted that system to date. When introducing the Budget, I explained that savings were being effected. Under the taxing measure which I shall present to the House, the revenue increase this year will be £81,000, and the reduced expenditure £104,245. These totals are made up as follows:—

	Yearly tax.	Yield this year.
	£	£
Betting tickets	4,000	3,000
Sweep tickets	5,000	3,500
Winning bets	5,000	3,500
Totalisator tax	20,000	15,000
Entertainment tax (extra)	80,000	56,000
Totals	£124,000	£81,000

The Parliamentary and salaries reductions tax will produce the following amounts:—

	Yearly tax.	Yield this year.
	£	£
Salaries	130,000	103,000
Parliamentary allowances	5,660	4,245
Totals	£135,660	£107,245

Mr. Willcock: After all we have heard about the reduction of Parliamentary salaries, one would have thought it meant a saving of about a million instead of £4,000.

The PREMIER: Some people seem to be under the impression that members receive very high salaries. I have been in Parliament for 25 years and in office for about half that time, and I am satisfied many critics would be very sorry if they had averaged only the amount that has come to me during that time, especially after deducting the unavoidable expense necessary to attend here. Last year the hospitals cost the Government £104,000. From this must be deducted the revenue received from hospital fees totalling £34,000. That left £70,000 to be provided by the Treasury, plus the amusement tax of £37,000, a total of £107,000. The new tax for hospitals is expected to produce £156,000, which, together with the revenue from hospital fees totalling £34,000, will make a total of £190,000.

Mr. Munsie: That is, provided they collect those fees.

The PREMIER: That may be a little uncertain.

Mr. Munsie: They will be lucky to get £4,000 instead of £34,000 this year.

The PREMIER: Perhaps the hon. member knows more about that than I do. The saving to the State will be the £70,000, which was found by the Treasury last year, plus £37,000 from amusement tax, a total of £107,000. If the hospitals get £190,000 this year, as compared with £107,000 last year, they will be much better off. I am surprised at the opposition that the member for Hannans (Mr. Munsie) has more than once indicated. Apart from the ordinary avenues from which the Treasury draws money, the trade contribution to revenue is helpful. This source of revenue is drying up bit by bit. I recognise that public and private economy is essential. Large loan expenditure means great advantage to the revenue. There will no longer be large loan expenditure; in fact, it will be limited. Consequently, we shall lose this year from the limited expenditure of loan money as well as from trade contributions. The big decrease that will take place in income tax and dividend duty collections, estimated at £150,000, will have to be made good by some means or other. Members must realise that in these bad times, and even in the present year when we are taxing on last year's incomes, we cannot expect to receive anything like the amount of taxation that the Government received last year. Everybody has to make sacrifices, and under these measures the Government are asking the people to submit to additional taxation, though it is very light taxation. The civil servants have been asked to make some sacrifice, and I believe they are willing to do it. They are not being asked to make anything like the sacrifice that has been made by people outside the service. Most of the big firms have had to dismiss employees and reduce expenditure considerably. The incomes of all classes of traders have diminished. Farmers, in common with all other workers, are losing income almost day by day. Everyone is losing money and making sacrifices. There is every reason why we should expect those who are permanently employed to join in the sacrifices that are being made by others. Money is not now available for circulation, trading concerns are losing and many employees have been put off. Next year will be a bad Treasury year; that goes without saying.

Mr. Munsie: It will be worse than this year, we are told.

The PREMIER: Taxation will be imposed on lower incomes, and the dividend duties will be paid on this year's trading. Even

if we could do any better by increasing taxation, the thing would be not to impose the tax but to collect it. The Government will have difficulty in collecting money from those who owe land rents. Although those rents are due to the Treasury as revenue, naturally in these bad times the Government will be and must be lenient. Of necessity this must be so, and it will be very difficult to get in the money. The harvest will certainly improve trade; no matter what the price for wheat is, the aggregate amount received for it will, I should imagine, range between £6,000,000 and £7,000,000. That amount of money cannot be circulated in a small country like this without improving trade. Rigid economy will still be necessary, notwithstanding the sacrifices that are made. Last year's revenue expenditure may be divided into several parts. Our interest bill is £3,257,000, and we cannot take a fraction off that. Salaries on revenue account amount to £2,241,000, and wages to £3,404,000. We purchased goods on revenue account, railway stores and other goods, to the value of £1,146,000. It seems an enormous sum to expend in that way. A closer inquiry is being made into that expenditure, and I hope considerable savings will be effected there. We are working to make savings along definite lines. Of all the savings we can make, those that will do the least harm are in the way of goods purchased. We are not buying more from overseas than can be avoided, or from the Eastern States. There are considerable stocks in store, and from those stocks and local purchases we hope to be able to carry on throughout the year. In order that members may know that everything possible is being done to economise, I would point out that the Treasury staff is being assisted by the officers of the accountancy staffs of all the departments. We have to keep in mind that we shall receive £150,000 less this year from taxation, and next year the amount will be still lower. Not only are business people and farmers suffering, but all who were engaged on loan works have lost their income, too. They in common with traders and farmers have lost the production they got from the expenditure of loan moneys. This Bill will interest members, and I hope will receive the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. Panton: You bet your life it will interest us.

The PREMIER: I am sure it will.

Hon. W. D. Johnson: You ever were an optimist.

The PREMIER: When I look at the hon. member, I am certain he will vote for the making of this sacrifice. The member for Victoria Park will also join in his willingness to make some sacrifice.

Mr. H. W. Mann: He suggested the tax.

The PREMIER: There is provision for a reduction of 10 per cent. on all Ministerial and Parliamentary allowances of every kind. This will include you, Sir, the Chairman of Committees, the Leader of the Opposition, and every one who has a seat in this Parliament.

Mr. Withers: Everyone within the Government net will be affected, and everyone outside it will go scot free. Is that the position?

The PREMIER: The hon. member suggests that the only people who make any sacrifices at all will be members of Parliament.

Mr. Withers: Oh no, I mean everyone in the Government net.

The PREMIER: That is utter nonsense. Everyone is making a sacrifice. If the hon. member imagines he can get out of doing his duty by the country by saying that no one else is doing anything, or suffering any reduction in salary, and that everyone is getting what he had before, and making what he made before, he is grossly mistaken. I do not suggest for a moment that members of Parliament are overpaid at £600 a year. I should like the public to realise what members of Parliament do for the emoluments they receive. They should know what it costs them to fill their positions and the work they are called upon to do. The work of a member is not done when he sits in this House for a few hours on a few days in the year. A great deal must be done by them day by day. They are expected to interest themselves in everyone in their electorates, and do anything that any of their electors ask them to do. It has to be remembered that we cannot all live in Perth and that most members have to keep two homes, which is a fairly costly thing to do.

Mr. Millington: It does not amount to that exactly.

The PREMIER: A man receiving £400 a year in any fixed occupation is better off than a member of Parliament receiving £600 a year, even if he has his home in Perth. Tremendous sacrifices will have to be made

by those who represent the people and are helping in the Government of the country. The public cannot imagine that all that a member does is to wander into the House, listen to what has been said, say a little on his account on this or that question, and that this is the sum total of what he does. That is not my idea of the duties of a member of Parliament. Whilst I am proposing a reduction in Parliamentary allowances, that is not to say I think members are adequately paid at £600 a year.

Mr. Panton: We have a good argument against the Bill.

The PREMIER: I hope those who argue against it will first satisfy their own consciences, and secondly their constituents.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They will soon satisfy their constituents.

Mr. Coverley: There is no doubt about that. Look at the galleries. See what great public interest there is in the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members must refrain from interjecting.

The PREMIER: I am not concerned about the galleries. I am speaking to members here. That is a sufficiently difficult task when they are so unwilling to give up anything in these difficult times. Ministerial salaries are not included in this Bill, but a similar reduction is being made under the Salaries Tax Bill. It is quite a simple matter for members to understand. They must know what will happen under the Bill.

Mr. Panton: Too right we will.

The PREMIER: The reduction in salary will be for 12 months, and at the rate of 10 per cent.

Mr. Panton: Where did you get the retrospective idea? I suppose that is the argument you put up against the Industrial Arbitration Bill.

The PREMIER: Hon. members can put up any arguments they please.

Mr. Panton: Too right.

The PREMIER: I would impress upon members the seriousness of the present situation. I would ask them to consider what are their responsibilities to the people. It will be exceedingly difficult to find money to meet the ordinary services of Government. It will be difficult because people outside are not by a long way as well off as they were. If one imposed the taxation that some members seem to think desirable, it would be difficult to collect the money—almost impossible. Apart from that, it would not be

fair to increase taxation. Traders and other people do at times make more money than salaried people. I believe that to-day the man who is best off is he who has a fixed salary and position. We have gentlemen in the community who draw Parliamentary allowances.

Mr. Pantou: Tell us where the fixed position and the fixed salary come in for members of Parliament.

The PREMIER: I assume that the hon. member's position is a very uncertain one, and that he will not come back here again.

Mr. Pantou: That is very funny, but I asked you where the fixed salary came in.

The PREMIER: I am not optimistic enough to think the hon. member will never see the inside of this House again.

Mr. Pantou: And I want to know where the fixed salary comes in.

The PREMIER: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is permitted to cross-examine me in this way?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. Angelo: He really ought to know better.

The PREMIER: Many people enjoy a fixed salary.

Mr. Pantou: There are many who have had fixed salaries but who are now out of work. I wonder where they are?

The PREMIER: The people most comfortably placed to-day are undoubtedly those who draw an emolument of a character than is fixed from one source or another for a definite term. I have no doubt that members will, on further consideration, gladly make the sacrifice asked for by this Bill in the interests of the country. I take no pleasure in asking them to do this; indeed, I am sorry to have to ask it.

Mr. Pantou: Not half as sorry as we are.

The PREMIER: It is necessary that this should be done, and that we should either reduce our expenditure or find some means to increase our revenue. This is one way to help to balance the ledger. Even if we had not promised the other Treasurers in Australia that we would endeavour to balance the Budget this year, it would still be necessary for us to do this, because there is no place from which we can take any deficit unless we raise loan

money and fail to spend it. We have to raise money by some means. It is a fair thing, therefore, that members of Parliament should be asked to make this sacrifice. It will represent a sum of £60 for 12 months and will stop automatically. The Bill provides that it shall endure for 12 months. In South Australia, Victoria, and other States, a similar reduction has been made. I suppose in the course of a few days the Federal Government will come down with a proposal to include a reduction in salaries paid to members there. If this is not done here we shall be the only Parliament in Australia that has not imposed some disability upon its members.

Mr. Pantou: The Government would not have the cheek to reduce the salaries of civil servants unless they first tackled members of Parliament. That is quite obvious. They must use us as a lever to work the same thing upon civil servants.

The PREMIER: I am glad the hon. member sees that much. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—SALARIES TAX.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [6.1] in moving the second reading said: The Bill provides for taxes on salaries and wages in Government and semi-Government departments, the rate being £3 15s. per cent. on weekly earnings up to and including £4 10s., £5 per cent. on earnings over £4 10s. and including £6, £6 5s. per cent. on earnings over £6 and including £8, £7 10s. per cent. on earnings over £8 and including £13, £8 15s. per cent. on earnings over £13 and including £19, and £10 per cent. on weekly earnings over £19.

Mr. Willcock: The incidence here is different from that of the Parliamentary Allowances Amendment Bill.

The PREMIER: It is lower here.

Mr. Willcock: By nearly half.

The PREMIER: Exemptions are provided in the case of officers with dependants; such officers will be exempt up to £252 per annum. The tax is expected to yield £132,000

in a full year. For the current year the yield is estimated at £100,000. Care will be taken to ensure that as little injury as possible is done to men in the Public Service. Some of them have pension rights, and those will be preserved notwithstanding the reduction. The reduction is called a tax in order to save the amount of the reduction from further taxation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

BILL—WINNING BETS TAX.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [6.5] in moving the second reading said: This Bill will apply only to bookmakers licensed by the Western Australian Turf Club or the Trotting Association.

Mr. Panton: Then those bookmakers will go out of business and you will have no one to tax.

The PREMIER: The measure provides for the payment of the tax on all bets made by such persons, no matter where made. The tax will be at the rate of 6d. in the pound or any part of a pound. The annual revenue from the tax is estimated at £5,000; for the balance of the current financial year the Government expect to receive £3,500. The bookmaker must keep books and produce them to the Commissioner of Stamps. The penalty for failure to keep books or produce them as provided by the Act will be £20, and a penalty of a similar amount will be incurred in case of failure to book debts. Power is given to the bookmaker to deduct the tax from winners. Hon. members will say that it is impossible to collect the tax. However, we already make the bookmakers stamp their betting tickets; and where bets are booked they still pay the tax, although tickets are not given.

Mr. Munsie: I can imagine the Government getting £5,000 out of this! They will be exceptionally lucky if they get a fiver.

The PREMIER: With the hon. member's help, I believe the Government will get £5,000.

Mr. Panton: The member for Hannans is our expert.

The PREMIER: Perhaps we shall get even a little more than £5,000. There is considerable revenue now from stamps on betting tickets.

Mr. Munsie: You can collect that, certainly, but not this.

The PREMIER: I do not know why the hon. member imagines that the bookmaker is not an honest man.

Mr. Munsie: I do not imagine anything of the sort, and have never said so.

The PREMIER: The bookmaker now brings in his books to the Commissioner of Stamps and pays the stamp duty on bets for which he does not issue tickets. I know that times are bad and that people do not now bet in fifties and hundreds. We shall not get as much from the tax as we would have got if it had been introduced earlier. However, the people to whom the measure refers should pay something more towards the State's revenue than they have done in the past. Betting is a kind of luxury in which people will indulge. The measure will not apply except to licensed bookmakers, and bookmakers who to-day use stamped betting tickets.

Mr. Sleeman: What about the man who collects a win on the totalisator?

The PREMIER: We already collect considerably from him.

Mr. Sleeman: Not on his winnings.

The PREMIER: Yes. Where does the money come from to pay a winning bet?

Mr. Munsie: But you apply the totalisator tax to those who lose as well as those who win. That is not so under this Bill.

