

proposed to introduce a great number of Bills into this House this session for the simple reason that, I think, we would be wasting time, remembering that there are such measures as the Health Bill, the Licensing Bill, the Redistribution of Seats Bill, and a few minor Bills to be got through in another place. I hope the other place will be sufficiently advanced by the time we meet again to keep us going. This adjournment will obviate the necessity for country members to come a long distance for, perhaps, a day's sitting a week. I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn to Tuesday, the 6th September.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th August, 1910.

	Page
Papers presented	170
Questions: Uncharted rock, "Pericles" wreck	170
Government Offices rented	170
Treasury Funds, interest	170
Esperance District—selections, cost of rail- way; water conservation	171
Land selection, Mungowine	171
Return: Police Force, grades and pay	171
Address-in-Reply, fourth day	171

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

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Mines: 1, Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into charges made by Mr. A. A. Wilson against the trustees of the Collie Coal Mines Accident Relief Fund Trust. 2, Return showing accidents to guards and shunters in the Railway Department.

QUESTION—UNCHARTED ROCK, "PERICLES" WRECK.

Mr. MURPHY asked the Premier: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to continue the search for the rock upon which the "Pericles" is supposed to have struck? 2, If so, will the Government, in keeping with the importance of the danger to human lives and the amount of private property concerned, commence the research as soon as possible?

The PREMIER replied: 1, The Government have requested that one of the vessels of the Australian Fleet be despatched to thoroughly examine the waters in the vicinity of the position given by the master of the "Pericles" as to where the ship struck; all that was possible having already been done by the Government with the appliances available to find the rock. 2, The Government are awaiting a reply to the communication referred to from His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief.

QUESTION—GOVERNMENT OFFICES RENTED.

Mr. KEENAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, What is the total rental paid or payable by the State Government for offices rented in the city of Perth for the use of State Government institutions? 2, What provision, if any, is made in respect of such tenancies for surrender of same?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Works) replied: 1, £1,850 per annum. 2, All these tenancies, with the exception of the following, are terminable on either one week's or one month's notice:—Taxation Department offices, 30th September, 1911. Charities Department and Children's Court, 31st October, 1911. Stores Department's offices, 6 months' notice.

QUESTION—TREASURY FUNDS, INTEREST.

Mr. KEENAN asked the Treasurer: 1, Has he entered into negotiations with any bank or banks carrying on business in Western Australia to take on deposit for a fixed period or otherwise moneys now in his hands as Colonial Treasurer? 2,

What amount has been offered by him on such deposit? 3, Have these negotiations been completed with any bank? 4, What amount has been arranged to be placed on such deposit? 5, What rate of interest is payable on such deposit? 6, Are the moneys so deposited moneys received under any loan authorisation? 7, What rate of interest is payable to the original lenders of such moneys, allowing for the price at which the loan was subscribed and all charges incurred in the flotation of the loan?

The TREASURER replied: 1, The Associated Banks have been approached. 2, £200,000. 3, No. 4, Answered by No. 3. 5, Ditto. 6, No. 7, Answered by No. 6.

QUESTIONS (2)—ESPERANCE DISTRICT.

Selections, cost of railway.

Mr. SCADDAN (for Mr. Hudson) asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What is Mr. Muir's estimate of the cost of the Norseman-Esperance Railway? 2, What area of land has been selected and approved in the Fitzgerald and Esperance districts since the 1st January last? 3, What area has been applied for in these districts and not yet approved? 4, What is the total amount to be paid as the purchase price for such lands so approved and applied for to date.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, £220,000 inclusive of water supply. 2, Total acreage 91,215 (this comprises 50 homestead farms, 8,000 acres; and 97 conditional purchases, 83,215 acres). 3, 12,200 acres (This comprises 4 applications for homestead farms, 640 acres; and 18 applications for conditional purchases, 11,560 acres.) 4, £47,397 10s. By instalments extending over 20 years.

Water Conservation.

Mr. SCADDAN (for Mr. Hudson) asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Does he intend to carry out his promise to provide for water conservation on the Esperance-Norseman road? 2, If so, will the work be done during the present winter? 3, If not, when?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Answered by No. 2.

QUESTION—LAND SELECTION, MANGOWINE.

Mr. ANGWIN asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How many applications were received for lots of land Nos. 15453 and 14976, situated at Mangowine in the Avon district, which was open for selection in May last? 2, Names of persons who applied for this land? 3, Names of persons to whom land is granted? 4, Name of surveyor of the land? 5, Was the land granted to the successful applicants by the Land Board?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, Three. 2, Thomas William Lees, Edmund Horace Armstrong Stirling, George and Hector Woodhams. 3, Thomas William Lees. 4, Charles Crossland. 5, No; as two of the applications were withdrawn before the Board sat there was no case to submit to the Board.

RETURN—POLICE FORCE, GRADES AND PAY.

On motion by Mr. COLLIER, ordered: That a return be laid upon the Table showing the grades existing in the Police Force prior to the 1st July, 1910, and the extent to which each grade benefited by the latest increases in pay.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Resumed from the previous day.

Mr. OSBORN (Roebourne): I do not propose replying to many of the remarks made by previous speakers. Before proceeding to say anything with respect to the present Parliament, I wish to convey my feelings of regret at the retirement of the late leader of the Opposition. I feel sure that it was not solely ill-health that caused him to relinquish that position. I have said before, and now I say again, that the position of leader of the Opposition is one of considerable responsibility, and a member occupying that

position certainly should be considered in some way financially. My opinion is that a good leader of the Opposition in the House is essential to the interests of the country; and I recognise that no member taking up that position can carry out its manifold duties in the way they should be carried out, on the ordinary remuneration of private members who have no responsibility other than that of rising in their places at given periods and making short or long speeches as the case may be. I recognise that to do justice to the requirements of the country, and even to this side of the House if necessary, the leader of the Opposition should spend most of his time amongst the papers and records of the House, and be at all times at the beck and call of his own party. Therefore it is clear that practically the whole of his time must be taken up by these duties, not only while the House is sitting but also during recess. I hope the time is not far distant when the Government will make some provision, in the way of a financial allowance, for the leader of the Opposition. I congratulate the Party on the election of the member for Ivanhoe, and I hope the good relations that have hitherto existed between the two parties will continue, and that if the hon. member at any time retires by choice from his new position he will do so leaving behind him the same honourable record as has the member who has just vacated the position. I do not propose to go very fully into the question of the financial position of the State; I do not pose as a financial expert. However, when I had the honour of moving the Address-in-Reply some two years ago, I referred to the deficit, which was then about £300,000 odd, and said my confidence in the country was so great that I looked upon that deficit as something quite trivial. The then Leader of the Opposition, the member for Brown Hill, took those remarks to task at that time and said the member for Roebourne treated the deficit in a very airy and easy-going way. The confidence I then expressed has not been shaken, and in the short space of less than two years my anticipations have been almost rea-

lised, for the deficit now stands at a very low ebb. The member for Brown Hill also said at that time that it was necessary for some better advisers to come along in order to straighten out the finances of the State. In that he was wrong, for the finances are now as sound as they have been for the last 10 or 12 years. There is a fairly formidable list of Bills to come before Parliament this year, but there are some not included that might be brought down later in the session. There is one very important measure which I hope will be introduced this session, and that is a Bill to amend the Early Closing Act. It is in the interests of the State and particularly those of the Metropolitan district that the Saturday half-holiday should compulsorily be an universal one. I hope this session we shall be able to place a measure on the statute-books to bring about this result. I am sure members will be able to decide what is the best means to bring this alteration about, whether by reference to the people or some other course. The business people of the Metropolitan area, if not of the whole of the State, should be compelled to close on Saturday instead of being allowed to use their discretion as at present, as to whether the half-holiday should be on Wednesday or Saturday. I am sure the police records during the time the Saturday half-holiday was in operation showed a marked improvement on the records either before or since, and they certainly went to prove the benefit of the working classes from the half-holiday on Saturday. There are the old questions of liquor law and local option in the air, and, so far as I am concerned, I have not changed my views on the question. I hope, however, that the Government will consider the advisability of inserting a clause in the Bill on the present occasion which will provide for the supervision by the police of clubs of every description where fermented liquors are sold. It is a disgrace to the country that men should be able to congregate in certain clubs and make them gambling and drinking dens. If these establishments are brought under the same provisions as hotels, a great

deal of the trouble will be done away with.

Mr. Hudson: Where are these clubs that are gambling dens; do you mean the Weld Club?

Mr. OSBORN: The member must find out for himself. If he has not already gained experience, he will not have much difficulty in hearing about it. Although I have no personal experience of such gambling and drinking dens, I am aware they exist, and that it is not in the best interests of our people that they should be allowed to continue without supervision from the proper authorities.

Mr. Hudson: Will the member give me the information privately?

Mr. OSBORN: I am not likely to take up the position of special detective in order to provide information for members, but it will be easy for the hon. member to find out the facts. If he makes inquiries he will soon discover some of these clubs. Every social club, without exception, which sells liquor should be under police supervision. There is no reason why a club should be exempt from that provision and pay a small license when the hotels are harassed and have to pay big fees. If clubs are run properly there will be no police supervision necessary, and therefore no hardship will be involved on them by passing the clause.

Mr. Murphy: You will have to get the police out of the clubs after once they have got in.

Mr. OSBORN: There are some members of the police force who do their duty and, generally speaking, I think this State is well served by the class of police we have here. I do not think that every constable can be accused of being bought by a few nips of whisky, or a pint of beer. I have a higher opinion of the police than that, and feel sure that if they have to attend to the work of supervising the clubs they will do their duty properly as they have done in connection with the hotels. Anyhow, we shall have plenty of opportunity this session to discuss this matter fully. I desire to offer my congratulations to the department responsible for the improved facilities provided along

the North-West coast by the erection of lights at various points of land, and on islands, and I trust that a result of the recent visit of the Minister in charge of the department will be to recognise that it is necessary to erect further lights along the coast in order to make navigation safer and easier than it is at the present time. I hope we shall see more lights erected there during the coming year, after the House adjourns, and that the work will be carried out before this branch of Government administration is taken over by the Federal Government. I also wish to draw attention to the position of affairs in connection with the Ashburton goldfield. I hope the Minister for Mines will endeavour to make some better provision for the development of the silver-lead, the copper, and the gold mines in that district. There are some wonderfully rich silver-lead mines there which have been worked with very great difficulty. The chief trouble is that, after getting ore from some 80 miles distant to the coast, the owners have to pay enormous lighterage charges to get it on board the steamers. Onslow, which is the port of the Ashburton, is absolutely without shipping facilities, and I trust that during the coming year the Minister for Works will seriously consider the position of Onslow in respect to shipping. It is not a new matter, and I am sure that in his desire to do that which is right for all parts of the State the Minister will see his way to do something there. Last year only 440 tons of silver-lead ore were shipped from that port. The previous year the quantity was over 2,000 tons, and the reason for that increased quantity was that a slight concession was made during the 12 months. Now, however, the concession has ceased, and the charges are so great that the miners have practically abandoned all the mines except those containing very rich ores. There are enormous quantities of lower grade ores there which are being worked by miners, and, if only the benefits of proper jetty accommodation were provided at that port, the properties could be worked with considerable profit.

Mr. Underwood: Where do they ship the ore to?

Mr. OSBORN: I do not know for certain, but I believe it goes to Sydney; anyhow I know it goes out of this State for treatment. The same remarks apply to the copper ore, much of which I believe is shipped to Sydney. The Whim Creek Copper Company ship all their ore, I believe, to London. With regard to many of the mines in this district, the lodes are very rich, and working men own them. I trust these men will still be able to continue the work and will make good money out of their shows. I am sure that if shipping facilities are given to the Ashburton district, many mines will be turning out stone there than cannot be worked to-day. Although it may be that the squatters are able to look after themselves, still I take it that a member in this House has a right to represent all classes of the community, so I will refer to this question from their point of view. In that district there are hundreds of thousands of sheep, thousands of horses, and very many cattle which can find no market unless they are overlanded to the South, or to Carnarvon and then shipped, or to Port Sampson and shipped. It is a great hardship, though no particular loss to the pastoralists because times have been very good with them, but we do claim at this end that our meat is dear, and that we are trying to facilitate delivery so that we may get meat at a cheaper rate, and I feel quite sure that stock from that particular port should be shipped from it, instead of having to be driven from there to some of the other ports for shipment. Carnarvon has made wonderful strides in respect to showing profits in its harbour dues and in its harbour generally. Carnarvon has benefited much from the district in behalf of which I am speaking, and whilst it takes away some of the trade from Carnarvon, yet I am certain that the people in that district should receive the same consideration as the people in Carnarvon, Roebourne and Port Hedland districts. In fact every other port along the coast between here and Wyndham has a jetty where vessels can tie up and discharge their cargo. Onslow now remains the only port of any importance where vessels have to lighter, and considerable loss

of time and inconvenience to the public and everyone concerned is thereby entailed. If the Government could see their way clear to make the port up to date they would be astonished at the returns that would be received in the way of revenue. It is pleasing to hear the Minister for Agriculture voicing the views of the Government in respect to freezing works, though as yet he has failed to convince me that Fremantle is the right port to commence at in respect to these freezing works. Yet it is a foregone conclusion, and we are always willing to accept what we can get. It is pleasing to note that the Government intend to erect freezing works at Wyndham.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Will that give us cheap meat on the coast?

Mr. OSBORN: I doubt whether I am competent to express such an opinion, but I think that these freezing works would add to the supplies for the markets by reason of the fact that it will be possible to get the stock away, and that in itself ought to bring about cheaper meat. There are millions of acres of land that any man can take up by applying for it, and in this particular part of the State there is a plentiful supply of water and any amount of feed. It is essentially a cattle country; it is not a sheep country and therefore sheep are out of the question. Beef is almost at a discount in respect to the small holders. If you and I were to start a station there with a few head of cattle we would find it difficult to ship them to Fremantle or to drive them overland to a market. The present large holders in the far North have been able to make their own markets and make arrangements with the shipping companies, and practically run the whole of the country themselves because of their large holdings. If the freezing works are established I am certain that there will be many more settlers in that part of the district than there are at the present time. They will be able to make a very good living indeed, and they are prepared to enter into the venture almost at any time. Under existing conditions it is impossible for the small man to start a cattle station in the Wyndham or the East Kimberley districts. During last

year the Minister for Lands sent along an expert to report upon the possibilities of tropical agriculture from Carnarvon northwards, and it is gratifying indeed to note that that officer's report states that it is possible to enter upon tropical culture from Carnarvon northwards. I would not suggest for a moment that the Minister for Lands should establish State farms or State nurseries in this particular district to show the people what they are capable of growing, but I think there are plenty of men in these parts who would be prepared to devote some of their time to tropical culture if they were assisted by the Government. If this plan were adopted I am certain that the results would be better than anything that could be done by State farms or State experimental plots. These people to whom I have referred are willing workers, and many of them have expressed the wish that they might have the opportunity of going into the venture, and have asked me on more than one occasion to interview the Minister in that direction so that land might be made available for them, and that some assistance might be given them to launch out. I trust that if the Minister is favourably considering the report of the expert who was sent up, he will first consult the various members interested, who no doubt will give him the names of those who are prepared to begin experiments in this district provided they are given some very small assistance. I am satisfied that with the conservation of water lots of things can be grown properly after the initial expenses have been overcome.

Mr. Collier: They can be grown with cheap labour, so the expert says.

Mr. OSBORN: I beg to differ. The expert did not suggest that such should be the case. He pointed out to the Government that certain nationalities were specially adapted to the work in the tropics.

Mr. Collier: By reason of their cheapness.

Mr. OSBORN: The expert considered that the people to whom he referred would make good labourers for that work, and he went so far as to say that he was hopeful that the more profitable products

would be cultivated, so that there would be no necessity to import cheap labour. I think the expert evidently considered the matter very carefully, and that was the conclusion he came to. He said in his report that many products could be profitably grown provided cheap labour could be found, but under the circumstances he would not advise the people to undertake the cultivation of less profitable products. With respect to land selection in the State I was struck by the remarks of the member for Balkatta when speaking last night. We know that there are many complaints from disappointed applicants for land. I happen to be one of them, but still I do not think that it was for the reason that the Land Board did not think they were doing the right thing. I was surprised at the hon. member's remarks in this regard. He stated the case of one particular gentleman, who is making from his business £1,500 a year, and who repeatedly applied for land which was refused him on two or three occasions by the Board. I certainly commend the Board every time when they refuse to grant land to men who are making £1,500 a year in preference to the man who has nothing and is anxious to make a living out of the land. I hope that policy will be continued.

Mr. Walker: We cannot go on the land with our salaries of £200 a year; we must have our salaries increased.

Mr. OSBORN: I stated at the last elections I was not in favour of an increase of members' salaries, because I thought for the amount of time we devoted to the work we were well paid. That is my opinion now and will be until I go up for election again, if I am permitted to offer myself again, and that is the attitude I shall take up in this House until the matter has been referred to the electors of the State.

Mr. Collier: You did not vote for the reference of the question to the electors.

Mr. OSBORN: It can be referred to the electors when the different candidates are addressing them.

Mr. Collier: The electorates might then be abolished.

Mr. OSBORN: Then all the better for the country, but I am drifting somewhat from the land question.

Mr. Collier: The other is a very important subject.

Mr. OSBORN: I admit it is a very important subject. Land selection is a difficult problem, and I trust that the applicants for land who receive first consideration will be men possessing very little capital or men who are honest workers prepared to take the land up as it is and go on it and make their living from it. I trust that this will be the kind of men who will receive first consideration, and I hope that the men who are in this State at the present time endeavouring to get thousands of acres in one batch will never have their requests acceded to by the Land Board. We should not grant land to any syndicate under such conditions.

Mr. George: They can buy it from the Midland Company.

Mr. OSBORN: They can also buy it from individuals in the State who are prepared to sell and are willing to sell. I was nearly forgetting another thing in respect to selling conditional purchase lands. I recognise that there has been a considerable amount of dummying going on in Western Australia, but I do also recognise that a lot of that dummying has diminished during the past two or three years, and to-day when travelling around the country there will be found fewer opportunities of buying these holdings than was the case three years ago.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Read the *West Australian*; they are advertising every day.

Mr. OSBORN: I admit that you can read the *West Australian* and go to land commission agents and always find land for sale. But why should not there be land for sale? I know people who have taken up land who are prepared to-day to sell through no fault of their own, simply because they have met with misfortune or sickness, or perhaps on account of relatives dying, and so forth, they are glad to get rid of the land and go into some other vocation, or, perhaps, leave the State. Considering the numbers of people on the land, is it a wonder that a fair proportion, at any rate, of the selectors make

failures or, from adverse circumstances, wish to sell their holdings?

Mr. Gourley: Would you attribute that to the fact that a lot of these people who are failures have been brought to the country and assisted here?

Mr. OSBORN: No. I know men belonging to the State who are equally as big failures as men brought here.

Mr. Collier: Hear, Hear! Natives of the soil!