The PREMIER: It is not intended that the bookmaker shall pay this tax from his own funds. It is intended that the tax shall come from the winnings. When the hon. member collects £20 on a horse and 20 other people have each lost £1, he is expected to hand the Treasurer 6d. out of each £1 of the £20 the other backers are good enough to present to him through the bookmaker. The people who pay the various pounds will be the people who pay this tax.

Mr. Sleeman: If everyone bets on the totalisator, you will get nothing at all from this tax.

The PREMIER: I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Munsie, debate adjourned.

BILL—STAMP ACT AMENDMENT (No. 1).

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [6.11] in moving the second reading said: At present the stamp duty is 2d. on a betting ticket issued by a bookmaker within the grandstand enclosure, and ½d. on a betting ticket issued elsewhere within the grounds of a racecourse. The Bill raises those two stamp duties to 3d. and 1d. respectively. Last year the revenue from this source amounted to £6,286. This year we expect a revenue of £10,000.

Mr. Panton: This is really a tax on the bookmaker. He does not pass at on.

Member: The punter pays all right.

Mr. Panton: The bookmaker has not deducted this up to the present.

The PREMIER: He will pass it on by giving shorter odds occasionally. Everybody passes on every disadvantage he can. If £6,000 is obtained from this source, surely we shall get £5,000 from the tax on winning bets. At all events, there are few avenues of taxation still open. I shall not be sorry if we fail to get a farthing of revenue from either betting tickets or winning bets. Still, that is too much to hope for. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Munsie, debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

BILL—LAND TAX AND INCOME TAX.

Second Reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [7.30] in moving the second reading said: I need say very little in presenting the Bill to hon. members. It is precisely the same as the Bill that was agreed to last year. It provides for the reduction of 33 1/3rd per cent. in income tax, for the same reasons as those advanced last year. As to the payment of £300,000 from the Commonwealth Government, I do not know what next year will bring forth. I hope that if the grant

is continued, we shall be able to persist in the reduction of taxation. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. P. Collier, debate adjourned.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES, 1930-31.

In Committee of Supply.

Resumed from the 14th October; Mr. Richardson in the Chair.

Vote—Lands and Surveys, £66,500 (partly considered):

HON. M. F. TROY (Mt. Magnet) [7.33]: For many years past optimism has been the dominant note in the discussion of the Lands Estimates. Until recently the development of the agricultural and pastoral portions of the State gave every reason for gratification and confidence in future prospects. The disastrous fall in the prices of wheat and wool must necessarily react on land selection and development, and that there has been a considerable falling-off in land settlement is not to be wondered at. The outlook to-day for agricultural and pastoral products is probably more serious than at any previous period in the history of the State. I felt that the good prices and good seasons we had enjoyed for so long could not, in the nature of things, last indefinitely. On the other hand, no person ever anticipated that prices would fall so low or that products would become almost unsaleable. If the present conditions do not last too long, the experience may be beneficial to the men on the land and to the State generally. In these more progressive and enlightened days, it is hardly to be expected that men who have embarked on land activities will be content with the isolation and hardships that were endured by the early settlers not only in Western Australia but throughout the Commonwealth. It can be assumed that the material progress made during the last 50 years has proved beneficial to the man on the land, but despite his material advantages, for successful land settlement there is still necessary the virtues for frugality, industry and economy. The goal of the land settler is the greatest in the world. The goal is that of independence. Any man who desires independ-

ence—and most men do—must realise that sacrifices must be made. The land settler must make sacrifices in his attempt to attain that goal. During the regime of the Collier Government, there occurred the most progressive era in the history of land settlement in Western Australia. That is not generally understood or appreciated. Between 6,000 and 7,000 settlers were put on the land during that period. That does not include the result of the strenuous work carried out in the group settlement areas, during the course of which 400 settlers were removed from locations and put on new blocks. The settlers who went on the land during the time the Collier Government were in office were not all inspired with those principles I have mentioned as essential if success is to be achieved. Many entered upon their task as a speculation. It was, as they thought, a get-rich-quick opportunity, because wheat was bringing good prices and the industry generally was most prosperous. Those persons, in my view, are the people who to-day are most detrimentally affected by present conditions. The conditions of settlement were easy inasmuch as the settler was given his land free for the first five years and then the Agricultural Bank stood behind him to the extent of a maximum of £2,000 to help him to develop his property. A prudent and proper outlook of life necessitated that settlers in that position should do the improvements themselves and live on the advances from the Agricultural Bank. I am of opinion that had those settlers done the work themselves and lived on the bank advances, they would have got through without undue hardship and without suffering embarrassment. Quite a large number of young men have employed others to do the work for them. They employed Southern Europeans in particular, and others when additional labour was available. The result is that their liabilities, after three or four years' occupation of their properties, are greater than the expenditure incurred in the early settlement of the State, when, with more prudent working, properties were developed in ten years or more. The class of settler to whom I have referred is the most seriously embarrassed in the State, and is at present a weakness in our social fabric. The experience of those people to-day, which I hope will not be too

long extended, will perhaps teach them that there is no royal road to success. If they are to reach the goal of independence, they will now know that greater personal sacrifices are required. In difficult times we should extend our assistance to those who have developed a proper sense of responsibility and if we pursue that course, it may result in a more careful, prudent and economical type of settler. If that should follow upon the present times of difficulty, the result will be of incalculable benefit to the State in the future. There will be much less money available for agricultural settlement than in years gone by. In my opinion the duty of the present Government is to see that the money available is expended to the best advantage and that the settlers most deserving of assistance are rendered aid first. Very serious injury has been done to the State in the past by sticking to men who would not farm their properties properly, and who, in some instances, were dishonest in their relations with the State and with the Government that assisted them. I hope the Government to-day will not continue to assist those men any longer. When I was Minister for Lands, I stood behind the trustees of the Agricultural Bank in their removal of men of this type, because I felt that those settlers would not be of any use to the industry. I felt that they set a bad example to their neighbours. In the past, political pressure resulted in many of the men of this type being carried on for too long a period. A number of these settlers were treated with most extraordinary generosity. Their capitalisation was reduced while more frugal and honest settlers are still carrying their full liabilities. The example set by that treatment was bad for the neighbourhood in which such settlers resided. It could not be expected in such circumstances that there would be a proper appreciation of an administration that insisted on the honest, hardworking, prudent settler shouldering his full liabilities while his neighbour who did not attempt to do so received the benefits I have indicated. It is hardly expected that the good type of settler will appreciate the fact that his less honest neighbour has his capitalisation reduced and is carried by the State from year to year. That sort of thing has happened too long in Western Australia. I shall be behind the Minister for Lands if he adopts a policy that will prevent the continuance of what has been the practice for

too long already. I am afraid he will be embarrassed by some of his own followers. During my term in office the trustees of the Agricultural Bank were embarrassed by Country Party members who frequently intervened on behalf of the people of whom I have been speaking. As there is not too much money available, there is more need for a sound responsible population on the land, and the Government would be wise to spend money only in rendering necessary assistance to the most deserving type of settlers. I regret that the Minister will not have an opportunity to help the producers and promote land settlement under conditions that have obtained formerly. I feel sure that the Minister would have worthily carried out the functions of his office and done fine work for Western Australia, but he is handicapped because of lack of funds. Probably that handicap will not be so serious if he applies himself to what I might describe as "digging in." That is to say, it may not prove so serious if he applies himself to the stabilisation of land settlement that already exists, and puts it on a proper and sound foundation. If he does that, he will deserve well of Western Australia. I have sufficient confidence in the Minister to know that he will do what he can in that direction. During the last election, the Premier told the electors he would see that every Western Australian youth who wanted land, would get it. That was one of his many promises. He deplored the fact that large numbers of young Western Australians could not secure land. He promised definitely that he would see that everyone of them was able to get land. The time has arrived in Western Australia when we must realise it will not be long before there will be no Crown land available for settlement within an assured rainfall area. As hon. members know, the whole of the agricultural areas throughout the State have been classified. That applies to all land within a reasonable rainfall area, and to-day there is not too much of that land available for settlement. And that which is available for settlement is in localities yet to be proved from an agricultural standpoint, and too far distant from an existing railway. Some of the land available is that within the 3,500 farms scheme area. That scheme, I think, should not be gone on with at the present time. The time is not ripe for further expenditure on that scheme. First of all the money cannot be got, and in the second place the

product to be produced cannot be sold at a reasonable price, or at all events not at a price that would make farming in that area profitable. So I think we may well let that scheme lie in abeyance for the time being, and in the meantime the Ghooli experimental farm, initiated by the Collier Government, and the Salmon Gums experimental farm may be looked to to determine whether the rainfall in that area is sufficient for our purpose. I was never very keen about the development of the whole proposition at one stroke. My desire was first to settle the country south from Southern Cross to Forrestania, to develop that country and in the process of development have the adjacent country proved by the Salmon Gums experimental farm and the Ghooli experimental farm. The only other areas of land available are that running east from the Wongan Hills railway from Kulja northward; and the area north of Mullewa, and the area north of Dartmoor in which the Minister is carrying on an experiment initiated by the previous Government. For that I commend him. I am very glad to find that his judgment agrees with mine in that respect. I hope that in view of the low price which is being paid for our wheat, settlement in those areas will not be embarked upon too hastily—I refer more particularly to the country north of Dartmoor—the area which is now being proved. I hope the Government will not be encouraged, because of scarcity of land, to embark upon settlement in areas which may be unsafe. I was very much surprised the other day to find that the lands in the vicinity of Lake Deborah had been made available to selection. I instructed that that land be withdrawn from selection because I did not like the prospects. I think it is premature to put settlers in the Lake Deborah country, because there are sufficient settlers in that district to incur a very large liability and put a heavy responsibility on the Government unless the area is proved to be capable of production. So I think it very unwise to throw open the Lake Deborah country for selection. I withdrew it because I felt that more knowledge was required of the rainfall before it would be a proper thing to put settlers on the land. The Minister now is pinning his faith to the development of the area. We have not too much money to spend on it. The Minister

has been criticised for his intention to establish settlers in the Nornalup area. I do not propose to make one of the critics in that regard. The Denmark-Nornalup railway has been built, and in my opinion it is only right that the areas should be settled in order that trade might come to the railway. Furthermore, if the land is good land, it should be developed, provided no undue expenditure is incurred in settling men down there. But I want to tell the Minister that I depend upon his judgment to settle good land. I hope he will not be influenced to take inferior country, and that particularly he will not be influenced by the Premier. Just here let me without any malice at all, say I have no respect whatever for the Premier's judgment of farming lands. I have had a remarkable experience of the Premier and I say this, despite the extraordinarily favourable publicity the Premier has received from the Press of Western Australia: I know no man in this country whose judgment regarding land I respect less than that of the Premier. I had the experience of having to reconstruct the whole of the group settlement system on land which was decided upon after the Premier's own investigation. I am very glad indeed that settlement which is now taking place in the Nornalup area is not under the administration of the Premier, but is under the administration of a practical man in the present Minister for Lands.

Mr. H. W. Mann: You must remember that another Minister was in charge of group settlement between the Premier's administration and yours.

Hon. P. Collier: But that other Minister did not profess to be a land expert.

Hon. M. F. TROY: That apology on behalf of the Premier will not do, because the Collier Administration did not select the land, nor did it put the settlers on the land. In my opinion there is no man other than the Premier, who, having any regard for the country or for the future of the settlers, would have placed settlers on the land included in a great portion of the group settlement scheme. A few years ago, while searching in the group areas for land to which to remove settlers from Northcliffe and from the Peel Estate, I was told that Sir James Mitchell had personally inspected an area of land between Den-

mark and Nornalup and had found it good. I went and made an inspection of that area, and I was told locally that Sir James Mitchell had travelled through it, and had approved it. Yet to my own knowledge it is one of the worst areas of land in Western Australia. And that country would have had settlers put upon it if the Mitchell Government had not gone out of office in 1924. Anybody who does not believe what I say can go there and see the land for himself. Further permit me to say that all the group settlement areas abandoned by the Collier Administration are still abandoned, and under Sir James Mitchell's Administration the houses are being sold and carted away. Yet it was Sir James Mitchell who declared in the first place that the land was all right. It was not all right. So despite the favourable publicity the hon. gentleman has received, I say there is no member of the House whose opinion regarding land settlement I would trust less than the Premier's. And my remarks are based on the fact that we had to abandon 400 locations, and link up 300 others, that we abandoned improvements costing £900,000, and that the aggregate loss will be something like four to five millions. Rather than see group settlement left under the administration of the Premier, I would much prefer to see it handed over to the Minister for Lands, who at all events would have a grip of farming practice. I hope the Minister will not put his Nornalup settlers 20 miles away from a railway. Dairymen cannot afford to travel long distances with their products, and if they are put down too far from a railway it will mean the expenditure of a great deal of money on roads. I do not think that anywhere in Australia dairymen will be found 20 miles from a railway. A limit of at most 10 miles is a sufficient distance. If we go to the other dairying areas of Australia, or to the dairying areas of New Zealand, we do not find cream being carted 20 miles over indifferent roads. I hope the Minister will be guided by two facts: In the first place he must get suitable land, must not bother about inferior land, and in the second place he must see to it that the settler has reasonable access to a railway and to the nearest butter factory. If the Minister looks to that, I hope to have no reason to criticise him. But I know the ambition of Ministers to do things; it is a very commendable thing in a Minister that he

should be fired with ambition to serve his country. However, I know the handicap under which the Minister for Lands must labour for lack of funds, and I only hope he will make the best possible use of what funds are at his disposal. A good deal has been said about the advisability of the Government repurchasing land along existing railways in preference to going farther afield. That could be all right, provided the land can be secured at a reasonable price. There is an immense area of land between Perth and Bunbury which might be repurchased at a reasonable price, and because of the existence of roads and schools and other facilities might be more suitable for settlement than the area at Nornalup or 10 miles beyond Nornalup. But the land must be secured at a reasonable price. It is of no use repurchasing land if the price plus the cost of the improvements is going to be greater than the settler can afford to pay. The Minister for Lands some time ago made the announcement that whilst in office he would not agree to repurchasing any more estates. I hope I am not misrepresenting him, but I think he was alluding to the Yandanooka Estate, and I trust that he was speaking on mere impulse. It is sometimes very good business to repurchase estates. The Collier Government repurchased three estates near Mullewa, the Kockatea, the Mendels and the Wongundy Estates, and within two years there was produced on those estates £50,000 worth of wheat. In other words, within two years the settlers on those estates had produced wheat of a greater value than that paid by the Government for the purchase of the properties.

Hon. P. Collier: A large number of settlers were put on them.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. If that can be done it is a very good thing for the country. It is unwise not to repurchase estates merely because the settlers may not be able to repay their liabilities. Wherever land settlement is entered upon, we always find a number of settlers who will not make good. Sometimes it is urged by the settlers that the price of the land is their undoing. But, as we know, if the land were given away to some settlers they could not make good. The same thing occurs on Crown land. Some settlers can never make good because they have not the instinct for farming, or because they are extravagant, or because they are careless and slovenly in

their methods. I think the Government, if they can get the money, could purchase several estates to-day at a lower price than ever before. Again, the Minister said that no estate would be purchased unless it was to be resold to people possessing capital. But the mere fact that a man possesses capital is not evidence that he will make good on the land. He might spend all his own money and still fail. We know that a number of settlers coming here from England have brought capital into Western Australia, and have purchased farms. Some of them have made good, and on the other hand some have not. The Collier Government refused to give a promise to British settlers with capital that if they came to Western Australia they would be provided with land. We found that when many of those people came here and invested their money in the land, they failed. It does not matter whether the Minister purchases an estate and subdivides and sells it, or whether he sells Crown land, he will have as many failures amongst one class of settler as amongst the other class. The Minister has made certain changes in administration during his term of office. I refer to them because some of them are somewhat inconsistent with his former declaration, and particularly the declaration of his own party and Government. One of the first acts of the Minister was to insist that, with respect to advances to settlers by the Agricultural Bank, preference must be given to the employment of British labour. I recall that that was a definite part of the policy of the Collier Government, so definite indeed that in the approval form was inserted a clause that the work must be done by British labour. If I remember aright, however, members on the Government side of the House criticised me most bitterly.

The Minister for Works: Not Ministers.

Mr. Marshall: The Minister for Lands was the first. He had just returned from Malta and told us of the possibilities regarding Maltese migrants.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister for Works did not. I know some of his constituents tried to influence him, but he was not influenced. The Minister for Lands was foolish enough to say that the position created by us was intolerable.

Mr. H. W. Mann: He has seen the light since then.

Hon. P. Collier: It must have been a revolving light.

Hon. M. F. TROY: He did what probably he thought was right in the circumstances. He was approached by a large number of constituents who resented the action of the then Government, and he expressed his mind in the House. I am very glad that the Government of the day have realised the necessity for adopting the policy of the Collier Government.

The Minister for Lands: We could not do otherwise while our people were out of work.

Hon. M. F. TROY: At the time the Collier Government insisted on this principle, land settlement was being carried on under the Migration Agreement, with aid from the British Government, and the obligation on us was to bring in so many settlers. The Collier Government were merely fulfilling the promise given by no less a person than the present Premier, Sir James Mitchell. We had to fulfil the promise. It is pleasing to note that the Government are standing up to our policy in that respect. Another change in the alleged administration has been the non-insistence upon residence conditions on grazing areas and certain types of conditional purchase areas. As a matter of fact, there has been no change of policy in that direction, because whenever a settler was carrying out the requisite improvements, he very easily obtained from me permission for non-residence. It was only when a settler was not making the improvements that I insisted upon the residence conditions. During my term of Ministerial office a large number of speculators secured land, and their dealings were not in the interests of the State. Men secured land on the pretence of being bona fide selectors, and sold it immediately without making any improvements at all. The Land Act does not stand for that sort of thing, and it is not good policy. Quite a number of people were taking up sandplain, and selling it in South Australia on the pretence that it was good land carrying a bank advance. I know of instances of sandplain country having been taken up and disposed of in Adelaide. Buyers came across with their families, having parted with their homes in that State, to find that they had bought a bit of sandplain, the like of which was available in millions of acres. During my last

year of office I forfeited 320 blocks of land because the holders would not make the improvements. Those blocks were merely held for speculative purposes, to sell to the first person who came along seeking land. I set my face against that sort of thing. The Land Act provides that any person who takes up land within 20 miles of his holding may hold it without residence conditions. In every instance when a settler approached me and showed that he was a bona fide settler and not a speculator, he experienced no difficulty about the residence conditions, so long as he made the improvements. On the other hand, when a man had appeared before the Land Board and sworn that he was a bona fide settler and intended to reside on the land, and had received preference over other applicants, and then tried to escape the residence conditions, his request was not granted unless he could offer a very sound reason. Outside of the Nornalup area, most of the land settlement that has taken place in Western Australia during the last few years has been carried out in consonance with the policy of the Government who recently vacated office. Naturally, I have no fault to find with that. Recently a good deal of publicity has been given to another area. A number of visitors recently inspected the Yanchep Caves, and the Press informed us that a new discovery had been made at Wanneroo. The Mitchell Government intended to open up that land. The Minister knows that before I left office, I had given the Surveyor General instructions to subdivide that land in order that it might be made available for settlement.

Mr. Millington: I was corrected the other night when I said that.

The Minister for Lands: I was referring to the 8,000 acres of Class "A" reserve.

Mr. Millington: You said the ex-Minister for Lands objected to it.

The Minister for Lands: I did not say that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: I went to Yanchep and saw the swamp country, and was satisfied it was not in the interests of the State to hold the whole of it as a reserve. I therefore gave the Surveyor General instructions to survey it for selection. The Minister knows that that instruction is on the file. I have a letter from the Wanneroo Road

Board thanking me for my work in that connection. I have made these references because of an interjection that was reported in the Press the other day. There is little to be said regarding the Estimates. I have already mentioned that the Minister is handicapped. I do not think there will be any need to adopt other than the general policy of land settlement that has been in operation in this State for some years. We have had a very prolific time. While the Collier Government were in office, it was a progressive period for land settlement. The fact that we expect to reap 50,000,000 bushels of wheat this year is due to a great extent to the large number of settlers placed on the land during our term of office. We pursued an absolutely sound policy, a policy that I am satisfied will be adopted in future. We first of all provided the experimental farms in the dry areas, farms that are now working out the problems of those areas and producing suitable wheats. We introduced the fallowing policy. Previously settlers were rushing in large areas of land without preparation and obtained very poor returns. As a result they had to apply to the Government for assistance year by year because they could not make good. We adopted the fallowing policy and, in the Esperance area alone, an area previously under a cloud, no less than 80,000 acres of country was put under fallow in one year. That area will be reaped this year, and I believe will give a good yield as a result of the application of that principle. Throughout the whole of the eastern areas we put the fallowing policy into operation for the first time in the history of the State, and that policy in my opinion is the soundest one possible. In the miners' settlement 20,000 acres were fallowed, and I suppose that settlement has the finest crops in the State to-day, as a result of the sound administration of the Collier Government. We also gave assistance, such as was not given previously, to settlers 20 miles from a railway. So it can be said that the Collier Administration acted in the best interests of the State. The results are already apparent, and I hope that the same policy will be pursued by the present Minister. If I were asked my opinion as to the wisest policy for the Government to pursue to-day, I should reply that if I were Minister I would lay down definite principles. One would be that

at this time, when prices are low and the future is uncertain, the farmer should farm the best of his land. He should reduce the acreage and cultivate well the area he intends to sow with the expectation of getting a much higher yield. Farmers in this State are putting 1,000 acres under crop and expending all the time and labour, superphosphate and seed necessary for that area, whereas if they put in 500 acres and put it in well, they would require only half the seed and super and would get a much larger return.

Mr. Willcock: They would need twice the number of bags.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Probably. I would also expend such money as was available to assist the stocking of properties with sheep, a few cattle, and pigs, in order that the farmer might be assured of some return. Last of all I would encourage a more extensive use of horses in farming practice. I would cut out the tractor, the motor truck if possible, and in many instances the motor car. There is no doubt that the tractor, the truck to a lesser extent, and the motor car to a considerable extent, have been responsible for the difficult position in which many people find themselves to-day. It will be said that by insisting on this change we should be condemning the settler to a very hard existence, and denying him what other members of the community enjoy. I have a very old-fashioned idea that the only things to which any man is entitled are those for which he can pay. No man is entitled to ask the community to supply him with things for which he cannot pay. A lot of the trouble now hitting the farmer is due to his having expended his money on tractors, trucks and motor cars, which he could not maintain.

Mr. Angelo: And expensive motor cars at that.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Yes. It is remarkable how competition sets in amongst settlers in the matter of the choice of motor cars. They start off with a Ford and compete one with the other to see who shall have the best.

Hon. P. Collier: And finish up with a Rolls Royce.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Members of the Country Party have stated that the farmer is the backbone of the country, and is entitled to the very best he can get. He is entitled to that just as any other man is entitled to it, no more and no less. The Government must

see that the farmer who is being carried on with State money is giving the best possible return to the State for that which he receives. They must inculcate in him habits of thrift, and a desire to produce from his farm more than ever of his own requirements. Many farmers boast that they have not a cow on their properties and would not even bother to get one. That is not the type of man who should be carried by the Government. The settlers must keep cows, and they must help to reduce the amount of their household bills by supplying as far as possible their own needs. I am sure members will not think I am hard when I say that the settlers are not entitled to own motor cars if they cannot pay for them. The State is not warranted in financing settlers to enable them to buy motor cars, as has been the case in the past. I know of instances where settlers have been going behind in their commitments year after year, but still purchased motor cars. I also know of the wife of a settler, who told the Agricultural Bank trustees that her husband had gone behind to the extent of £3,000 in two years because he did not possess a mould board plough. The farmer had been using a disc plough, which was said to be unsuitable. During that very week the trustees discovered that the lady in question had purchased a £600 motor car.

Mr. Angelo: Because her neighbour had one like it.

Hon. M. F. TROY: When the trustees spoke to her about it she replied that her sons were tennis players and had to meet their neighbours on the tennis court on Saturday afternoons. He could not spend all his days at farming. It might be imagined from that sort of thing that the settlers thought that by going upon the land and developing the country they were conferring a benefit upon the people of the State. It would appear that they did not take up land in order to become independent, but that they insisted they had done so in order to keep some alleged parasite in the city.

Hon. P. Collier: That is what some farmers think.

Hon. M. F. TROY: My view is that we who went upon the land did so to make a competence for ourselves. I do not mean we want to amass wealth. I mean that our endeavour is so to strive and push ahead that in our later years we may take life a

little easier, that we may have to call no man master, that we may have a home from which we may not be evicted, and that in times of stress or at any other time we need not look to another for a job. That is the goal we should have, and the goal we should encourage all who go upon the land to work for. No man gets a better opportunity anywhere to reach that goal than he does in this State, but those who go behind to the extent of £3,000 in two years, and still purchase expensive cars, the State should finish with entirely. I hope that for the future not so much stress will be laid upon the great obligation we owe to the man on the land. We are not under any greater obligation to him than to any other man in this country, whether he be on the land, in a factory, in an office, or in any occupation in which he is giving useful service. No body of people is entitled to demand anything unfairly of the Government. They should not look to the Government to be kept on their holdings unless they be prepared to make an effort on their own part. I address these remarks through the Chair to the Country Party. At conferences of primary producers, the loudest talkers are usually the worst workers.

Mr. Raphael: That is hard upon the politicians.

Hon. M. F. TROY: They are for ever talking about the working man who will not work. Members of that party always condemn such an individual, the worker who, they say, is not giving a fair return for the money he receives. All the virtues are not in one party. In their own ranks there are people who will neither work nor pay, nor do their best with that which they have.

The Minister for Works: There are some who can talk, too.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister may speak for himself. There are those who do none of these things. If in his administration the Minister for Lands finds settlers who will not work, who are living a life of extravagance and are dishonest towards the Government, he ought to allow such a man to survive on Government assistance no longer than he would do in the case of a man who fails in his job in any other walk of life. I compliment the Minister upon his elevation to office. I should have done this in the first place. I entertain very candid feelings towards him and feel that

the administration of the Lands Department is in good hands. I know he will do his best for the country, and I wish him every success.

HON. W. D. JOHNSON (Guildford-Midland) [8.20]: The present must be a period of great anxiety to the Minister for Lands. Many of us who are interested in the agricultural industry appreciate the fact that just now the further we go the more money we are losing. Unless things improve, it is only a question of time when we shall see the finish. If that applies to those areas which have been settled for some time, to those people who have been farming for many years and have had the benefit of railway communication and other facilities within reasonable distance of their holdings so that they can market their produce economically, we must appreciate the difficulties confronting the large section of people who are far removed from railways, who have not a reasonable distance in which to cart their produce, and who really are in a hopeless position. The member for Mount Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) referred to the era of land settlement covering the last few years. I regret that so much has been done. Some time ago when sitting on the other side of the House I said that the 3,500 farms scheme was one that should be tackled very slowly. I deplored the fact that the Government were putting men out from 50 to 60 miles from a railway and expecting them to farm successfully. Their position must be deplorable. They cannot make a success of their ventures, and all of them are being assisted by the Agricultural Bank. Were I Minister I would at once attempt to remove them, slowly but surely, into closer touch with means of communication. Years ago an attempt was made to settle the Lake Brown district. This was isolated and removed a long distance from the existing railways. The Agricultural Bank had advanced considerable sums of money to the settlers. It was clear to me, as Minister, that these people could not make a success, that we were merely advancing money to them to maintain them on a proposition which for many years could be neither a profit to themselves nor to the State. I issued instructions that the area should be gradually closed up, and that the settlers should be transferred to other blocks that became vacant, and were

within reasonable proximity to the then existing railways. I am prepared to admit that the opportunity for doing that sort of thing is not now so great as it was in the days to which I refer. I only mention the circumstances to show that Lake Brown has been twice settled. It has now received railway communication, but it was many years after the first settlers had been removed that the second batch went into the district, and that only occurred when railway communication was possible. There is no possibility of providing railways and other facilities for a long time for the settlers we have east of Naremburn and south of Southern Cross, Westonia, etc. All the while we have to keep them going. Money has to be found to maintain and sustain them on their holdings. We are continuing to clear land that cannot be brought into profitable use. Not another settler should be put into that part of the State. I want the settlement to stop at once, and I think the Minister should take every opportunity to bring out of it those who are now in the area.