Mr. OSBORN: Yes; I happen to be a native of the soil. I admit that there are natives of the State who are absolute failures from any business point of view in undertakings of their own, but in any community there will always be a proportion of men who do not make success as masters. This will always continue, but I hope that Western Australia will particularly endeavour to improve that position.

Mr. Collier: What is your opinion of the Easterners, the t'othersiders.

Mr. OSBORN: I do not care whether they are t'othersiders or arrivals from any other part of the globe. I do not care to what nationality a man belongs as long as he is not a Chinaman or an Afghan. I have a particular aversion to these. I would be glad if a clause could be inserted in the land regulations whereby Afghans and such like could be excluded from taking up land. I know cases where Chinamen have been able to buy land in the State. We should endeavour, if possible, to pass legislation whereby such people should not be allowed to purchase the lands of our State. I am sorry to have to admit it, but on one of the railways I passed an Afghan's place recently and it was very creditable indeed. They had made very great improvements, and evidently were carrying out things in a very systematic style. It only shows the industry of these people, but I do not think it is desirable; I think we should have that provision to prevent those people coming to Western Australia and purchasing land and becoming landlords amongst us.

Mr. Collier: Why, we are bringing out wives for them!

Mr. OSBORN: They may want wives, but I do not think the hon. member is right in inferring that such a thing was ever done. I think the interjection is very uncalled for and very untruthful. We know that there are among us unfortunate women as well as unfortunate men, and while the world goes on there will still be the same condition of affairs existing; but because a case happens to crop up with respect to some girl who has come across the sea, some unfortunate woman who has fallen, I think it is uncalled for to infer that that particular woman was brought out for a particular class of person. I think it is a remark that should not emanate from any member of the House. I hope that some of the remarks I have made will be noted by the various Ministers concerned in respect to those matters. I hope the Government will endeavour to do something more for the Northern portion of the State than has been done in the past. I know the Government have recognised that more consideration was due to the North, and I hope that they will not, in the future, lose sight of the fact that a great deal more consideration is still due to that district, and that the mining industry in the North should still be fostered. Now that the Southern parts have been so well proved, I hope Ministers will give more attention to proving the auriferous country in the North-West, and I am certain that within a few years the North-West of the State will be producing gold and tin and every other metal that is in use, I think, in the world; and I hope and trust and am certain it will be producing it in such quantities that it will be remunerative and will give a handsome return for the outlay the Government may undertake.

Mr. HEITMANN (Cue): I have a few remarks to make upon the motion now under discussion, and I want, as far as possible, to confine myself to the motion and to the Speech which has been delivered from the Throne. In the first place I think it is high time the good sense of Parliament and the people of Western Australia abolished the system both of the Address-in-Reply and the Speech from His Excellency. It seems

to me the time has arrived when a common sense and practical Government should, instead of having the Governor here to deliver a Speech, merely place before both Houses a statement of what has taken place during the financial year and then we could get on with the business of the country. It seems to me that it is about the only duty that now remains for the official, or, rather, for the Governor, and it is high time also that the people of the State took it into their heads to tell members of Parliament that this office is costing altogether too much to the taxpayers of the country. In these days when we are considering economy in all directions, when the Government are endeavouring in every possible way to economise, I think we should first of all get rid of those offices, the duties attached to which are not giving a fair return in labour to the country for the money paid. As to the motion moved by the member for Fremantle, it seems to me the greater portion of the hon. member's speech was one of eulogy of different parties and of sympathy with others. I am just about tired of hearing references to the peaceful times we had during the reign of our late King. I take second place to none as far as sympathy with the family of our late King is concerned, and also as far as a loyalist is concerned, as far as I can understand. I do not know much about loyalty, but as far as Australia is concerned I am at heart in love with my country and a true patriot. And I am inclined to think that many of the utterances we have heard, and many of the different speeches we have read in various parts of the world, came from people who, while pretending a great love for the Motherland, as it is called, have very little love for their own country. It seems to me that if the same energy and the same ability were put into speeches that would instil into the hearts of our own people and into the hearts of our children in the State schools a love for their own country, we would be doing much more good. As a matter of fact, when we speak of the peaceful times and refer to our late beloved King as Edward the Peacemaker,

one has only to think for a moment to recognise that in no time in the history of the world have there been such preparations for war as there have been during the last ten years, every nation arming up to its full extent, some of them pauperising their people. England itself, has had a mania in the last few years for Dreadnoughts. Australia, a short time ago, thought it necessary to join in, and Australia, or some of the people of Australia at all events, wanted to present England, governed by this peaceful King, with a Dreadnought for the fear that some of the other countries were endangering her supremacy. It always strikes me, when I hear a man proclaiming his loyalty, that first of all no man can be loyal to the old country unless he is first a patriot. If he is not patriotic he cannot possibly, in my opinion, be loyal, and I think it is high time that we Australians, getting our livings in Australia, and in honoured positions elected by Australians, should have at times a few words for the country which has given us birth, or which we have adopted. Now, in the Speech itself, I want to deal with the various items. The first paragraph says, "During the Parliamentary recess my Ministers deemed it advisable that the Premier of the State should visit London." I am given to understand that the object of the visit of the Premier was to reorganise the Agent General's Department. That was one of the chief objects. Now it seems to me to be extraordinary that it should require the Premier of the country, with his secretary, to go home to London to reorganise a department which, I believe, has five or six officers. It seems to me that could have been done without the Premier going Home. In the second place I believe he went Home to encourage immigration. I would like to say here that we recognise with all true Australians that it is necessary for Australia that we should encourage population; that is desirable if we wish to carry out the scheme laid down by the national Parliament of Australia for a White Australia policy. It is necessary that we should populate this country and encour-

age in every way possible the desirable immigrant. But, from what I can see up to the present time, although we have had in Australia from time to time various schemes of immigration they appear to have been only spasmodic, and no definite line of action has been laid down, and none of them have succeeded. None of them have left a lasting impression on the people of the old country as to the desirability of people coming out to Australia. It is true, at times we have 40 or 50 or 60 people coming here who have been induced to come out by the personal efforts of officers of the Immigration Department in London, but there is no proper scheme. In the case of Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and South Australia immigration soon petered out and when a new Government came in there was the cry: "We must send someone home to induce immigration." As long as we fail to lay down a proper scheme of immigration, a scheme that will not only bring people to our shores, but, which on arrival here, will settle them on our land, we shall not succeed. As soon as immigrants arrive here settle them on the land; do not allow them to run about the streets or go over the country looking for land; it will not interfere with the labourer, but we shall have a successful immigration scheme. At present, immigration becomes distasteful to many people in the country, and with people who really recognise the necessity of populating the country. They have been so disgusted with the schemes of immigration of the past that at the present time they tell you that they are against a scheme of immigration altogether. They have come in contact with people brought to this country who have been allowed to stray and take "pot luck" as it were in getting work, or in getting land. Before we lay down a scheme of setting aside land for immigrants, it is only right and just that the people of our own country should be first of all served with land. It is a well known fact to anyone who has travelled in the agricultural areas that there are hundreds and thousands of people in the State who would go on the land immediately if they could get it. I am sure

that on the goldfields, particularly on the fields having deep mines, there are many men to-day who recognise that it is necessary for them on account of the bad conditions of mining, and on account of their health, to get out of mining and their only hope is to go on the land. I know scores of men who would make good settlers if they could get the land. It is all very well for the Minister for Lands to tell us we have millions of acres of land available. Let him get the experience of men who come from the goldfields looking for land; they get sick of it in a week or two. They are bandied about from one department to another until they come to the conclusion that there is no land available. I admit there is good land in Western Australia, good land for agricultural purposes, but the system adopted by the Lands Department and the officers, is not such as will commend itself to the people in general. Next we find the Premier floating a loan, and from all authorities I have looked up, this loan has been looked upon almost as a failure, and, despite what might be stated by the Premier and his officers, it is recognised by the financial authorities as a very bad deal indeed. In a paragraph of the Speech it says—

Ministers are satisfied that the visit has proved and is proving of great advantage to the State.

I would like to know from Ministers, when addressing the House, what advantages have been derived from the Premier's visit to England? I have looked in vain for any benefit, and cannot find it. On one occasion the Premier had a deal in steel rails. I see here the same jingoistic spirit entering into the deal as I find in many other things. Reading from one of the budgets sent out weekly, or bi-weekly, by a correspondent in London during the Premier's stay in England, I find that Sir Newton Moore had called for tenders for the supply of 20,000 tons of steel rails, and that he had received tenders from British manufacturers and from manufacturers on the Continent. The lowest tender I believe, was from Belgium, and the Premier points out very clearly that he considers it was right to give a preference to

the British manufacturer no matter what the difference in the price might have been; and as it happens, the people in this State are paying to the British manufacturer a sum of 8s. a ton in excess of what would have been paid had the Government given the tender to a Belgian firm.

Mr. Butcher: It would be contrary altogether to Australian principle had he done so.

Mr. HEITMANN: I am coming to the principal of preferential trade in a moment. There were several interviews with the Premier, and in one he states—

The Belgians' price was 8s. a ton cheaper, but for patriotic and other reasons I gave the preference to the British—though why the Belgians should cut your manufacturers so fine is for you to consider.