The Minister for Lands: We are not settling any more there now.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I am glad to hear that, and I hope the Minister is endeavouring to take some of the settlers out of it.

Hon. M. F. Troy: I hope you will give them a railway. Do you know the Migration Commission agreed that if the settlers went there they would receive that facility?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We know the authorities have departed from that.

Hon. P. Collier: I think they will stand to that.

The Minister for Lands: I wish they would.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Commission can only stand to it provided funds are available. The money has to be raised just as it would have to be raised if it were a State concern. The Commission have no opportunity to raise the money. They have actually gone out of office, and we cannot look to them to fulfil their undertaking. We must rely upon the Federal Government, and there is not much chance of our financing this railway for some years to come and of serving the settlers east of the existing line. We must remember that thousands of settlers within carting distance of existing railways will require a considerable

amount of assistance apart from that which they have been receiving. In many cases we shall find those who will want to go on getting what they have been receiving. We must continue advancing Agricultural Bank funds which have given out for some time past. Other settlers will require an additional amount, because they will get no returns from their farming operations to enable them to do what they have been doing, and funds will have to be provided by the Government to keep them on the land. The position has to be faced. Already the Government are reducing the amount that was advanced from the Agricultural Bank, and are telling the settlers they must not go on clearing above a certain area. Notwithstanding this, it is now proposed to open up new areas. This is where I want to appeal to the Minister. I care not what kind of land he has at Nornalup, though it be the best land in Western Australia, I say most emphatically that we cannot afford to increase our capitalisation as regards land settlement to-day, and that the capitalisation we already have is all we can carry, and more. We are telling farmers actually on the land that they must restrict their operations, that they cannot go on clearing land to which railways have been built in anticipation of the land being cleared and cultivated. We have said to them, "We look to you to clear 1,000 acres and to provide products from that acreage."

The Minister for Lands: The restricted area is 700 acres.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: We say to the farmer to-day, "You must only use 700 acres." That is, provided he has no more cleared.

The Minister for Lands: The land is all cleared along existing lines.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I wish to goodness it were. Hundreds of thousands of acres remain uncleared along existing lines.

The Minister for Lands: In the wheat areas?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Yes. I have appealed to Parliament on more than one occasion to have a thorough investigation as to the area of land that is within carting distance of existing lines and has not been cleared. I know what the Minister is thinking. I am not referring to Crown lands. I do not say there are Crown lands

available, but lands alienated and unused, in the agricultural areas.

The Minister for Lands: Where are the lands?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister need only keep his eyes open when travelling. I was pointing out that the hon. gentleman has issued instructions that the area of land cleared must be reduced. Side by side with that he proposes to open up new country.

Mr. Angelo: For a different industry, though.

Hon. P. Collier: And when that industry produces, there may be no market for its products.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister's restriction on agricultural advances will not apply only to the wheat belt. The Minister will have to restrict advances for the development of the South-West. There will be limitations in regard to people already settled there. Yet he proposes to open up a new area, for whose development this is emphatically not the time; there is no need to develop it at present. We have quite enough to do to maintain on alienated lands the men who have selected them. A grave difficulty we shall have during the next six or 12 months will be to keep on the land people already there. The full resources of the Government will have to be tapped in order to do that. It is clear to every hon. member that to-day markets are such that we shall experience great difficulty in getting fallowed areas cropped next year. The burden falling on the Government in regard to super and other necessities will be heavy. Then what is the use of going to Nornalup and starting to clear roads and land and to settle new areas, in view of those difficulties in connection with areas already opened? Again, the Minister speaks about Dartmoor.

The Minister for Lands: I never said that we were going to do a thing at Dartmoor.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: If the Minister is not going to do anything, I will accept that. He conveyed to me that he was going to—

Member: Carry out the previous Minister's policy.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I made no notes, but my recollection of what the Minister said was that he intended to do some-

thing at Dartmoor in the way of increased land settlement.

The Minister for Lands: I never said anything of the sort.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Let it go, then. I am glad to hear that nothing more is going to be done at Dartmoor.

Mr Willcock: At Dartmoor there are 7,000 or 8,000 acres under crop, yielding 15 to 20 bushels.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I will say the same of the Dartmoor land as of the Nornalup, that it is some of the best in the State, but that I do not want it settled just now, because it cannot be settled without increased capitalisation. No area, I care not where it is situated, should be opened up, at present if it involves increased liability for land settlement. The Minister says the opening up of the Nornalup area is justified by the fact of our having a railway serving it. That would be all right if the area could be brought into production without heavy expenditure. I cannot accept the Minister's figure of £800 per block.

The Minister for Lands: I would not expect you to do so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: My experience of the South-West tells me that the figure is inadequate, and my slight experience of farming confirms me in that view. (But suppose the Minister can do the work at £800 per block; the £800 is a burden this State cannot undertake at present. As to the Nornalup railway, there are to-day areas of improved land between Nornalup and Denmark.

The Minister for Lands: Held by the Forests Department as a reserve.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: No; held by private individuals.

The Minister for Lands: There are only two private individuals in that locality. I will show you the plans.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: One of the best blocks the hon. gentleman and I inspected at Denmark was Kingdon's. The Minister and I were on the farm, said to be the most progressive farm in Denmark, milking quite a number of cows, and being worked on a good economic basis; a farm that is generally speaking a success. But the owner of that farm now has land which he cannot afford to improve, not having the money.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Is not every Western Australian farmer to-day holding land he cannot afford to improve?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Would it not be better for us to adopt a scheme by which such men as Kingdon would be enabled to utilise land already alienated, land better situated than the Nornalup land?

The Minister for Lands: Kingdon's block is at Denmark. We are talking of Nornalup.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I mentioned Mr. Kingdon's block because the Minister knows it as well as I do, and because it is close to Denmark. Further afield the position is worse. The percentage of unimproved land further out—

The Minister for Lands: Oh!

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: It does not pay the hon. gentleman to admit what I say. If unimproved land is to be found in the vicinity of the railway, he will have no justification whatever for proceeding with the Nornalup scheme. In order to justify that scheme he conveys to this House and to the country that the land adjacent to the Denmark-Nornalup railway has been improved, and that we are getting from that land the production that is to be expected: and that therefore, to give greater traffic to the railway, we must open up new areas. Nothing of the sort. What we have to do is to devote our attention to seeing that the land close to that railway is more thoroughly developed. The hon. gentleman says the settlers do not patronise the railway but carry their cream 40 miles to Nornalup.

The Minister for Lands: You asked me the distance, and I told you 30 miles.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Cream can be carted 30 miles in a motor truck with pneumatic tyres over a well-made macadamised road; but it cannot be carried ten miles over the new area the Minister proposes to open up. He will have to make roads of a kind that will enable the settlers to cart their cream. Cream cannot be carted ten miles over a bush road. The hon. gentleman states that this Nornalup area is within ten or 12 miles of the existing railway. But the settlers must have roads in order to get from the area to the railway. The cost of making those roads will be something enormous. Therefore to the so-called £800 for the development of a block, we must add the heavy cost of road construction. The proposition is not a practicable one for us to tackle at present; it should be deferred for some years. During the huge expenditure

on group settlement, Governments were urged not to proceed at the pace they were going. Appeals were made over and over again to restrict the expenditure, but they were of no avail, and the expenditure went on. I wish the Minister to realise that if he persists in going on with this expenditure at Nornalup, I will give him no peace regarding the subject.

The Minister for Lands: Then I shall not be a bit disappointed.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not suppose the Minister will. Members used to endeavour to influence Governments regarding expenditure on group settlement. Ministers used to sit and listen. Now we have to appreciate that five millions sterling have been wasted because Ministers ignored the opinions expressed by members, and went on in spite of those opinions. I hope we shall not have a repetition of that episode. Numbers of members on both sides of the Chamber are opposed to any increased capital expenditure on land settlement. Numbers of them have already spoken against the expenditure at Nornalup. I hope the Minister will take an opportunity of testing the opinion of Parliament regarding the Nornalup scheme, and that he will not go on with it in defiance of Parliament. That is exactly what took place as regards group settlement. Parliament was not consulted regarding group settlement expenditure to the extent it should have been. From that aspect it is highly desirable that the opinion of Parliament should be obtained before the Government proceed with the Nornalup scheme. I agree with the view expressed by the member for Murray-Wellington. There is an area of partially improved land between Perth and Bunbury. The member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) also referred to that aspect. I know perfectly well, and the Minister himself knows, that during the investigations of the Group Settlement Royal Commission many south-western land-owners made representations as to how cheaply partially improved country could be obtained in the South-West. I think the Minister will agree with me when I say that land can be purchased in, or around, Pinjarra at a cheaper rate than it would cost to clear land at Nornalup. We could acquire that land plus improvements at a much cheaper figure. That applies today; the land is still there. If the Govern-

ment desire to provide work for the unemployed—I commend the Government in that regard—why not secure some of the land I have referred to?

The Minister for Lands: If it is improved land, what work would there be there?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I refer to land that is partly improved. That land is improved to the extent that it has a carrying capacity. There is a certain amount of feed already available there, and stock could be carried to a limited extent. If that land were acquired and made available for settlement, I believe that an economical scheme could be arranged. I have no objection to a scheme of that description because the settlers will be close to an existing railway. Increased production will give a greater quantity of goods to the railway for carriage, and we will get out of our financial difficulties more quickly if we can build up the earnings of our railways. We can do that if we use the land that adjoins existing lines. If the Government were active in investigating the possibility of getting such land, I am sure good results would follow.

Mr. Angelo: Could we buy that land with Treasury bills?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) expressed the view that the land could be acquired on reasonable terms. I believe there is a large area of land that could be obtained on terms that would be suitable to the Government, even under existing conditions.

The Minister for Railways: We cannot issue debentures now for the purchase of land.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not mind how it is done; I want the matter to be investigated.

The Minister for Railways: It could not be purchased that way.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Government are able to get money for the settlement of the Nornalup area, and if that is so they should consider a land settlement scheme on the partially improved areas I refer to, and so provide for some of the unemployed. Why not acquire land that is close to existing railways if it can be purchased at a cheaper cost than the work at Nornalup will entail? It would not be necessary to build roads such as will be required at

Nornalup nor will there be as much clearing to be done. It would be possible for the land I refer to to be partially productive immediately upon settlement. With the carrying capacity the land has to-day, stock could be depastured at once.

The Minister for Lands: Then why is not that land being used now?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: The Minister might ask why thousands of acres are not being used. The explanation is that people are realising they have too much land.

Mr. McLarty: That is so.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: There is such a thing as being land poor. Thousands of settlers are keeping themselves poor by endeavouring to hold on to their properties, and to pay rates and taxes on a large proportion that they cannot farm. The member for Mt. Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) said that the farmers were making a mistake through cropping too large an area. He pointed out that the area cropped was out of proportion to what was represented by good farming, and out of proportion to the machinery and plant the farmers had at their disposal. The result is that the work is not done thoroughly, and the returns they get from their aggregate holdings are not as great as they would secure from smaller areas better farmed. In addition to that, the proper farming of smaller areas would save those settlers all the additional cost of labour, machinery, super, seed and so on.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Would not the land you refer to in the Murray-Wellington electorate cost as much for drainage as the land at Nornalup would for clearing?

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: I do not think so.

Mr. McLarty: That land is crossed by brooks and creeks now.

Hon. W. D. JOHNSON: Of course I cannot answer the question put to me by the member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann), but I want the whole position investigated. I do not wish to say any more on the Vote, but I appeal to the Minister to realise that we cannot increase capitalisation to-day in connection with land settlement. It will take us all our time to maintain the settlement we have established already, and during the next few months we will have a particularly anxious time in meeting the requirements of those already on their holdings. In addition, I urge that the time is not opportune for increasing land settlement within the State.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [8.49]: I wish to have something to say on this Vote.

Hon. P. Collier: You have already spoken!

Mr. Panton: Do you want two speeches?

Mr. BROWN: I do not think I have spoken on this Vote.

Hon. P. Collier: Of course you have.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member spoken before?

Mr. BROWN: I did not think that I had.

MR. SLEEMAN (Fremantle) [9.50]: I should not have spoken on the Vote had it not been for a remark made by the Minister for Lands the other evening. Some time ago I said there were large quantities of valuable timber in the Nornalup area, and that it was likely to be destroyed under the land settlement scheme there. I listened attentively to the speech delivered by the Minister for Lands when introducing the Vote, and I confess I could not follow him. When he started off he said that there was no timber to be destroyed, and then he said that the timber in the district was of no value, as it was mostly overgrown karri and a little tingle. Finally he said that provision had been made whereby all the timber in the district would be safeguarded. So long as the last-mentioned statement is the correct one, I shall raise no objection. I shall not have anything to say in opposition to the settlement of people on holdings so long as there is no wastage of valuable timber. For that reason I was pleased to hear the Minister say that the timber will be safeguarded. I believe there is a good opportunity available for placing some of the unemployed on blocks adjacent to the metropolitan area. Some members may laugh when I say I am referring to the Peel Estate. I have been down there and dozens of others have visited the estate, and we are all convinced that there are a number of blocks available on which a living can be made.

Hon. P. Collier: There has been a procession on and off those blocks during the last seven years.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The department must think that a living can be made on the blocks I refer to, because they have put them up for sale. Some of the blocks still have houses on them all ready to be occupied by new settlers. If something is not done, those houses will not be there in the near future. They will "walk" off, and then the Government will lose the house and a prospective settler as well.

The Minister for Railways: Some of them have "walked" already.

Mr. SLEEMAN: And the rest will "walk" off too, unless something is done. There are some good genuine men among the unemployed in the metropolitan area who are prepared to take the blocks and endeavour to make a living there, provided they get some little assistance.

Hon. M. F. Troy: What, more money to be spent there?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Money has to be spent in the shape of sustenance for the people who have nothing else to do but walk the streets. There does not appear to be any prospect ahead of them for the next 12 months, unless the Premier gives effect to his promise of work for all. But that seems to be a long way off at present.

Hon. M. F. Troy: Would it not be far better to give them decent land on which to make a start?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Put them where the hon. member likes, but the fact remains that the men I refer to are at present drawing sustenance pay in the metropolitan area, and if they got a little additional assistance, they could take their wives and children on to the blocks and live on the sustenance money there, whilst at the same time endeavouring to improve their prospects. It is simply a matter of transferring sustenance payments from men who are walking the streets to men who will be working the blocks. These men want the opportunity to make an honest attempt to get a living.

The Minister for Railways: Would they go to blocks on the Peel Estate for their sustenance payments?

Mr. SLEEMAN: Yes, with perhaps a few pounds extra for the purchase of stock and fowls. The great bulk of the assistance they would want would be represented by the sustenance money they received already.

Hon. P. Collier: Could not the Minister transfer Blackboy Camp to the Peel Estate?

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is a reasonable suggestion, and I believe the member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. McLarty) will agree with me when I say that there are some blocks on the Peel Estate on which a man could make a living. I do not say all the blocks are suitable, but surely it is better for the people who are receiving

sustenance to have an opportunity to do some good for themselves than to be allowed to continue walking the streets.

The Minister for Railways: What have these fellows done to you that you want to be their enemy and send them there?

Mr. SLEEMAN: I do not want to be their enemy; I want to assist them. It is merely a matter of transferring the sustenance payments from the street to a block at the Peel Estate. Regarding immigration, here is another heading under which the Premier can save a little money. On former occasions I have spoken about the way migrants have come to Western Australia and have lived for a long time at the expense of the Government. They themselves, their wives and their children have received sustenance payments for quite a long time. In the end, some of them have had to be repatriated to the Old Country. I have been in touch with the Immigration Department regarding a couple of cases, and I have been turned down. I have been told nothing could be done until the people concerned were able to pay their fares back to Great Britain. It seems to me that if these people are to be kept going here with sustenance payments until they can provide their fares Home, it is ridiculous.

Mr. H. W. Mann: I have had similar cases, and I found it was a Federal matter.

The Minister for Railways: It is not a State matter at all; it has nothing to do with us.

Mr. SLEEMAN: The final reply I received from the department regarding one individual whose case I investigated, contained the intimation that advice had been received from the Melbourne office—

The Minister for Railways: We have no office in Melbourne.

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, but the Immigration Department is partly under the State Government. If relatives are prepared to pay the fares of people who are being provided with sustenance by the State Government, surely it is right that I should attempt to move the Federal authorities to assist those people to return to England.

The Minister for Railways: We would have no objection; we would kiss them goodbye.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It would be well for the State if those people were allowed to leave and it would be well for the State to kiss goodbye quite a number of people whom we cannot afford to keep here. I do not condemn all migrants, but there is a small proportion of them that the State would be well rid of.

The Minister for Railways: Are you taking up their cases?

Mr. SLEEMAN: No, the migrant I referred to was genuine and the relatives were prepared to pay his fare home.

The Minister for Railways: We are not stopping them from doing so.

Mr. SLEEMAN: But you are not assisting them. The case I refer to is not isolated; the member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) and the member for Canning (Mr. Wells) referred to similar instances, and we go on paying the sustenance? We are keeping these people here indefinitely, providing them with sustenance, notwithstanding that we could get rid of them because their relatives are prepared to pay their fares.

The Minister for Railways: That is misrepresenting the position.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I say it is not.

The Minister for Railways: We have no power to take action.

Mr. SLEEMAN: I have written to a State official, namely, the head of the Immigration Department, who has done all in his power, but apparently has not had much assistance from Ministers. The Minister controlling Blackboy says I am misrepresenting the position. If he will do something to rid the State of some of those families who can get their fares to the Old Country paid, he will be doing a service to the Treasurer. Those people are unemployed and likely to remain unemployed, and it is a very serious matter.

The Minister for Railways: It is a Federal matter.

Mr. SLEEMAN: It is both a State and Federal matter. What is the State doing to get the Federal people to agree?

The Minister for Railways: This Government have made representations in one instance, but their request was turned down.

Mr. SLEEMAN: Then you should make further efforts. We cannot go on indefinitely keeping people who can get their fares back to the Old Country. I hope something will be done in order that all these cases may be dealt with. I have known

migrants come out here to go on the group settlements. In one case that came under my knowledge the State would have been well rid of an immigrant. He lived around the metropolitan area for a long time and at last, fortunately for the State, he was going to get out of the country by accepting a position on a steamer. But the immigration officers went aboard and told him he could not go. So the State had to keep him for another 12 months. It is time an investigation was made with a view to dealing with these cases. If a man can get back home to England, let him go, and let us not keep him here at the expense of the State.

MR. H. W. MANN (Perth) [9.3]: I want to congratulate the member for Mount Magnet (Hon. M. F. Troy) on his very practical address, and on the moderate way in which he put up a warning to people going on the land with the idea that they would be assisted and maintained by the State. The hon. member was very definite and was speaking from a lifelong experience when he said that a man going on the land to-day must go on with the clear understanding that he would have to face great hardships, and that the greatest reward he could expect would be that in the declining years of his life he would have a competence and would be relatively independent of the outside world. But there is a feeling amongst a great many settlers to-day that if they are unable to do 100 per cent. of what they desire to do, and can only properly do 50 per cent. of it, the other 50 per cent. must be done by the Government. There is amongst them a marked lack of initiation and application, and I agree with the member for Mt. Magnet that those people will not ultimately be a success either for themselves or for the State. I have before me a report issued by the Imperial Economic Committee. This is a very useful and interesting publication. It would appear from it that the Imperial Government must have taken the long view, must have foreseen the economic position that is approaching Australia to-day, when this committee was set in motion; because the committee has dealt with matters affecting almost every part of the Empire, and with matters that certainly are very applicable to Western Australia to-day. The member for Mount Magnet casually mentioned sidelines, and amongst

them the pig and bacon products. This committee in its report emphasises the great value of the pig product to Australia, and the fact that no attempt has been made by Australia to exploit the pig market in Great Britain. Great Britain imports £96,000,000 worth of pig and bacon produce annually. And we find that neither the Eastern States of Australia, nor this State, supplies £1 worth to that market. It would appear that we in Australia are ignoring the existence of that market, because the prices that have been obtained during the last few years certainly appear to be profitable. Four years ago New Zealand decided to investigate that market, and as an experiment sent 5,000 frozen carcasses of pork to Great Britain. So reassuring was the result that the Government of New Zealand, just to give the industry a start, agreed for a period of two or three years to pay a bonus of one half-penny per lb. on frozen pork weighing from 80 lbs. to 120 lbs. And last year New Zealand exported to Great Britain 160,000 frozen carcasses of pork valued at over £400,000. With the development of our South-West—which is mentioned in this publication—in addition to the butter industry, I suggest to the Minister that he organises the pig and bacon industry.

The Minister for Lands: They should go together.

Mr. H. W. MANN: I am pleased to hear the Minister express himself in that way, because undoubtedly the one must run with the other. So, in reply to the criticism of the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson), who spoke as if the whole of the produce from the Nornalup settlement would come to Perth, I take it that produce will, or at least should, go through the port of Albany to Great Britain, that it will be an export trade, and that the metropolitan requirements will be supplied from districts nearer at hand. I take it the production of Nornalup and Denmark will go to Great Britain; and so the criticism that Nornalup is too far from the market is not sound, for it is close to a first-class seaport and will go straight to Great Britain.

Mr. Wansbrough: And it is not a man-made port either.

Mr. H. W. MANN: No, Albany is a natural seaport, and there will be a cheap freight from there to Great Britain, taking the regular supply of pig, bacon and dairy produce from Nornalup. The Imperial Economic Committee, dealing with the vari-

ous products of Australia, and particularly with Western Australia, evidently had some very excellent information, for they said the barley crop was one of the best crops for pig production, and that the barley crops of Tasmania, and of the cooler portions of Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia were likewise capable of great expansion, again in close relation to the dairying industry. On a former occasion I referred to the great development of Denmark. When Denmark was facing a position probably even more acute than that which Western Australia is facing to-day, at a period when Denmark had lost all her wealth-producing land after a war, and was left with an area of swamp and very inferior land, she decided to change her policy from wheat production to dairying. And at the end of 50 years we find Denmark the wealthiest country per head of population in the world, and certainly the most practical dairying country in the world. When I was speaking on that subject the member for Mt. Magnet, who was then Minister for Lands, said, "That is all very well, but the conditions of Australia are not severe enough, the economic condition of Australia has not reached that point when the people will settle down to developing dairying lands." Certainly we have reached that point now. The economic position is hard enough to-day and the dearth of employment is so severe that it now becomes an absolute necessity to develop our dairying industry. This for several reasons: Not so much land is required for it as is required for wheat production. As a matter of fact, the area of land used in Denmark, Holland and other European dairying countries is from 12½ acres to 60 acres. It may be suggested that the land in those countries is of better quality than ours. That may be true to-day, but it was not always of better quality; it has been improved. So, if we desire to settle the multitude, the Minister is wise in deciding to develop the dairying industry, in which a large number of people can be employed and greater facilities can be provided for the production of wealth. Following up this report, I went to the trouble of getting out a few statistics that to my mind are interesting. They show that in developing the dairying industry and the pig industry there is not so large an amount of money required for machinery as is necessary in the wheat industry. It may be that more money is required for stock, but

I doubt it. If the industry is strictly supervised, and if care is taken that the settlers do not rush in and pile up big debts for clearing contracts and in other ways overcapitalise their holdings, I think there will be no doubt about its success. A minute or two ago I said that Great Britain imported £96,000,000 worth of pig and bacon products annually. Of that quantity Denmark supplies £26,000,000 worth and Canada £6,000,000 worth. The United States of America at one time supplied £12,000,000 worth, but the demand in the United States for home requirements has increased, and so the States now supply only £5,000,000 worth to Great Britain.

Mr. McLarty: How much does Australia supply?

Mr. H. W. MANN: Nothing at all. None of the States of Australia has exploited that market in any degree. The only part of the Southern Dominions to do so is New Zealand, and in three years New Zealand has built up a trade from 5,000 carcasses to 160,000 of a value of £400,000. So there is a good market in Great Britain for that product. In the United States the pig industry is second only to the cereal industry. There a pig is grown to every two adults. There are 120,000,000 persons in the United States, and just on 60,000,000 pigs.

Mr. Pantou: They can pay the rent there.

Mr. H. W. MANN: That is almost akin to the position in Denmark. We are not developing an industry for the produce of which there is no market. There is a market for produce of this kind. The prices ruling in Great Britain in 1926 were—Irish produce, 137s. per cwt.; Danish, 122s.; Canadian, 117s.; Swedish, 115s.; Dutch, 112s.; American, 103s.

Hon. P. Collier: What was the price of wheat in those years compared with the price to-day? Is there any possibility of a fall in the price of that commodity?

Mr. H. W. MANN: The price has fallen, as I was about to show. In 1929 the prices were—Irish, 107s.; Danish, 98s.; Canadian, 93s.; Swedish, 92s.; Dutch, 90s. Still, we do not read in the cable messages of any fall in prices comparable with the fall in the price of wheat. If there had been any such great fall, I think it would have been cabled. Nobody believes that wheat will remain at its present low level. If it does, it will be God help Australia. The broad lands

of Australia are wheat-growing lands, and the area to which the dairying industry is applicable is small compared with the area suitable for wheat production. Dr. Earle Page, in the course of an address at Byron Bay, New South Wales, said—

Dairy farms alone represent a capital of £125,000,000 with an annual production of £45,000,000, of which £30,000,000 is for mild products. Butter and cheese factories represent a capital outlay of £4,250,000, and their annual production is nearly £23,000,000. On the farms 143,785 people are employed and in the factories 5,826 people. Direct dependants on the dairying industry number 500,000.

Let me compare the position of this State with that of Victoria. We export wheat to the value of £7,000,000, £8,000,000 and in a good season perhaps £9,000,000. We export no dairy produce at all. On the other hand we import dairy products to the value of over £1,000,000 annually from the Eastern States. Victoria exports over £7,000,000 worth of wheat and £11,000,000 worth of dairy produce. If we were exporting our normal quantity of wheat plus £11,000,000 worth of dairy produce, I venture to say there would be no unemployment in this State, but that there would be work for all.

Mr. Sleeman: That is what we want.

Mr. H. W. MANN: I take it that is what the Premier has in mind. By developing this industry and making it as productive as the wheat industry, there will be work for all.

HON. P. COLLIER (Boulder) [9.19]: I am not going to threaten the peace of mind of the Minister, as did the member for Guildford-Midland (Hon. W. D. Johnson), and I join in the discussion only to register my disapproval of the scheme of settlement launched in the Nornalup area. The Minister for Lands quite sincerely painted a very glowing picture. He told us of the running water there; he said it was an ideal place to live in, that the land had been classified as some of the best in Australia, that it would be impossible to estimate its value 50 years hence. These and many other terms of eulogy he employed. Those words, however, have an old familiar ring. If one searched the pages of "Hansard" during the past seven or eight years, he would find volumes filled with similar remarks about the group settlements of the South-West. Similar expressions are

to be found, not only in "Hansard" but in back files of the newspapers, regarding the Peel Estate, where at one time we had 700 settlers and where now there are only about 140. At the Peel Estate where something like £2,500,000 has been spent, houses are empty and have been for years. Land there is waiting to be taken up and no one will have it. Some of the houses, it has been said, are disappearing in the night. Throughout the history of group settlement, all those optimistic opinions were expressed. Well, we have established group settlement. We have about 1,700 settlers at a cost of something over £5,000,000 and upon which it is safe to say we shall wind up with a loss of between £5,000,000 and £6,000,000. It might be said that the fact of our having established dairying in the South-West is worth the loss of the money. I am not saying that the Minister has over-estimated the value of the land and the possibilities at Nornalup. I shall concede for the moment that it is all he claims for it and, by a stretch of imagination, I shall also concede that his estimates of costs will be realised. He says they are going to clear tracks 10ft. wide for 5s. a chain, and that the roads will be constructed for £90 a mile. Those are estimates. There are other figures as to the cost of bringing the blocks into production, £800 per block. We are familiar with all those estimates. All over the State are monuments of the unreliable character of the estimates of Government officers. While the first estimate of draining the Peel Estate was £57,000, the cost to date, I believe, has exceeded half a million for drainage alone.