Then he goes on to deal with other matters. It is true the principle adopted in Australia by the Federal Government is to give preference to British manufacturers, and to British trade generally, and, in connection with steel rails, there is a preference I believe of 5 per cent. I do not know exactly what the duty on steel rails is, at all events the Premier preferred to buy from the British manufacturer on account of patriotic reasons, and on account of the principle already mentioned by the member for Gascoyne. And the Premier preferred to pay £8,000 of the taxpayers' money to give the tender to the British manufacturer. Let us see what the British manufacturer does for himself, and what the Government of the British Isles do for the manufacturers of Great Britain. It is all very fine to speak about preference in trade, but the War Office in England, some two years ago, when calling tenders for horse-shoes for the army accepted an American tender in preference to that of a British manufacturer. And we find case after case where the foreigner has come in and tendered lower in price to the British manufacturer, and has got the contract. Let us see how this principle has been applied in Western Australia. Some 12 months ago tenders were called for some iron work in

Perth required by the Public Works Department and the manufacturers of the State applied to the Minister for Works for some consideration. They said at once that they could not do the work at the price which Victorian manufacturers could do it for. The Minister for Works would not have it at any price and bought the material from Victoria. If the principle is good in regard to England, if it is good for us to pay England a little more than to the foreigner then the principle is good enough to apply in Western Australia. Let us see again. We have in the mines of Western Australia at the present time a fair average of English mine managers, and the men, I find, who cry out most about loyalty to England are the men who have come from England and have been here only a few years. On the Gwalia mine outside Leonora there might as well be posted a notice that no English need apply, because I think 90 per cent. of the employees on that mine are foreigners, and this mine is managed by an English mine manager. The man who generally cries loudest about England and the dear Motherland is the man who will employ a foreigner if he can get him from a penny to a shilling a day cheaper than he can his own countryman. Personally I have no sympathy with the deal or the principle either, of the Premier. I consider in commerce England should have no sympathy, and English manufacturers should have no sympathy. The War Office has accepted tenders from other parts of the world in preference to that by British manufacturers. As the Premier said, it gives employment to the British workman. How do we know that the British workmen are working under better conditions than the foreigner? How do we know that the English manufacturer will not pay 8s. less to a Belgian firm and then send the rails to this country, thus making a good deal out of it? I would not be surprised if the manufacturer who received the contract is not the owner of boats on this line. At any rate he will utilise the cheaper boats for his loading. Often the manufacturer is a shareholder in merchantmen travelling in various parts of the world, and the

man who cries out for our preference and who is looking for business from Australia is the kind of man who, when coming to Australia, will jump on a boat in which he has a share and which probably is manned by lascars. I have no sympathy with this sentiment. As far as I am personally concerned, I am an Australian right through, but when one comes to commerce, we should get the best deal we can, that is if it does not interfere with our ties with the old country. All countries are foreign to Australia when it comes to a matter of commerce. England has adopted a policy by which she has lost a great portion of her trade; she finds other countries are competing against her, and sending goods into England, but a matter of giving £8,000 to the British manufacturer will not help in one degree.

The Premier: Not if the rails are better?

Mr. HEITMANN: There is no question as to the rails being better. In your interview there was no mention of that. I take it that when tenders are called there are our engineers in England and they will lay down the specification according to which the manufacturer must make the rails, which must reach a certain standard, and if they are not up to the standard they will be ruled out at once. The whole thing is a preference to a particular country. I say that, all things being equal, Australia should buy in the cheapest market. I would just like to refer to the report of Mr. Despeissis in the North. He occupies pages in telling us the countries we should go to for cheap labour, mentioning even coolies, Japanese and Chinamen. It seems to me that this gentleman has a great aversion to the principle of a White Australia. However, in the mines themselves I have often found "jingo" barraeking for England right through, and then finding time to support Japanese and even Chinamen if necessary. That kind of Imperialism has not my sympathy at all events. Another item is in connection with the financial agreement. In the Speech we are told that His Excellency's advisers regret the loss of the financial agreement. I want to say that I differ from His Excellency's

advisers. For my part I am as proud of the victory in respect to the financial agreement as I am of the victory achieved at the Federal elections by the party to which I belong; because I consider that in the past all the actions of successive Commonwealth Governments, no matter what party were in power, have gone to show that they had every sympathy with the States and were and are prepared to deal very fairly with them. I look upon the Commonwealth Parliament as being of the greatest possible importance. I do not desire that the State should hamper that Parliament in any way. I recognise the responsibilities they have in connection with their big non-earning departments, and that they must not be leg-roped in any way. I am pleased to know that whilst we here in Western Australia, like the people in the other States of Australia, are getting a fair deal, the Commonwealth Government have been left a free hand in financial matters. I would like to refer to an address given by the Minister for Mines when he was touring the country for the ostensible purpose of urging the acceptance of the financial agreement. I listened to him at Cue and at Day Dawn when he pointed out to the electors what had been done by the present Government; what railways had been built, and what amount of money expended in the interests of education in Western Australia; and he wound up by saying "If you do not vote for the financial agreement, if the agreement be not carried, we will not be able to build the railways we propose to build." That honourable gentleman knew that he was misleading the electors. He knew that the financial agreement did not in any way affect the building of our railways. He knew, just as well as many of the electors knew, that from revenue we have built very few railways, if any. It only goes to show what is done by Ministers of the Crown in order to further the ends of their particular party. Now I want to say a few words in connection with the mining industry. I regret to say it appears to me that at the present time mining is playing a very small part in the minds of legis-

lators, whether private members or Ministers, as compared to what it did a few years ago. It would seem that we are prepared to allow the mining industry to carry us on to another industry, on which we hope to base our prosperity, after which, ungratefully enough, we propose to leave mining to fend for itself. The mining industry in Western Australia is not looking at all as bright as we would like to see it. Throughout the several fields a depression exists, and the exceptions can be counted on the fingers of one hand—Meekatharra, Sandstone, the Golden Mile, and one or two others; outside of these, mining is very flat indeed. I think it is time the Government recognised that they owe a duty to the mining industry, and that that duty should take the form of again building up the industry. I feel sure that with the assistance of the Government, so liberally granted to other industries, a great improvement would be shown. As far as my particular district is concerned I regret to say that one of the places which has battled hardest throughout is at the present time in a very bad way. I refer to the centre of Cue itself. Unfortunately the Great Fingal mine is not looking as well as we would like to see it.

The Premier: It has been proved, has it not?

Mr. HEITMANN: Proved in the bottom, I think. Cue itself is in a very bad way. I predicted this some time ago, when asking the Minister for Mines for a public battery. I then pointed out that Cue was going down steadily but surely, and that the best way to give her a lift would be to provide a public battery. That was refused, and to-day I am sorry to say Cue is in a very bad way. With other members I trust that greater assistance will be given to mining than has been done for some time past. I would suggest that a sum of money be put aside and mining boards be elected or appointed for the various districts so as to give practical assistance to mining in the shape of grants for small mine owners, or prospectors, who in some cases have discovered very fair shows, whilst others not so fortunate could be sent out into new country. One matter I wish to touch upon is in

regard to the item on the Estimates referring to the construction of railways. Here again I must find fault with the policy of the Government in respect to the methods adopted in carrying out this work. Until two or three years ago the Government recognised that the policy of departmental construction was preferable to that of private enterprise. But so soon as the present Minister for Works entered into office the policy of departmental construction was abandoned, and most of the railways since constructed have been let to private individuals. I am informed, and I would like to impress this upon the Premier, that many of these contracts have been let out at prices much above that put in by the Public Works Department. In respect to the Nannine-Meekatharra railway I am informed that the department tendered a price some £6,000 below that of the successful contractor. It is strange that when we have good officers in the department—I really believe these officers have their hearts and souls in their work; I have come into contact with many of them, and I am imbued with the belief that they make special efforts to justify the policy of departmental construction—it is strange that having such officers, and moreover having at Sandstone at the time a plant capable of carrying out the Nannine-Meekatharra extension and also the Upper Chapman line—this in itself allowing the department to do it cheaper than a contractor who had to bring his plant from Perth—it seems strange that in these circumstances the contractor should get the work at a price £6,000 above that tendered by the department. In respect to the Upper Chapman line, I am led to believe that the department tendered below the price of the successful contractor. Again, in respect to the first portion of the Dowerin-Merredin extension, the same thing applies. The department put in a tender, but the work was given to a contractor whose price was higher than that of the department. It seems to me to be nothing short of a farce to ask for a tender from the Public Works Department; because although their price is lower than that of private con-

tractors they are not given the work. If it is true that private contractors are given contracts at prices above those put in by the Public Works Department, it is time the Minister for Works was removed from his position. I say that the man who will take taxpayers' money and put it into the purses of private individuals simply because he seems to be wedded to the system of contracts—I say he is no longer a fit and proper person to occupy a public position. If it is true, it is nothing but robbery of the taxpayers' money. I have no desire to go further. There are many matters upon which one could speak, but as we have various Bills to come down shortly honourable members will then have a chance of speaking to the respective questions. One, in particular, of these Bills I would refer to, namely that dealing with health. When that comes down members will have an opportunity of discussing matters of general health. But there is one particular point I would refer to, namely in connection with the infectious diseases generally, and in particular to the disease known as phthisis. We have a report from the Chief Medical Officer, and I must say it is an extraordinary document. That officer points out that during last year we lost 235 lives from tubercular diseases, that is, phthisis and other tubercular troubles. It seems to me that the health of the people depends upon the financial condition of the State for the time being; for whenever anything is required to be done in health matters, even if it be suggested by the departmental officers themselves, they are told that the finances will not allow of the carrying out of the work, whatever it might be. In connection with the sanatorium at Coolgardie, ten months ago it was decided to build a new dining room for the patients. The room was completed a few days before last Christmas, but owing to the state of the finances it has never been used up to the present time because it has not been furnished, and the kitchen arrangements have not been completed. Surely the health of our people should not depend upon the state of the Treasury at any time. We are endeavouring to bring immigrants out here