Mr. Marshall: And it is not drained yet.

Hon. P. COLLIER: And it never will be drained.

Mr. Marshall: What about Herdsman's Lake?

Hon. P. COLLIER: At the last consultation I had with the engineer in charge, who requested another £20,000 or £30,000 for drainage at the Peel Estate, I said, "Will you guarantee that the drainage will then be effective and complete?" He replied, "No, I do not think it will ever be drained, because the estate will gradually fall below sea level. So much sand has been carried through the outlet to the ocean that a great bank has been raised outside, and we

shall require to have a dredge out there permanently in order to clear it away."

The Minister for Railways: To clear the sea?

Hon. P. COLLIER: Surely, in the short space of a few years, we are not going to forget that experience. We are apt to forget experience after the lapse of many years, but not when it is a matter of only yesterday. Every one of our hopes and aspirations and estimates has been falsified by actual results, every one of them. So I have no faith at all that the position has so completely changed, or that the knowledge now possessed by departmental officials will enable them to make such a recovery in this particular scheme. I do not think it can be done. The Minister says that the estimates would appear to be ridiculous. They do appear to be ridiculous, and ultimately it will be found that they were ridiculous. All our experience points that way. Admitting that the scheme is all that is claimed for it and that the work can be accomplished within the estimate, I object to it because it should not be launched at this juncture. All that the member for Perth (Mr. H. W. Mann) has said regarding the production of dairy produce and the market existing in Great Britain is correct, but in my opinion it is beside the question. There is no doubt whatever that a great future lies ahead of the dairying industry in the South-West of this State, and there can be no question that we shall be exporting large quantities of butter and other dairy produce from the South-West, but this is not the time to start aiming at the export of butter. The present situation is too serious. The Loan Estimates show a reduction of the amount provided for agricultural development, as compared with the expenditure last year, of over £400,000. This is a year when the outlook is such that we shall require more money for agricultural development, that is to maintain the settlers already on the land and in difficulties, than we have required in any year of our existence. Every pound we can scrape together will be needed to tide over the people in the wheat belt. Although the Nornalup scheme may provide work for a hundred or two of men at the present time, it is quite possible that the amount necessary to maintain the Nornalup scheme, if expended on the men in the wheat belt, would save perhaps four or five times the

number being thrown on the unemployed market. I say candidly that with the outlook for wheat and wool at the moment, only by tremendous financial assistance from the Government will it be possible to retain a large number of our settlers in the wheat belt. Otherwise they will have to walk off in armies. Consequently we should spend no money on new schemes until we find ourselves out of the wood, until we get through this year at any rate, until we see signs of overcoming the depression that exists throughout Australia. Until we can see that we have turned the corner, every penny of our funds should be conserved for consolidating our position with regard to the settlers already on the land.

Mr. J. H. Smith: You do not mean that the settlers in the wheat belt are the only ones to be considered?

Hon. P. COLLIER: No, but I have regard for the fact that this State has expended large sums of money in the wheat belt, that people are already established on holdings there, and that before we embark upon new schemes we should be sure that we are able to retain present settlers on their holdings. We cannot be sure of that at this stage until after the harvest, when we shall know what the position is in the wheat belt.

Mr. J. H. Smith: The country cannot live on wheat alone.

Hon. P. COLLIER: People will not have either wheat or butter unless we maintain on the wheat belt those who are now there. Is it wise to start upon this new proposal of spending money when no Minister can see his way through what is facing us concerning the settlers on the wheat belt, with the position as it is to-day? I believe in the necessity for developing the South-West. I do not question Ministers' opinions with regard to its prospect of success. It is, however, well to remind them that there will not be any self-contained holdings there for many years. The Minister says it may be three or four years before the settlers are self-contained. If that is so, his estimate will be altogether different from our experience of the group settlements. A great many group settlers have been on their holdings for eight years and are not yet self-contained. Many of them have been there for seven years and none of them is self-contained. If we could succeed in bringing them to the stage when they are able to maintain themselves for three or four years,

we shall have improved upon our experience in the groups by 50 per cent.

Mr. J. H. Smith: We can easily do that.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Wonderful strides are being made in the South-West. Assuming that the period of three or four years proves to be correct, even that would be too long just now. The Government cannot see their way over the trouble that is facing a great many men in the wheat belt. I am sure they cannot do so. We do not know what money we shall get. The Treasurer told us this afternoon that although the Loan Estimates covered a certain amount, he does not know whether the money will be spent or not, because he does not know whether he will get the money. This is money the Loan Council hope to get, but they may not be able to get it. We shall probably be placed in the position of having to allow large numbers of men to walk off their farms in the wheat belt whilst we are launching out in a scheme to spend money elsewhere. Then there is another question. Our experience has shown us that there is nothing more difficult than to make a successful dairy farmer—it is much more difficult than to make a wheat farmer—out of an inexperienced man who has no money. The Minister has told us that for every one man who was wanted, 100 persons applied. It does not matter what scheme is launched, for every one man required, 100 will apply. Thousands of men are out of work, in a desperate frame of mind. They would clutch at a straw to keep off the labour market. They are walking the streets day after day with no prospects in front of them. Of course they will apply for any scheme. They would apply even for the hopeless proposition of going back to the Peel Estate in order to escape their desperate situation. We have had the experience of men taken from the Labour Bureau. I do not reflect upon any man who, because he is out of work, has to register at the Labour Bureau, but I am certain they are men who have no money. They are also men, I should say, who are entirely without any experience of dairying. One cannot learn all the intricacies of that industry as quickly as one can learn to grow wheat. It requires also a different temperament and outlook upon farming life for a man to be content to engage in dairying, in preference to wheat farming. We have tried

inexperienced men from the Old Country without capital. We have endeavoured to make dairy farmers of them, but have paid mighty dearly for the experiment.

Mr. H. W. Mann: There are no holidays on dairy farms.

Mr. Willcock: And no Sundays.

Hon. P. COLLIER: I am afraid that if we settle men at this time in heavily timbered country, men without money or experience, we shall be confronted with the same difficulties that we met with in the group settlements. I should like the Minister to explain one or two points. He is reported to have said that the Agricultural Bank has agreed to find the money, that the officers of the Bank agreed to the proposal, that there was no guarantee for the bank, and that the trustees were prepared to finance the scheme. What does the Minister mean? First of all, we are told, the trustees agreed to the proposal, and agreed to find the money and to finance the proposition. How are they to find the money?

The Minister for Lands: It was in reply to an interjection when I was asked if the Treasurer was guaranteeing the bank. I said no, but that the money would come out of the ordinary funds of the bank.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It would appear—I know the Minister did not mean it in that way—that the Government were taking no risks, but in some way the scheme was being buttressed by the trustees of the bank, who were to finance it. Of course they cannot finance it. They may control and administer it, but that is a different thing. The finance is entirely a responsibility of the Government.

The Minister for Lands: Of the Treasury.

Hon. P. COLLIER: The bank have no funds apart from what they obtain from the Treasury. The Government, not the trustees, are financing the scheme.

The Minister for Lands: They only find the money for development.

Hon. P. COLLIER: They draw it from the Government. The trustees can only control the scheme.

The Minister for Lands: You will remember the Treasurer guaranteed money at Esperance to relieve the bank of their guarantee.

Hon. P. COLLIER: Whether the trustees make advances that are guaranteed by the Treasury or otherwise, the money all comes

from the Government. I do not know about the officers of the bank having agreed to the proposals. It seems to me to be the policy of the Government. They conceived it and decided to go on with it. They said to the officers of the bank, "This is your job. We are going to do so-and-so down here. This is your work, and we are handing over the administration to you." It is not a question of the trustees agreeing to it. They have no alternative if the Government say, "Here is the policy we have undertaken. You are the officers who are going to carry it through." As officers of the Government they do it. I cannot imagine Mr. McLarty, knowing him as I do, making a suggestion of that kind. I am sure he was not responsible for putting the idea into the heads of the Government, of suggesting that they should take this on, and of saying he would be glad to control and administer it. The Government will not deny it is their policy.

The Minister for Railways: He is too Scotch to give anything away.

Hon. P. COLLIER: It would be a good thing for the State if the Scottish instinct had been given a freer rein during the last eight years with regard to the groups in the South-West. It would be a good thing if the Scottish instinct dominated a good many situations and controlled a number of methods which are alleged to be Scotch. I wish to place on record my opposition to the scheme that is now being launched. I am confident that all our financial resources will need to be conserved to get us over the difficulty of handling the men on the wheat-belt.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Immigration, £2,292:

Item, Officer in Charge £611:

Mr. H. W. MANN: I wish to refer to a point raised by the member for Fremantle. Many migrants have been unsuccessful in securing employment or doing well for themselves, and their friends in the Old Country have offered to supply the fares for their return. Until the passage money for the outward journey has been repaid, however, the authorities will not allow such persons to leave the country.

Mr. Willcock: They are allowed to return after two years.

Mr. H. W. MANN: Only if they have repaid the cost of their passages out. If they

live to be a hundred some of them will never earn the money or save it.

Mr. Marshall: Do you think they could do any better in some of the fish shops in Barrack Street?

Hon. P. Collier: Some of them will never pay the money back.

Mr. H. W. MANN: They are not capable of earning it even in times of prosperity. The Federal authorities will not allow them to leave until the cost of their passages has been paid.

Mr. Sampson: Do you suggest deporting them in one of the State steamers?

Mr. H. W. MANN: There is no power under which they can be deported. The term is wrongly applied. Many of these circumstances are brought under my notice because of my association with charitable organisations. Day after day we are compelled to do something to assist these people back to the Old Country. It would be well if the Government took up the matter with the Federal authorities with a view to writing-off this money. It would help the State if this money were written-off and these people got rid of. They are an encumbrance and a cost to the State.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: We have already taken up this matter with the Federal authorities. It is a question of policy. They say these people entered into an agreement to do certain things, that they knew what they were coming to, and that, as they and the Imperial Government have advanced the fares, they do not propose to allow these people to go until the money has been repaid. They must stay in Australia for two years.

Hon. P. Collier: In the meantime they are being kept by our department.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: A little while ago a youth was deported, but we had to maintain him under restraint for a long time. We tried to throw the responsibility upon the Federal Government, but they refused to accept it. I assure hon. members that the matter will be taken up again with the Federal Government. If the relatives of these people have the money to pay their fares Home, about £16 per head, that would be the proper course to adopt. There is now a Commonwealth officer in this State collecting migrants' fares.

Hon. P. Collier. I do not think the Commonwealth Government will do any better

in that respect than our officers, whom they blamed, have done.

Mr. WELLS: A resident of my district came to see me recently. He is a migrant, with a delicate wife and three children. The wife's parents are prepared to pay her fare back and the fares of the children, and the husband is prepared to remain in Australia and try to repay his own passage. Nothing can be done in the matter, however. If the Minister can assist these people to return to the Old Country, it would be well for him to do so.

Mr. RAPHAEL: I protest against the class of some of the migrants who have been permitted to come to Western Australia. In Victoria Park a lady came to see me last week. Her husband is an ex-Imperial soldier. He was mental in England, but was permitted to migrate to Western Australia at this country's expense. Now he is a burden on the State, which may have to keep him for the rest of his life. He will never be able to repay to the Federal Government the fares that he owes. He will have to receive the invalid pension, and his wife and children will have to be supported. Then there is a migrant girl who became a melancholia case. No doctor would attend her, nor could she be put into a home. The Federal Medical Officer could not do anything. The girl is now in Heathcote, where perhaps she may have to be maintained for the rest of her life, or at all events until she is fit to be deported.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The amount of the Vote is much decreased, but I should have expected a still greater reduction by reason of the almost total cessation of migration. I understand one of the officers connected with migration is now employed at Nornalup.

The Minister for Lands: He is not employed at Nornalup. He went there to make an inspection.

Hon. M. F. TROY: Nornalup is not his place. There are men of far greater practical experience in group settlement. I hope the Minister will be able to get the Commonwealth Government to write off the liability for fares. Their experience with an officer of their own on the spot may help to induce them to do so. As Minister I do not remember recovering one of these debits. I even tried prosecution. Some of the debtors considered they were entitled to compensation for having been brought out here.

It struck me what extraordinary morality some people must have to owe money and have no regard whatever for their liability. The cheapest course would be to wipe the whole thing out. Within the last 10 or 20 years a feeling has grown up amongst certain people, "We owe the Government money; well, the Government is nobody." That feeling should be discouraged.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The Vote has been reduced by half. Moreover the State receives a certain amount of revenue from the Commonwealth, 5 per cent. on the amount collected. A surprisingly large amount is collected.

Mr. H. W. Mann: But the cost of collection is more than 5 per cent.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The only cost is postage. There is an estimated revenue of £1,000. The staff are not used only for collection purposes. We are bound by an agreement with the Imperial and Federal Governments, and we keep up the Immigrants' Home at Fremantle for sheltering girls out of employment. In other respects, too, assistance is rendered to migrants for short periods. The officer in charge of the branch has been transferred to do other work. At present he is out among the farmers endeavouring to fix up jobs for the unemployed.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Is so large a staff needed?

Mr. Munsie: There are 14 clerks all told.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The total estimated expenditure is £2,692, including the salaries of the immigration staff, £637. There has been a considerable number of dismissals.

Mr. SLEEMAN: At the Immigrants' Home meals have been and are being cooked for 175 people until such time as the Minister can supply the Fremantle single unemployed with restaurant tickets as is done in Perth or transfer them to Blackboy Hill. Pending some such arrangement the home will have to be kept open and the staff can scarcely be reduced.