and do all we can to increase the population, whilst at the same time we are losing valuable lives because we cannot afford to spend the money necessary to prevent such loss. If the Government were to place £40,000 or £50,000 on the next Estimates and gave it to a responsible officer, telling him we wanted tubercular troubles stamped out, it would pay both the Government and the country. It would save years and years of unnecessary trouble and unnecessary pain to which the patient is subjected. It would also be of great value from an economical standpoint, leaving out sentiment altogether, for it would pay the country. To the Agricultural Commission which sat some five or six years ago, the Government Actuary gave certain evidence in which he calculated the value to the State of the lives of all persons between the ages of 20 and 50. He put the value of each life down at about £309. There have been some 150 deaths from this disease, so it is easy for members to realise what a considerable monetary loss the demise has been to the State. And this loss was occasioned simply because we failed to grasp the question properly. We failed to find for those officers who were desirous of fighting the disease the money with which to do so. If we could save even one life all the expense would be warranted. To my mind one life is of more value than a million of money, and I do not think we can spend too much money in dealing with this question, so long as it is spent judiciously, so long as we have officers who recognise that the initiative in dealing with the question is left with them, officers who are prepared instead of only keeping on the old track and waiting until an epidemic arises before fighting the disease, to go out to meet the disease half way. It is by this means that we shall eventually stamp out the disease from among us. We should be doing good service if we placed a large sum of money on the Estimates for this purpose. With regard to the question of phthisis, I want to know from the Minister for Mines, or from the Premier, what is to be done with the officer of the Mines Department who made such extraordinary

statements in connection with the inspection at the Fingal mine? The Premier will remember that he was induced to send an officer, Dr. Blanchard, to that mine to report upon the health of the miners. The doctor was the medical officer at Day Dawn. He was an old officer of the department and had been in the service for 10 or 12 years, having resided at Day Dawn for over 11 years. In his report as to the existence of the disease at the mine, the doctor stated that there was an extraordinary increase in the number of cases of phthisis in the locality. This report was pigeon-holed, or at all events it never came before the House until mentioned by some members. When asked what he would do about it, the Minister for Mines, not satisfied with the report of Dr. Blanchard, who undertook the first examination, sent up Mr. Montgomery, the State Mining Engineer, to make a report. It seems to me that Mr. Montgomery was instructed to bring back a certain report. At all events he reported that he went to Day Dawn and could find but one case of miner's phthisis. As a matter of fact since that report there have been four deaths of men from phthisis who were actually working in the mine on the date Mr. Montgomery was supposed to have examined the men. One man who was said to have been examined by Mr. Montgomery, sent to his association a signed statement contradicting what, according to the report, he was supposed to have told Mr. Montgomery. Here is an officer of the department, high up in the service, holding the highest position in the administrative branch of the Mines work, a man who is there to administer some of the Acts which deal directly with the health of the miners, to see that the miners get a fair deal, and who should be looked upon by the miners as a friend. One could forgive this officer if his report dealt with other matters than life and death, but when he goes to Day Dawn, not to find out the true state of affairs, but rather to prove that my statements and those of Dr. Blanchard were untrue, when a man will do that, there should be no further use for him in the de-

partment. He actually told deliberate falsehoods, I can call them nothing else. Although there were 10 or 12 men suffering at that time from phthisis at Day Dawn, Mr. Montgomery said there was only one case and even that had not originated in the district. Since then, however, four deaths have taken place of men who were working in the mine at that time. During the last few months I have assisted, in various ways, men in that district who have come to me every week suffering from the disease. Two or three of the sufferers died in the sanatorium, others are there now, and still others refuse to go there for some reason or other. They contend that the treatment is not what it should be. I have tried to dispel that idea but have been unable to do so. There are several cases of phthisis in Day Dawn now. I can recollect as many as 30 deaths from the disease which have taken place in the last few years. Included among them was that of an underground manager and of three shift bosses, and yet we have the highest official of the Mines Department going to Day Dawn and saying there was no phthisis there except one case which had originated elsewhere. I can assure the Premier that unless this man is dealt with I am determined to stick to this matter, and the public shall know whether this man, this brutal individual, is going to be backed up by the Minister. With regard to the question of phthisis itself, I am pleased to know that the Premier before leaving for London saw that a Commission was appointed to inquire into the disease. When that report is in I feel sure that the references in it to the Day Dawn district will astound the people of this and the other States. It will show, that unnecessary loss in lives is taking place continually. After the report is brought in I want to see that something is done to remedy the position, so that there shall be no continuance of the unnecessary loss of lives. I had intended to mention several other matters, but I will leave them until the Health Bill comes along. All I can say is that I think it is high time the Government recognised the value of the lives of the men in this

State. I do not mean to say for a moment that some of the members of the Ministry are not as humane as anyone else, but I must confess that brutality has been shown in connection with the subject, as I have shown in my speech to-night. I hope the Government will consider that even if one life is saved, no sum of money is too great to bring about that much to be desired result.

(Sitting suspended from 6.10 to 7.30 p.m.)

The PREMIER (Sir Newton J. Moore): I do not propose to speak at any length to-night, but to confine my remarks to replies to one or two criticisms made by the member for Brown Hill with regard to the finances, the alleged non-success of the loan, and the references he made to our indebtedness. I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the member who moved the Address-in-Reply, on the speech he made, his maiden effort in this House. It is evident he is not altogether a stranger to Legislative Assemblies of this character, and I am convinced he will be an acquisition to the debating strength of the Chamber. The member for Brown Hill stated that I was to some extent stage manager with the object of hiding the sins of the Government. But, with the alert Opposition, as we have it constituted in this House at the present time, if we have sins, I can tell hon. members that they are pretty well and quickly found out. Fortunately, we are in the happy position of not having any serious ones to answer for. I would like to refer to the statement made by the hon. member wherein he argued that our interest bill at the present time represented something like 27.4 of the revenue of the State, while in 1903 it represented 19 per cent. of the revenue of the State, and that the percentage had increased with the financial position of the State, and was not as sound at present as it was in the period he referred to. This fact was really hurled at us as if nothing else was required to send us to that place where Oppositionists like to see Ministers con-

signed. I would like to say that I realise the hon. member is not altogether in sympathy with the loan policy of the Government, and consequently I am only too pleased to welcome any criticism whether it is in regard to the financial position or the immigration policy of the Government, or whether it is relating to the land policy, provided that that criticism is given with the desire to point out the faults of the administration that the Government have been guilty of. We realise that we are only human, and that there is a certain amount of work to do, and however earnest members of the Ministry may be there must be occasions when there are lapses. Then it is the duty of members to bring these under notice. If they are found to have any foundation, then the Government are worthy of censure if they do not take steps to right what is wrong. I would like to point out with regard to the question of percentage increases in the interest bill, as compared with the total revenue, that it is important to note that the revenue per capita of the State during the period the hon. member referred to has gone down from £18 12s. 11d. per head in 1903 to £12 18s. 1d. at the present time, really a drop of about 30 per cent. per capita. This, as hon. members are perfectly well aware, is largely due to the failure in the return of the customs revenue, and consequently it cannot be considered that it is an indication that the State is not as prosperous as it was then. That drop is represented as follows: In 1902-3 the State revenue, exclusive of what was received from the Commonwealth, was £11 1s. 7d., and at the present time it is £10 8s. 4d. The big drop in customs receipts, which have gone down from £7 11s. 4d. per capita to £2 9s. 9d. I am satisfied members will realise that a drop of that kind brought about by fiscal changes, which we can in no way control, does not reflect upon the financial administration of the Government. As a matter of fact, it will be noted that we are now in a better position than we were then. We must judge the loan policy by the effect of the expenditure and its return of interest and sinking fund, and when we

realise that during last year, our four large trading concerns—the Railways, Harbours, State Batteries, and Goldfields Water Scheme, practically returned interest on the whole of the national debt, it cannot be contended that the money has not been expended to the best advantage of the State. I would point out that in 1902-3, the four trading concerns that I have mentioned produced 66 per cent. of the total interest and sinking fund. At the present time, as I have pointed out, they are returning nearly sufficient to pay the whole of our interest bill, and are yielding 77 per cent. of the interest and sinking fund. That is to say that those concerns are producing 11 per cent. more than they were in 1902-3. With regard to our indebtedness per capita, the hon. member and I have had differences of opinion before, and he has given me a lot of worry in trying to keep him right. I can only refer hon. members to the Public Accounts in order that they may judge for themselves whether the statement the hon. member has made, and which I know he has made in good faith, is correct or not. I will endeavour to show that the statement I made at Bunbury with regard to the per capita indebtedness was correct, and that the statement of the hon. member that while in 1902-3 our per capita indebtedness was £65 9s. it is £66 12s. at the present time is incorrect. I may say that since that statement was made, the Treasury books have been closed, and the position is a trifle better than it was when I spoke at Bunbury. The whole of these facts are set out in the Public Accounts, but I am in a position to show the hon. member where he has made a mistake. On the 30th June, 1903—it is simply a question of arithmetic—the population of the State was 221,992. The gross debt was £15,627,298 and the accumulated sinking fund was £655,069. The unexpended loan balance was £103,333.

Mr. Bath: I looked up the Treasury returns in the *Government Gazette* and they gave it there as over £300,000.

The PREMIER: I am just going to explain. That £103,333 is the balance

after deducting the expenditure from Loan Suspense Account, namely £336,000. Now, as against £103,333 at that time, the unexpended loan balance at the present time is £1,908,368 after deducting the expenditure for the year on Loan Suspense, namely £6,700. The hon. member did not take that £336,000 into consideration. That represents something like 30s. which is practically the difference between the figures that he gave and the figures that I gave at Bunbury. One other matter while I am dealing with the finances that I must refer to has reference to the terms on which the last loan flotation was raised. I do not think there is any need for any apology as far as the result of that flotation is concerned, taking everything into consideration: but the hon. member (Mr. Bath) said the price per £100 received by the State was not satisfactory, and he referred to some financial paper. On the other hand, I can quote one or two leading financial journals in regard to this loan flotation.

Mr. Underwood: Did you advertise in them?

The PREMIER: I can quote from the *Financier* and I do not think the Western Australian Government have spent any money in regard to advertisements in the *Financier*. I am only endeavouring to tell hon. members speaking as a business man, that the loan was a success. When we realise that last year the bank rate of interest was only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. whilst in July of this year it was 4 per cent. and yet the same amount, £96 10s. was received, and when I show that one trust fund, an Indian guarantee fund, which last year floated a loan at the price of £96 per £100, put a loan on the London market a fortnight after the Western Australian loan and only brought £92, it will be seen that the Western Australian security stood high taking all things into consideration. As a matter of fact, as hon. members are aware, the death of the late King caused a pause in the investment of money, and the rubber boom was on.

Mr. Underwood: There was another boom there.

The PREMIER: The rubber boom was on at the time the loan was brought out, and naturally a large amount of money usually invested in safe securities was invested in this more speculative operation. One financial paper in referring to our loan said—

It is generally considered that the price was too high to be attractive and that dear money was an adverse factor. The multiplicity of other loans available also had an effect on this Western Australian appeal for financial support. Because the Commonwealth is enjoying prosperity, Australian Governments imagine that there should be no difficulty in borrowing. They appear to forget that the opportunities for investment available in this country are enormous, and that a return of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. possesses little attraction for the average investor, no matter how attractive it may appear to banks and insurance companies.

The hon. member also referred to the fact that the loan was not subscribed by the public in the way preceding loans were subscribed; but the whole position is this: we have underwriters and pay them $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. for underwriting and financing the whole concern. If the loan is subscribed two or three or four times over it is evident that we have fixed the price too low. Now if the price of the Western Australian loan had been fixed at $95\frac{1}{2}$, very evidently it would be over-subscribed four or five times, and the underwriters would have been in the position of getting their $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. and unloading next day. That would simply be a gift to the underwriters, whereas at present they have to wait until the market is easier in order to unload. To my mind that is one of the advantages of underwriting our loans. The *Financier* said—

The British investor has not come up to the scratch to the extent it was anticipated. The market recognises the issue price of £96 10s. was too high. It was the same price as the previous Western Australian loan, and the Premier would naturally have been disappointed had it been less. While it was not anticipated the loan would be covered, a reduction in the bank rate can-

not but have had a favourable influence on it and gilded securities generally, and it will not be long before the whole amount comes into general consumption. Taking the accrued interest into consideration the net loan works out at about 95½. This is better than the late New Zealand loan, and when all these things are considered the Premier is to be congratulated on having secured such a favourable loan. The point to be considered by the investing public in regard to Western Australian loans is that a sinking fund of one-half per cent. has to be provided which now amounts to considerably over two million sterling.

In reply to the interjection of the member for Pilbara, I may say that I have not the pleasure of knowing the proprietor or the editor, or anyone else that I am aware of, connected with the *Financier*. These comments were not forthcoming as the result of an advertisement, although any statement made to the credit of Western Australia as the result of an amount paid for an advertisement might often be a good investment for the State. I have already given some reasons in regard to this loan as to why the market was unfavourable, mainly owing to the unsettled conditions as the result of the death of the King, and to the fact that the bank rate was 4 per cent. when the loan was floated as against 2½ per cent. when the previous loan was floated. At the same time it must be recognised that there is on the part of the London investors a tendency to look out for more interest. Financial people allege it is largely due to the additional taxation they have to pay, and they naturally look out for some investment that will pay more interest than the interest generally given on trust securities. I have no reason to believe that by waiting we would have improved the condition in any degree. As a matter of fact the loan that succeeded ours was £4 lower than similar stock issued last year, and it is gratifying to know that, so far as our loan was concerned, it did not go further back in discount than the preceding loan, and that a fortnight after the loan was floated it stood at only a quarter per cent. lower.

Why I was particularly anxious to get the loan off just then was that in April next the first option of the redemption of £1,876,000 will become due, and whilst I was in London I took the opportunity of giving twelve months' notice of redemption. That was a 4 per cent. loan, and it is anticipated that we will get it off at 3½ per cent. which will mean a saving to the revenue of something like £18,000.

Mr. Bath: Are you going to float another loan for that redemption.

The PREMIER: We will probably float a loan for redemption in April next year when the opportunity offers. The expenditure of the loan just raised has already been allocated by Parliament and is shown in the schedule to the Loan Bill.

Mr. Foulkes: Had that particular loan a sinking fund attached to it?

The PREMIER: Yes, a sinking fund of one per cent.

Mr. Foulkes: Then there will be something less to raise.

The PREMIER: Certainly; instead of having to float a loan of £1,870,000 for redemption it will be something like £1,600,000. I need not pursue this subject further, but it is interesting to know that the rate of interest per £100 sterling paid by the Government on recent loans, shows that the last flotation is very satisfactory. On the loan of 1901, second instalment, if allowance be made for redemption at par at the earliest date of maturity, namely the option date, the rate of interest per £100 sterling is £4 1s. 10d. On the first instalment of the 1906 loan it is £3 19s. 10d., on the second instalment of the 1906 loan it is £3 18s. 10d., on the 1909 loan it is £3 18s. 10d., and on the last loan it is £3 18s. 11d., so taking all these matters into consideration I think it must be admitted that the transaction was satisfactory.

Mr. Horan: Was the cost of flotation any higher than formerly?

The PREMIER: It was about the same. There is one per cent. put down for underwriting and ¼ per cent. for arranging the underwriting. It is the rate paid by all the Australian States for underwriting any loan. The member for Brown Hill

in dealing with my statement at Bunbury in regard to revenue said that I did not show how I proposed to make up the additional revenue it would be necessary for us to raise during the ensuing year in view of the fact that our return would be considerably less this year from the Commonwealth, something like £120,000 less, whilst at the same time our interest and sinking fund would be £53,000 more. Now last year's results were considerably in excess of what I anticipated. I forecasted a surplus of about £50,000, but as hon. members are well aware, my forecast erred on the safe side, and the result of the operations of the year was that we showed a surplus of £210,000, largely owing to the fact of the big increase of £102,000 in the Commonwealth returns, of £17,000 in probate, of £12,000 in harbour dues and £6,000 in stamps, etcetera. By the way, the stamp revenue is generally looked upon as a barometer as far as the business community is concerned. The higher the stamp duty is generally the more transactions are going on, the greater the commercial activity. When I was speaking at Bunbury it was not possible for me to go into detail as to how I anticipated results would be at the end of the year, that will be shown when the Budget is delivered, but at that time I realised that whilst we had a surplus of £210,000 on the year just closed it would be necessary for us to exercise the utmost caution during the current year. And while it is satisfactory to have a surplus still, we must not be permitted by that fact to relax our vigilance as far as the various departments are concerned. Another point to which a considerable amount of attention has been devoted to in this debate is that of immigration, and in this connection I would like to say that during the time I was in England I certainly advocated emigration. At the same time I took every step that prudence dictated and impressed on the officers generally in the service in London the absolute necessity for exercising great caution. It is very difficult, indeed, in dealing with the question of immigration to so select emigrants that there are not mistakes made occasionally. I am satisfied that in

the very near future it will be advisable for the Government to appoint a board that would be prepared to give the question more consideration than it is possible for the Government to do. The board could be representative of both sides of the House, so that any scheme brought forward would receive the consideration of members. It would entail a certain amount of work, at the same time we would be assured that the matter would receive more attention than it is possible for a Minister to give it at the present time. One is inundated by schemes for the introduction of immigrants, and it is not possible to give due time and attention to the various proposals made. I went away in favour of immigration and I came back feeling stronger than ever that if we are going to do our duty to Western Australia, and Australia as a whole, it is absolutely essential that we must do our best to populate it with a white people. I think this feeling is general throughout the Commonwealth. Many who were opposed to immigration a little while ago are now prepared to give it support, so long as proper supervision is exercised.

Mr. Scaddan: You have sufficient officers to make two boards. One officer meets the emigrants on the boat, one is on the wharf, and another is in Perth.

The PREMIER: As far as immigration is concerned, Canada spends considerably more in placing the emigrants after arrival than in getting the emigrants, and we in Australia must look to that. If a board of the character I have referred to is appointed, the members would be in a position to make suggestions to the Government. If the Government are going on a certain line of policy the board could make recommendations, and would be in a position to ascertain if abuses exist. The board would be able to recommend alterations with the object of doing away with abuses.

Mr. Hudson: Relief of responsibility.

The PREMIER: I do not think there would be any relief of responsibility at all. I do not care if the Commonwealth or the State bring out the emigrants, we want people in Australia. What is

Canada doing at present? Backed up by the various railway companies and other companies they spend £300,000 a year. You cannot go into any small town or village in England without seeing placards about Canada, and there are motor-cars going through districts advertising the resources of Canada at the various shows. Canada also spends a large amount of money with the Press. There is a bidding all round for the desirable emigrant. You can fill ships with undesirables if you are anxious to secure numbers, but as far as the Government are concerned, I appeal to members if they can make any suggestions by which additional safeguards can be effected, and these we shall be glad to receive. When Mr. Ranford addresses a meeting he places before the people the class of emigrant we require. The applicants are met the next day, and before they are approved, they have to give a certificate or declaration that they have had experience, they have to give references of two reputable persons within their own town or district, and after that they are medically examined. That, it seems to me to be all that can be expected. We have in Mr. Ranford a man who has a thorough knowledge of the State and to whom you must, to a certain extent, give a free hand as far as the selection is concerned.

Mr. Jacoby: Do they give any bond?