The Minister for Lands: It is not proposed to reduce the staff.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Town Planning, £1,737—agreed to.

Votes—Medical, £61,999. Public Health, £36,115:

Mr. MUNSIE: Does the Minister intend to make a statement on these Votes? If he does not, I will.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. C. G. Latham—York) [9.59]: I was hopeful that hon. members would not require a speech on these Votes, seeing that legislation coming forward will involve the discussion of the whole subject.

Mr. Munsie: Not the whole subject.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I suppose the hon. member desires to speak about the reduction of some £100,000 in the Medical Vote. However, that Vote anticipates legislation, and I think the discussion may be left over until the Bill is debated. After all, the whole subject will come up for consideration then. If there is any other aspect on which the hon. member desires me to touch, I shall be only too pleased to give him the fullest information. Heavy demands have been made on the Health Department by the Commonwealth Government. Under the provisions of the Health Act, we formerly received 50 per cent. from the Commonwealth on account of the cost of treatment of venereal diseases, but we have been notified by the Federal authorities that, as from the 30th June last, they refuse to provide us with any more money under that heading. As the State has been committed to expenditure for three months, we have taken the matter up with the Federal Government with the request that they should extend their payment until the end of the year. Western Australia is in the unfortunate position of having a large territory, with lines of communication difficult and far apart. We have pointed out to the Federal authorities that it is impossible to reorganise the staff immediately to meet the demands of the altered position, and we hope to receive some consideration in that respect. During the year, certain alterations have been made in connection with some of the hospitals, but I anticipate there will be very little money available from revenue or loan funds for further buildings this year. I am sorry to make that statement because of the many demands made upon the Government from the agricultural areas and other parts of the State for additional hospital accommodation. In the past people have provided 50 per cent. of the total money required for hospital buildings, and I anticipate there will be very little such

money provided in the future. That will mean that the State will have to find a large amount of money. I do not desire to anticipate legislation that will be dealt with next week, when hon. members will have an opportunity of fully discussing the whole question. I suggest we leave the question of the reduced vote until we deal with that legislation.

MR. MUNSIE (Hannans) [10.3]: It is all very well for the Minister to suggest that we should not say anything about the reduced vote at the present stage. Not knowing what the provisions of the Bill may be, I do not feel disposed to allow the Estimates for the Medical and Health Departments to go through without some comment. Seven years ago we had the experience of the then Government introducing a similar Bill and similar Estimates. If there is nothing said about the reduced Estimates on this occasion, and no protest is raised on that account, the outside public may consider members of this Committee have acquiesced in the attitude adopted by the Government. In this instance, it might be thought we approved of the action of the Government in proposing to impose a tax for the upkeep of hospitals amounting to £156,000. Personally I am not prepared to do that. In introducing a taxation Bill this evening, the Premier again quoted figures indicating what he anticipated raising under various taxation proposals. He again said that the saving to Consolidated Revenue, under the heading I have referred to, would be £70,000. I do not know what is in the mind of the Premier, but the Estimates before us show conclusively that he anticipates collecting from the people £156,000, and on his own showing he is going to take £105,000 into Consolidated Revenue. It is useless telling me that Consolidated Revenue will benefit to the extent of £70,000 only. Even so, I would raise just as trenchant a protest against the smaller amount as I do against the £105,000. It is not fair to introduce legislation to make people pay a tax for a specific purpose, namely, to help the hospitals out of their present difficulty and permit them to be run on proper lines, and then to take the money so raised into Consolidated Revenue. It is not fair, genuine or honest. During the period I had the honour of controlling the Medical Department, I was continually criticised by mem-

bers now sitting behind the Government, and particularly by those representing country constituencies, on account of the enormous amount of money I was spending on the upkeep of the three large hospitals in the metropolitan area, and the small amount of subsidy I provided for country hospitals. Perhaps no other member was so critical as the present Minister for Health. Now, when that hon. gentleman introduces his own Estimates for the current year, he provides a reduction in the amount of subsidy for hospitals amounting to £2,896. The whole of that amount has to come from the country hospitals. What is the Minister, as a representative of a country constituency, doing? He criticised me because out of a total vote of £68,863 the Labour Government spent £59,128 on the three large hospitals in the metropolitan area. His own Estimates show that the total vote provided this year is £65,250, which indicates a reduction of £2,896. The estimate is exactly the same—£59,128—from the three metropolitan hospitals! I warn country members that their hospitals will suffer to the extent of a reduced subsidy amounting to £2,896, and yet not a penny is to come off the subsidy for the metropolitan hospitals. I want to make it clear that the metropolitan hospitals were, and are, merely receiving a fair deal in connection with the subsidy paid. As a matter of fact, many of the country hospitals were getting far more proportionately than the metropolitan hospitals are receiving to-day. On the other hand, the metropolitan hospitals, being institutions with a greater number of patients, can be run proportionately cheaper per bed than the small country hospitals. The Minister desires us to allow the question of the hospitals tax to be passed over until the Bill is before us. I again draw hon. members' attention to the financial statement appearing at the foot of the Estimates relating to the entertainments tax. I ask the Minister to show the Committee how the figures submitted to hon. members by the Premier this evening can be borne out. I want some explanation from the Minister because the Premier was definite in quoting figures to show that the total saving to Consolidated Revenue was £70,000. The figures I refer to have been compiled by the Under Secretary of the Chief Secretary's Department. He is now, and has been for the last 11 years, Secretary of the Medical Department. I am satisfied he is

a gentleman who would supply only figures that are absolutely accurate, both in regard to the present Estimates and those placed before hon. members in previous years. His figures prove conclusively that if the Premier does realise his Estimates, he will not take £70,000 but £105,000 into Consolidated Revenue. I want to know which is right, the figures supplied by the Minister from the head of the department, or the statement made by the Premier to-night. I want to know why the Minister has made a reduction of £114,630 in the Medical Vote this year. What has been the motive for it? Why has the reduction been made? I know the Minister will say it is because they are going to put on a tax to get it back. But that is one of the taxes in respect of which the Treasurer will be £100,000 out in his Estimates for this year. He certainly will be that amount short. He will have to get it somewhere else.

Mr. Raphael: By another reduction in our salaries!

Mr. MUNSIE: I do not think members would agree to allow him to get that Bill through.

The Minister for Lands: Surely you are not in order in anticipating legislation.

Mr. MUNSIE: And so I am expected to say nothing about that legislation! I am not prepared to sit down under it. I want to have something to say about it, and I want the Minister to give us an idea as to whether the figures he submitted to us are correct, or whether the figures quoted by the Premier to-night are correct. I am positive in the morning—

The Attorney General: Not only in the morning.

Mr. MUNSIE: I am positive that in the morning members will see in the "West Australian" the figures quoted by the Premier to-night on the Taxation Bill. They will there see the definite statement that there is to be taken into Consolidated Revenue from the hospitals tax £70,000. I say the Government are doing nothing of the kind, and I hope the Press will publish my statement as well as the Premier's statement. For I say the figures quoted by the Premier to-night are incorrect, according to his own Estimates.

Mr. Raphael: You won't get that published.

Mr. MUNSIE: No, I do not suppose I will, but just the same I will let the public know it somehow.

The Minister for Railways: Broadcast it.

Mr. MUNSIE: I might do that, too. I am not prepared to sit down and allow the Government to mislead the public of this country as they are doing in regard to the Medical Department and the hospitals generally. It is absolute misrepresentation of the facts, and I want to know what the Minister has to say about it. It is a most remarkable attitude for the Minister to adopt to ask members not to discuss a reduction in the main vote, one of the most important votes in these Estimates. In my opinion the health of the community is the most important subject we can discuss. On that very vote the Government in one cut have made a reduction of £114,630. And then the Minister remarks that he does not want to say anything about it, that we should wait till the Bill comes down. I am not prepared to do that. I want to let the public know what the Government intend if they get just what they have asked for. I should like the Minister to give us some idea of the extent to which he thinks Consolidated Revenue will benefit if the Bill goes through. On the general discussion of the Estimates I said what the amount would be. There are the figures, and members can work them out for themselves. Those figures show unquestionably that £105,000 is to be paid into Consolidated Revenue. The Minister declares he is not going to say anything at all about it. If he persists in that attitude, we shall be here for another hour and a half at least. He must give us some explanation as to why he is reducing this vote by £114,630. It is due to members that we should have that explanation.

MR. BROWN (Pingelly) [10.15]: I should like a little information from the Minister. The people of Pingelly a few years ago collected some £800 towards the cost of a hospital. I went to the Minister then in charge of the department, and he promised that Pingelly should have pound for pound up to £1,000.

The Minister for Railways: He was not a member of this Government.

Mr. BROWN: No, he was the member for Hannans. As I say, the people of Pingelly collected £800 for the purpose of a hospital. We found we could purchase a suitable building for £800, so the people

of Pingelly paid £400 and the Government also put up £400. But the place has been lying idle ever since, and there is in that building £400 of Government money not bringing in a penny. For want of the hospital the people of Pingelly have to go to Narrogin. They are working together now getting up fetes and bazaars, and trying to raise their fund to £1,000. I should like to know if provision is made in the Estimates for any assistance towards that hospital, and if not why the Government are content to leave £400 lying idle in that building all this time. I do not know whether any such provision is made in the Estimates, and I should like that information from the Minister, who might also tell us whether, if the people of Pingelly increase to £1,000 the fund they have subscribed, the promise of pound for pound made by the ex-Minister will be honored. The Government Architect is to blame for the hanging up of the project. The building we purchased for £800 was previously a private hospital that cost some £1,600 to build. The local doctors who have inspected the building are of opinion that with very slight improvements it would be fit to accommodate patients, but I understand the Government Architect insists upon the expenditure of some £700 to render the building fit for the reception of patients. Are we to be ruled by the Government Architect, or are the local doctors to say whether or not the building is fit to receive patients? The Government have put £400 into the building and the local people have put £400 into the building, and yet it is allowed to lie idle, the Government making no effort whatever to induce the people of Pingelly to finish the work on the building. Now that we are likely to have a hospitals tax, it is only right that Pingelly should have a hospital.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH (Hon. C. G. Latham—York—in reply) [10.20]: Under our arrangement with the Loan Council we have given an undertaking that we will not use loan funds except on revenue-producing works. I regret to say that hospitals cannot come within that category, and we shall be restricted in our operations this year owing to that fact. Previously we used money from loan funds. Any buildings this year will have to be paid for out of revenue, and there is no revenue available for the

purpose. If our proposed legislation passes, some funds may be available, but I am not permitted to discuss proposed legislation. Revenue will not benefit by the proposed taxation. The only result will be that revenue will not contribute to the upkeep of hospitals in future.

Mr. Panton: That might go down with some people who do not understand the position.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is a fact.

Mr. Munsie: You are going to tax the people to get what you now pay out of Consolidated Revenue.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: That is so. The proceeds of the tax will not be paid into revenue. It will be paid into a trust account. The hon. member said he did not understand the Premier's remarks on this question. I think the Premier made the position perfectly clear. He said that revenue would not be required to find £104,000 which it had found in the last few years. Previously the fees collected by hospitals were paid into Consolidated Revenue. That money will be available for assistance to hospitals. If we deduct from the £104,000 the amount collected last year that we do not expect to collect this year, £36,000, a sum of £68,000 remains.

Mr. Munsie: But you intend to take £36,000 raised by the entertainments tax that went to hospitals last year in order to balance that sum, so the hospitals will not be one penny better off.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The hon. member knows that that sum was paid into a trust account and not into revenue.

Mr. Panton: Was it not paid towards hospitals?

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I am not permitted to discuss the whole of the ramifications of hospital finance at this stage, seeing it is the subject of projected legislation. What the Premier meant was that it is not proposed to pay the £37,800 into revenue. It will be paid into the trust fund, together with other funds raised by taxation. I hope I have made the point clear. The whole matter can be discussed in detail next week. In reply to the member for Pingelly (Mr. Brown) much as we should like to be able to find money for hospital buildings, we cannot do so this year.

Hon. P. Collier: There is £10,000 for a railway. Could not you take £2,000 of that?

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: The Leader of the Opposition knows that that item may be there next year. The Premier made it clear that while he is budgeting for £2,800,000, he may not be able to get that amount. It would be wrong to lead the hon. member to believe that that money will be available. If there is any money left from the proceeds of the proposed tax, we may be able to use some of it.

Item, Perth, Children's Hospital, and Fremantle, £59,128; Grants in aid of maintenance, buildings, additions and repairs, fees, etc., public hospitals, £6,122:

Mr. MUNSIE: The Minister contradicted me when I said that expenditure on some buildings, particularly for additions and repairs, had been paid out of revenue.

The Minister for Health: The member for Pingelly was talking of a new hospital.

Mr. MUNSIE: A sum of £800 was paid for a building that had been erected for years.

The Minister for Railways: But it was for a new hospital. Where did the £400 come from?

Mr. MUNSIE: That was half the purchase price of the building, and it came from loan funds. Additions costing up to £320 were financed out of this item last year. In many instances the cost of additions has been paid out of this item. A considerable amount has been paid to the Perth Hospital for additions and renovations.

The MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I misunderstood the hon. member. I did not mean to imply that no money was taken from revenue for hospital purposes other than for maintenance. No provision is made for new buildings. The item shows a reduction of £2,896 on the expenditure of last year because we are not making provision for any special grants this year. We shall have sufficient difficulty to get money for hospitals without providing for special grants. The hon. member knows what special grants refer to. The country hospitals will not suffer more than in the past as regards money for carrying on their administrative work.

Mr. MUNSIE: It is of no use the Minister saying that the Government have decided to make no special grants this year. No special grants were paid out of the £9,736 spent last year. Special grants were made, but not from this item. The Minister

is actually reducing the amount of subsidy to hospitals. If members peruse the Estimates for the last three years, as I have done, they will find it is so. For what purpose is the amount of £59,128 provided for the three main hospitals? It is exactly the same amount as the subsidy of last year. The amount paid in subsidies to country hospitals last year was £9,735, the amount on the Estimates for subsidies this year is £6,122, and the reduction to country hospitals represents £2,896. No special grant was paid last year, and there is no provision for it this year. If these Estimates are adhered to, country hospitals will be £2,896 worse off than they were last year in respect to their general maintenance fund.