The PREMIER: No, there is no bond. It would not be possible to give any bond. What I would say in regard to the immigration policy is, it would be to the advantage of the States if the Commonwealth undertook everything in connection with the emigrants after they are selected by the States. The States are in the best position to say what class of emigrants are desired. We know in Western Australia the immigrants we require, while in Victoria or New South Wales they may require another class of immigrants. Perhaps in New South Wales they may require navvies; we know that in Western Australia we do not want them. We are in this position. While we assist the immigrant to Western Australia there is nothing to stop the immigrant going to another State and that

State reaping the result of the action of this Government, or of the Queensland Government, as the case may be. And wherever the immigrant goes he is a Commonwealth citizen, and, therefore, the Commonwealth should contribute towards the cost of his passage.

Mr. O'Loughlen: That would cut both ways.

The PREMIER: I say that as they become Commonwealth citizens let the Commonwealth contribute, and not let the State be responsible for the full passage money, because we know that some other State may receive the benefit. Wherever the immigrant goes in Australia it means that he is going to bring revenue to the Commonwealth as a consumer of dutiable goods, and, therefore, it is of advantage to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Scaddan: The Commonwealth would have to satisfy themselves that the State would accommodate the immigrants.

The PREMIER: If a general scheme were adopted the States's officers in London would select the emigrants, and if an arrangement were made the emigrants could be brought out in large numbers, therefore we could secure cheaper passages than we can at the present time. I think the Government of the Commonwealth are in accord with any sound scheme of immigration. It is only a question, as far as they are concerned, if a desirable class of persons are being introduced, and if there are any suggestions or improvements we can make in the present system, the Government generally are prepared to adopt them.

Mr. Collier: The Government ignored the recommendations of the select committee of last session.

The PREMIER: What were they?

Mr. Scaddan: The select committee on immigration that sat last session; several recommendations were made but the report was not looked at.

The PREMIER: In regard to advertising Australia generally in the old country, I am quite in accord with the proposals of the present Prime Minister that we should endeavour to have all Australian agencies under one roof. And in reply to a communication I received from

him a few days ago—I had said that as far as Western Australia was concerned that we were prepared to transfer our quarters from where they are at present to a building which it is contemplated to erect if the Commonwealth have the support of the States—

Mr. Hudson: That is a proper Federal spirit, different from the Minister for Works.

The PREMIER: I am fully satisfied of this, that if Australia has a building of its own it will be one of the best advertisements we can have. As far as our quarters, where we are located at present, are concerned, they are inadequate, out of the way, except as far as officialdom is concerned. The premises occupied are small poky rooms and are located on four different floors. It is absolutely hopeless to think that proper organisation can be given effect to in such quarters as the present Western Australian agency is located. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to assist in every way the Commonwealth Government to erect in London a building which will be a credit to Australia. It is absolutely necessary that some of the other States should shift their quarters. At the present time poor premises are provided for the High Commissioner, and Commonwealth premises erected in London would be a benefit to the whole of Australia. If a man goes to London he naturally is anxious to see the High Commissioner, and he is also anxious to see his own Agent-General, and if the two offices are in the same building he gets over the whole business in the one act. During the course of the speech of the member for Albany he levelled some criticism both at myself and the Minister for Lands. I can only say as far as I am concerned he has a right to criticise every action I took when I was in the old country, but I can assure members that while I was there I realised that I was a representative of the State generally. I do not think he can take one statement of mine that was not made from a disinterested point of view. In regard to the accusation that I sent a cable out, I do not think that anyone can find anything very

objectionable in that cable. Members are aware of the deep interest which I took in the financial agreement. It was a matter, I understood, that the House supported, because a resolution was carried in the House in favour of the agreement generally. It was only after two or three years of hard fighting that we were able to induce the members of the Premier's Conference to realise the special consideration due to Western Australia. I certainly do not think I exceeded my duty as Premier, in view of the keen interest I took in the matter, by cabling out.

Mr. Hudson: Did you really cable it?

The PREMIER: I did. The cable is as follows:—

On the eve of the referendum I earnestly appeal to the people of Western Australia to ratify the financial agreement and so terminate the era of uncertainty as to revenue returns which has existed with more or less acuteness since the inception of federation. We shall thus secure, with financial stability, the special consideration for Western Australia conceded to us by the Commonwealth and States after long and strenuous effort, and which, if not now secured, is not likely to be conceded again. The agreement, while providing for the increasing requirements of the Commonwealth—defence and other national services—will stimulate the development of each State by promoting increase of population. In the interests of the present electors and of those who in the future will make Western Australia their home, I urge acceptance of the agreement.

Now is there anything very objectionable in that? If it is the cost of the cable that hon. members object to, I am prepared to pay it myself.

Mr. Scaddan: Is it not a fact that you were bound to send that cable in accordance with a promise given at the Premier's Conference?

The PREMIER: No; I said that so far as the financial agreement was concerned I was going to support it, and I supported it in this House, where it was carried practically unanimously.

Mr. Taylor: I think the financial agreement was only laid on the Table.

The PREMIER: No; it was debated in the House. One other matter to which the hon. member referred was in connection with the Minister for Lands, when he said that he was not in a position to reply. I would like to say that whatever else may be urged against the hon. Minister, no charge of discourtesy would lie for a moment. Hon. members have had an opportunity of realising that. The fact that a goldfields member was asked to reply to the toast of the fruit-growing industry was due to the circumstance that he was the senior member of the Opposition present. There was absolutely no attempt on the part of the Minister to belittle the hon. member. As a rule it is the senior member of the Opposition who is asked to reply, and that is what happened on this occasion. There is another matter which the hon. member criticised to some extent, and it is one in which I feel sure he is not supported by his colleagues on those benches; that is in connection with the expenditure on pine-planting. Surely to goodness if any work is reproductive, it is pine-planting. He took exception to the locality. That locality was selected by practical men some three or four years ago. The men who made the selection were, the chief nurseryman, Mr. McFarlane, Mr. James C. Port, and Mr. Tom Adams, both members of the board. I was Minister for Lands at the time. I remember that they visited Albany, Bunbury, Ludlow, and other places, and after consideration they chose this as the most suitable for a pine plantation, whereupon the Government acted on their recommendation. The hon. member took exception to the fact that the Government were clearing some waste land for the planting of the trees, instead of planting them in open country. But it does not follow that a locality, because it is open country, will be suitable for a pine plantation. The whole cost of this plantation was something like £5 per acre to get the land ready for planting, £2 per acre for actually planting the trees and 8s. per acre for two years for cultivating the plan-

tation. I looked up the report of the Conservator of Forests in South Australia, Mr. Gill, and I am sure that we will be doing good work if we more than double the present area.

Mr. Taylor: What area is there at present?

The PREMIER: About 350 acres in all. That there is ample justification for the undertaking has already been shown in the Eastern States where pine plantations formed some 18 years ago have recently been cut over with a view of testing the probable return from the pines planted. The result of this cutting showed that the value of the timber was very considerable, some of the pines turning out sufficient timber to make 28 cases, which found a ready sale at 1s. each, and would yield a return of about £200 per acre. Recently a Royal Commission was appointed in New South Wales with a view to examining the forest reserves of that State, and making recommendations in regard to the planting of soft woods. In the report of that Commission it is stated:—

Considerable evidence was obtained by us in South Australia and Victoria in regard to the growth of *Pinus Insignis*.

That is the tree we are planting both at Hamel and Ludlow.

In both of these States the demand for the timber, which is used for packing-cases, weatherboards, flooring, mouldings, turnery, etc., far exceeds the present supply. Under ordinary conditions timber fit for milling has been produced twenty years after planting. Mr. Walter Gill, Conservator of Forests in South Australia, in his evidence stated that Mr. Herbert Stone, F.L.S., a recognised authority on timber in London, to whom he had referred for an expression of opinion on *Pinus Insignis*, considered it to be as good a timber as the North American white pine, and he predicted a great future for it.

Undoubtedly this pine is the hardiest of that family and is being cultivated very successfully in Western Australia. It was only after some considerable experiment-

ing that it was made a success. When planted first of all in some of the open sandplains to which, presumably, the hon. member referred, it was found the tree did not thrive. Mr. Ednie Brown first of all experimented in that direction, and now the success which has been achieved at Hamel and Ludlow is evidence that the cultivation of these trees is in the best interests of Western Australia. One other matter referred to by the hon. member for Cue was in regard to the purchase of rails made during the time I was in London. I may say I do not know what appeared in the newspaper, but the facts are these: Belgium rails were quoted some few shillings lower than British rails. Cables were exchanged between the Engineer-in-Chief out here and the office in London. That officer stated it would be false economy to accept the Belgium rails as against the British article, and, naturally, I was only too pleased to take the British in preference to the Belgian, or any other. It is the policy the Government propose to adopt as far as possible in Western Australia. Those responsible in our various institutions are under instruction to, wherever practicable, use the products of the country.

Mr. Collier: Why not extend the same privilege to the people? Why not give our own people a job in preference to outsiders?

The PREMIER: It has been done, and a Western Australian has been given a job as Premier for a start. The hon. member for Murray referred to the fact that there were many advertisements in the newspapers of conditional purchase properties for sale, and said he was of opinion that transfers were being effected without any improvements having been carried out on the blocks. He is hardly correct in his assumption, because it is necessary that a certain amount shall have been expended before any transfer can be effected. Certainly the amount may not be as large as is desirable, but the Act provides that at least 2s. per acre on conditional purchase land and 4s. per acre on homestead farms shall have been

expended before a transfer can be effected.

Mr. Collier: Is the Act carried out in that respect?

The PREMIER: Yes; the Act is being carried out. I made inquiries to-day, because I realised that it is of no avail for these things to be brought under the notice of Ministers if investigation be not made.