Hon. M. F. TROY: The Minister gave an assurance there would be no cutting down in the grants to country hospitals. There has, however, already been a cutting down. I appeal to him not to allow himself to be used to the detriment of country hospitals. There has been a tendency on the part of the Medical Department to penalise people who tax themselves for the upkeep of their local hospitals, in order that special facilities may be given to more payable institutions. Publicity is obtained by the department from the fact that some new installation has been made at Perth, Fremantle, or Northam. It might be imagined from the large amount of money spent on these institutions that the department was most progressive. It is progressive, except in respect to country hospitals, where it is most unprogressive. I have had a good deal of experience of the department in the back country. When times become bad there is a tendency to reduce the vote to back country hospitals, and to spend the money in the more populous centres. The tendency is to penalise the country at the expense of the city. In the back country there are many good prospectors and other people out of work, but they are never heard of. When they reach the city, provision is made for them. When the Government are short of money they penalise the back country by taking away officers and general facilities. What is happening in other respects is happening in respect to hospitals. I appeal to the Minister to show sympathy for those who live in remote parts of the State, who labour under heavy handicaps and are entitled to consideration. But for them the community would not

exist. One would think that the Government would have regard for them. If the country is to be developed they must be retained in their centres and must receive consideration. They get no facilities except in regard to hospitals and schools, and should be allowed at least to keep them. If mothers of families are to remain in the country and bring up their children in good health, they must be encouraged and considered. I hope the Minister will resist any attempt on the part of the department to penalise them.

THE MINISTER FOR HEALTH: I have given members an assurance that we will do the best we can for all sections of the community. We do something for country districts that is not done for the city; we subsidise doctors. That policy was instituted by the previous Administration. The salary of the doctor is made up by a contribution of two-thirds from the Government and one-third from the local authority up to a total of £750. This has led to many doctors going into the country who would not otherwise do so. Some hospitals receive a larger subsidy than they are entitled to with the money we have, and we are trying to level them down a little. It is, of course, difficult for them to adjust their own financial position. I only wish we had more money for them. I am informed that the cause of the decrease this year is that none of the additional special grant has been provided. If that statement is incorrect, I will put the matter right when the Hospitals Bill is before us.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Attorney General £91,654:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. T. A. L. Davy—West Perth) [10.37]: This is not a large spending department; members will observe very little change from last year. Where possible, economies have been effected. I do not contend any great effect upon the balancing of the Budget will arise from anything to be found in my department. I shall be pleased to answer any questions that are raised by members.

Item—Arbitration Court, £2,212:

Mr. RAPHAEL: The economies referred to by the Attorney General have been applied in the wrong direction. I wish to

make a reference to some correspondence that has passed between the secretary of the Clothing Trades Union and the Crown Law authorities. The first letter is from the secretary of the union to the clerk of the Arbitration Court, and is as follows:—

The apprenticeship examinations for the stock tailoring and order dressmaking sections of the clothing trades are usually held in the months of April and October, and as we have had no communication from the court to date re the holding of the examination next month, we would like to know what the position is, and if the examinations are to be proceeded with.

The reply from the industrial registrar to the union is as follows:—

I beg to advise you that I have been notified by the Treasury that there is no more money available at present for the examination of apprentices registered at this court. I will therefore be unable to issue to you, in January next the list of apprentices in the tailoring trade whose examination should take place in that month.

These girls, 250 in number, are to be penalised by not being allowed to sit for the examination, and the union representatives have no power to investigate whether the masters are training the girls adequately. I have also to quote an extract from a report submitted to the Arbitration Court in July of 1929—

In presenting this, the 25th report, of the examination of the order tailoring apprentices, your examiners wish to call attention to the separate sheets, which give a detailed report of each individual apprentice; also lists which show absent, sick, left the trade, etc.; final and progressive passes granted, and backward apprentices. We regret to report that in a number of cases apprentices have not been taught according to the sequence of the syllabus laid down by the apprenticeship board for the progressive work of the various garments to which they, the apprentices, have been indentured. (On a separate list you will please note names of employees and apprentices affected.)

Thus hundreds of girls are hindered in their advancement. Numerous cases at the Technical School will not be affected, because they will be examined there. The girls who are deprived of the opportunity should have it restored to them. I ask the Attorney General to reconsider the matter. When £750 is granted to a stock inspector for the purpose of silencing a grievance, surely the money required for the examination of apprentices can be found.

Mr. PANTON: I appeal to the Attorney General and the Treasurer in this matter. Members now on the Government side of the Chamber talked a great deal about the benefits of apprenticeship when they were on this side. Western Australia has one of the finest systems of apprenticeship to be found in the Commonwealth. The abolition of the examinations will break down that system and do grave injustice not only to the girls mentioned by the member for Victoria Park but to apprentices in all other trades. Rationing of work and cancellation of indentures have already affected the apprentices seriously. Even those on half time have to pass examinations before becoming entitled to grade increases. Thus the abolition of the examination means that from an apprenticeship system we shall drift into a junior employment system and have skilled labourers instead of tradesmen. Boards have been formed to examine the apprentices, and the State is not in such desperate straits as to be compelled to sacrifice all its young tradesmen for the sake of £1,700. On this subject a deputation is to wait on the Premier.

The Premier: The Government will think the matter over.

Mr. PANTON: The Government might think too long, and that would be the end of the apprenticeship system.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It is absurd to say that the apprenticeship system will be wrecked because some of the examinations are done away with.

Mr. Panton: Some of them?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes. The bulk of the examinations have not been eliminated. I presume that many skilled tradesmen served their apprenticeship prior to the period, five years or so ago, when apprenticeship examinations were initiated.

Mr. Panton: More than five years!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was comparatively recently.

Mr. Panton: Of course, there were skilled tradesmen before Western Australia progressed to any appreciable degree.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Of course. It was not the examination of apprentices that made skilled tradesmen.

Mr. Raphael: That is not the point.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The question of examinations does not mean the end of the whole apprenticeship system.

Mr. Panton: No, but it means that the apprentices cannot get their grade increases until they pass their examinations.

Mr. Raphael: And that is the point.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: If that is the position and we cannot conduct the examinations that are required, we will have to alter it. It would be a gross injustice to apprentices to say that they shall not receive their grade increases until they pass examinations, and at the same time say that they shall have no examinations set for them.

Mr. Panton: Some are examined quarterly.

Mr. Raphael: And some twice a year.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: I presume the practice differs in various trades. If it is demonstrated to me that the shortage of money that has resulted in this step, will prevent apprentices securing their grade increases, we will certainly have to take some measure by which that will be obviated. My position is a simple one. The Premier, as Treasurer, is as hard as nails in these times. He has told me that I can have £2,212 for the Arbitration Court and £2,050 for contingencies. It is just a question of how that money can be divided up.

Mr. Panton: You chose the weakest link in the chain.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Even so, I did not do this off my own bat. It was decided upon after consultation with those who have greater knowledge regarding this phase than I have. My idea was that we could make a saving in other directions. For instance there was the question of reporting and typing. For some reason or other all the proceedings in connection with the Arbitration and Industrial Courts have been reported fully and the whole of the proceedings typed out and copies made. All the tittle-tattle between the respective advocates was taken down in shorthand and transcribed. It may be that a saving could be effected there.

Mr. Panton: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: When I suggested a saving under that heading, there was a howl of horror and I was told that the reporting of proceedings was of the utmost importance. A man may be brought before the court for having worked someone two minutes overtime, and everyone knows that for that offence the individual will be fined 2s.

Mr. Panton: The fine is mostly 1s.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Although everyone knows that, the fact remains that every word uttered during the proceedings is taken down in shorthand, and subsequently typed out. I do not want to see the examinations cut out for the apprentices. When the deputation waits on the Premier, no doubt he will pass the matter on to me, and I will see what can be done.

Mr. MILLINGTON: I had intended speaking on this matter this evening but as the Premier has agreed to receive a deputation from the skilled trades for the purpose of discussing the position, I am satisfied he will deal with the matter sympathetically and will advise the unions that the examinations will continue.

The PREMIER: If the cutting out of the examinations will result in the injustice to the apprentices that the member for Leederville indicated, they will have to continue.

Mr. BROWN: The Estimates show that the local court at Pingelly is to be closed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member cannot discuss that matter. We cannot go back.

Mr. BROWN: I would appeal to the generosity of the Minister to give me an explanation as to why the local court at Pingelly is to be abolished.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: With the permission of the Chairman, I would explain that a number of courts have been closed recently because of the hard times. We had to choose between cutting out something of real importance imposing real hardships, and cutting out something that would not inflict much hardship upon a few people. Pingelly happened to be one so affected because it was realised the court could be closed without causing inconvenience to many people. Practically no business has been transacted there in recent years. The total fees and revenue from the court last year amounted to only £8 15s. 6d.

Mr. Panton: Not even a drunk per week!

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Licensing, £91,654:

Item, Magistrates, £2,250:

Mr. MARSHALL: I suggest the State could well afford now to dispense with the Licensing Board. I am not taking up this attitude simply because of any recent ap-

pointment, nor have I anything against any member of the board; but I think they have outlived their usefulness. Their original appointment, no doubt, was warranted, but they have completed the work for which they were appointed and I do not think there is any longer necessity for their existence. Also they have developed into something more than a licensing board, and when visiting my electorate they acted quite contrary to the statute under which they work. Their principal duty is to see that a community is properly catered for, but I know of instances in which they have gone in the other direction and forced upon a community unsuitable conditions. Only a year or so ago a licensee in Wiluna, in order to comply with the law, found it necessary to add six rooms to his premises. He notified the board of this, and they intimated that he must submit to them properly drafted plans in duplicate. As a matter of fact, there was not in Wiluna at the time sufficient paper for the drawing of those plans, and so they were drawn on blotting paper. The board refused to accept them, but had the plans re-drawn in Perth. In the re-drawing, those plans were completely altered. In a hot climate like that of Wiluna it is necessary to have the door and the window of a room opposite to each other. But this wonderful board altered the plans and put the window alongside the door. The rooms had to be built to those plans, and as a result nobody can sleep in those rooms. I should like to hear the Attorney General justify the continuance of the board. Recently in answer to questions that I asked in the House, the Attorney General explained that the board was acting in two different capacities, namely as a Licenses Reduction Board and as a Licensing Court. This board has made many mistakes, and I do not think we are justified in continuing it any longer. The taxpayers should not be saddled with the cost of a board that has outlived its usefulness. Many people give the board credit for the improvements they have made to licensed houses, but I say that wherever this board has done good work it has been due to the particularly good Act under which the board works.

Mr. PIESSE: I have no desire to cast any reflection on the integrity or the ability of the board, for I realise it is impossible for them to carry out a close inspection of hotels.

Hon. P. Collier: It should be a feature of their work.

Mr. PIESSE: But the board can only make periodical visits to a country district. Many of the country hotels that I know are run very well, and on the whole there has been a distinct improvement since the appointment of the board.

Mr. H. W. Mann: Since the passing of the new Act.

Mr. PIESSE: But I think the whole system is lacking in point of close inspection. I cannot understand why the board does not make greater use of the police. My point is in regard to lavatory conditions in hotels. One rule that should be insisted upon is that every such lavatory should have some light in it. But I know of one or two hotel lavatories that have no light of any sort. This may appear to be a small matter, but it is important and should be brought under the notice of the board. Many country hotels provide very narrow bedsteads that are quite uncomfortable. No bedstead should be less than 3 feet in width. A convenience that should be provided at every hotel is an enclosed telephone box so that conversations may be conducted in private. Some hotels provide a hot-water service, but many do not. This is a necessary convenience. At least two towels should be provided in each bedroom, and there should be some regulation as to the size of towels, because some are no bigger than pocket-handkerchiefs. The police should make monthly if not weekly inspections of hotels.

[Mr. Panton took the Chair.]

Mr. H. W. MANN: Recently I put some questions to the Attorney General regarding the powers of the Licensing Bench. I do not know where they get authority to give the instructions and orders they serve on licensees. The authority is not derived from the Licensing Act.

The CHAIRMAN: On which item are you speaking?

Mr. H. W. MANN: On the item "Magistrates, one at £850 and two at £700."

The CHAIRMAN: Then the hon. member may discuss the salaries but not the Act.

Mr. H. W. MANN: The magistrates should give service for their salaries, and I question whether they are doing so. When the board were appointed, their main duty was to reduce licenses where there was an excess of licenses. That work was completed

a year ago. As a licensing bench the magistrates are not required. It is unnecessary to spend this large amount on a licensing bench. One licensing magistrate, acting with the district magistrate, could carry out all the duties. Any further reduction of licenses is unlikely. The magistrates tell licensees they will not issue a license unless some alteration is made or unless they provide two mosquito nets in each room. Recently they have been asking licensees the amount of their weekly takings and profits. That is not within their province. Where it is difficult to get water, they order bath-heaters. The Attorney General might consider the position when the magistrates' term of office expires at the end of the year.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Some members appear to want the Licensing Court to extend their operations and others to reduce them. Some say they are interfering too much; some not enough. Other members complain that the magistrates are doing things they have no power to do. If any member thinks the magistrates are exceeding their powers, the matter is in his hands.

Mr. Marshall: You know there is no appeal from their decisions.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Act makes their decision on many questions final. I think the magistrates have done very good work. The standard of country hotels has substantially improved since the court was established. The Government have by no means decided that the present system shall continue indefinitely, and we may or may not make an alteration.

Item—Police Inspection (Licenses Reduction Board) Allowance, £50:

Mr. MARSHALL: Who is this officer; what are his duties; and is this expenditure warranted?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: This is a special allowance paid to the chief inspector who accompanies the Licenses Reduction Board on their travels and advises them.

Hon. P. Collier: He is the inspector of the Licensing Court.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes, and the payment is not extravagant for the work he does.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.