Mr. Bath: The Premier will probably remember the case of the land on the Wongan Hills advertised by Mr. Schruth.

Mr. George: What I object to is the fact that the land agents hold out as an inducement the advances to be made by the Agricultural Bank.

The PREMIER: Well, it is very difficult to meet a case like that. The only method at all feasible is that if a man selects a conditional purchase block and disposes of it he shall not have the right to select another.

Mr. George: It simply robs the man who has to rely on the assistance of the low price at which the Government sells the land.

The PREMIER: How are you going to prevent the transfer?

Mr. George: The Minister controlling the department could do it.

The PREMIER: Take the position of a man who has spent a certain amount of money on his land. He has carried out the necessary improvements, but is temporarily embarrassed for want of funds. It is hard if he cannot transfer that land.

Mr. George: That is another thing altogether.

The PREMIER: Of course you can stop him doing it again by taking from him the right to select a second time.

Mr. Taylor: You desire to let the robber go free the first time.

The PREMIER: Show me a possible amendment of the Act in this respect which will not inflict hardship. Hon. members must realise that, as far as improvements are concerned, they are now carried out to a greater degree than ever before. That is largely due to the Act of 1906 which made the provisions much more stringent than they had been.

Under the old Act a man could hold 1,000 acres of conditional purchase with residence, 2,000 acres without residence, 4,000 acres of pastoral country, 4,000 acres of grazing country—he could hold about 10,000 acres, and, with his sons, perhaps 30,000 acres; much of which had subsequently to be repurchased by the State. There is no doubt that under those conditions very little improvement was done, but it is very different with the law as it stands now, and I really believe that law is being enforced. I asked the Minister to-day to be good enough to send to my office the first batch that came before him. I went through them and was very pleased indeed to find from the inspectors' reports that these applications, which had been picked up haphazard, showed that more extensive improvements were effected upon the blocks than were required in order that they should be held. I believe that obtains generally.

Mr. Scaddan: Persons have secured land this year and already the properties are in the hands of agents for sale.

The PREMIER: I know that cases of that kind must necessarily crop up, but the trouble is that to make an amendment such as has been suggested would, while preventing such abuses, at the same time be liable to inflict hardship on men who are practically forced to get rid of their property. It would mean that the property would be sacrificed. I do not know that I need detain the House at any greater length. There are several departmental matters to which reference has been made by members, but they will be replied to by the Ministers more directly concerned. It is not necessary for me to go into detail with regard to the railway and other proposals of the Government, for they are matters which will be submitted in due course and will receive the consideration of the House. I can only say that, so far as the Government are concerned, we propose to pursue the policy we have carried out in the past, and which I think we can say is, to a very large extent, responsible for the improved position of Western Australia to-day. I thank mem-

bers for the attention they have given me.

Mr. ANGWIN (East Fremantle): I wish at this juncture to offer my congratulations to the Premier on the success he achieved on behalf of Western Australia during the time he was in England. Those who follow the English papers must admit that Western Australia has been more advertised during the last six months by the Premier than it ever has been on previous occasions. There is not the least doubt to my mind that in the future this State will reap the advantage of the Premier's visit. In fact it seems almost a pity that, considering what the Premier did and the reputation he made in England, he could not have remained there longer in order to advertise the State to a greater degree than the time at his disposal permitted him to do. I do not know whether it might not be arranged that he should be sent back there for a time to fill the position of Agent General. As I stated at a function held at Fremantle, the idea has unfortunately arisen that once a gentleman has held the position of Agent General he should go out of local politics altogether. That is altogether an erroneous idea, for the knowledge a man gains while Agent General in regard to the financial affairs of Western Australia, as the outcome of his association with the financial people in England, would be of inestimable benefit to the State, if on the expiration of his term of office he should return to the State to the position he occupied before he went away. Thinking that, I am of the opinion that it would be well if the Premier's colleagues considered the question of sending him to England for a little while longer. The Premier, in the course of his statement, referred to the election of the member for Fremantle. It is not my intention to go into that question very fully now, but I want to say this, that I honestly believe that if the Premier had gone to Fremantle and found himself in the same position as did two of his colleagues, who went down there for the purpose of going on the platform to support one candidate and found another candidate pushed

into his place, he would have returned very quickly to the City. I do not think he would have lowered his dignity in the manner done on the occasion referred to by his colleagues. While the colleagues of the Premier went to Fremantle for the express purpose of supporting a candidate on behalf of the Government, what they really did was to support the candidate of the Licensed Victuallers' Association. I am sure at the time members of the Ministry were supporting him, that candidate was not accepted by many of the supporters of the Ministry in Fremantle. The Ministers might well feel proud of the man they decided to support for the Fremantle election. If I had been in the same position as the member for Fremantle, if I had made statements so condemnatory of the Government I would never have got up in my place and supported that party as was done by Mr. Murphy the other night. A person cannot change so thoroughly in a few months. I have here a copy of the *West Australian* giving a report of a speech made by the member for Fremantle with regard to the Government, which shows clearly what a high opinion he held, previously to this election, of the Ministry. Mr. Murphy's opinion of the Government was so high that he was reminded of the remarks of Lord Rosebery, and, in fact, quoted them, saying "He would like to hand over the control of the finances to six of the shrewdest men of the Nation, and thought that if some of the ability of the leading business people of Western Australia were brought to bear on the present position people would not hear so much talk of the present depression." That shows clearly that Mr. Murphy had no confidence in the Government, because he wished to take the control of the finances out of the hands of the Government and put it in the hands of some gentlemen who would put the finances into a better state.

The Premier: Perhaps he wanted a job?

Mr. ANGWIN: He went on to say "The gross neglect of the town by the Government during the last few years has

been to the detriment of Fremantle." Just fancy an honourable member who made remarks like that now supporting the Government. It seems ludicrous that the town of Fremantle should be represented by a man who, while supporting the Government, said they were neglecting his constituency.

Mr. Hayward: What is the date of that report?

Mr. ANGWIN: It was published a few months ago. I could give many more extracts. I only mention this to prove the interjection which I made the other night and which was rebutted so earnestly by the member for Fremantle. His conversion has come rapidly, and it evidently only took an election to bring it about. His remarks on the occasion I have quoted were so strong that the Press did not publish them all. As members know, the Press will not publish anything much against the present Government. No matter what members here say, if the Press think it detrimental to the Government they will not print it. The newspaper concluded the report of the remarks of the member for Fremantle by stating "In the concluding remarks of his speech Mr. Murphy dealt at considerable length with the Government's proposal to cut down the municipal subsidies and to deprive the municipalities of their share of the police-court fees, which he strongly condemned." That shows clearly that so far as the member for Fremantle is concerned the election has secured him a seat behind a Ministry whom he really thinks should not hold office. I happened to be at a function the other night when a Minister pointed out that, notwithstanding the great development which has taken place in this State, the result had been achieved without the necessity for increased taxation. On many occasions when I have read the wail of Ministers in regard to the Federal Parliament, to the effect that that body were encroaching on the financial position of the State I have had a certain amount of sympathy with it; but when I realised that the Ministry of this State are following exactly the same principle by handing down the necessity for making increased taxa-

tion to the local governing bodies, I came to the one conclusion that it is the local governing bodies that need consideration at the hands of the people of the State. The Government have cut down the subsidy and have thus retained a certain amount of money, thereby doing away with the necessity for increased taxation for the works they have in hand; but the municipalities and the roads boards have been compelled to increase their taxes in order to make up the loss through the reduction of the subsidy. Then again we find the Government cutting down the hospital votes, thereby causing the health boards of the State to increase their taxation. They have said to these bodies "You must carry out the duties and must raise funds for the express purpose of providing hospital accommodation." By this means the Government relieved themselves of the necessity of spending a considerable sum of money from their revenue. We find that by forcing this expenditure on the health boards and the local governing bodies, the Government have been relieved of a considerable expenditure, but at the same time they have deprived the local bodies of an amount equal to from 1s. to 1s. 3d. in the pound on the annual value. When the statement is made that the Government have carried out their big developmental policy without increased taxation it only means that the increase is thrown on the shoulders of the local authorities. I want again to bring before members the necessity for giving direct representation on the Harbour Trust at Fremantle to the workers. Some time ago there was an attempt made to bring about an agreement between those who work on our wharves, the ship-owners, the stevedores, and the Harbour Trust. I do not know what is likely to take place, but I hope that a satisfactory settlement will be made. I think I can say safely here that if there had been a workers' representative as a member of the Harbour Trust at Fremantle, negotiations which were in existence to bring about a settlement would have been effected some time before. The position is that the Trust have stood in the way, and they have tried to make an agreement which it was recognised made it difficult,

because of the dangers surrounding it, to find men to engage in the work. Life and limb, after all, are of more importance than pounds, shillings, and pence. In proposing a Harbour Trust for Bunbury, at the instigation of the member for Mt. Margaret, the Premier stated that he was providing that a member of the Lumpers' Union at Bunbury should be one of the Harbour Trust. In dealing with the Bill again in 1908 the Premier, in response to an interjection by Mr. Bolton, who asked whether the Premier was still of the opinion which he had previously expressed, that he would give the representative of the workers a place on the board, said in reply "Did you ever know me to alter my opinion?" I hope in this instance that the Premier has not altered his opinion as far as the workers' representatives on boards such as harbour trusts are concerned. Then he said that the Government desired to secure practical men who knew the requirements of the board. If the services of a representative of the lumpers were available in connection with the working of the board, the Government would be justified in appointing such a representative. The Lumpers' Union at Fremantle consists of 600 members.

Mr. Bolton: There are 734.

Mr. ANGWIN: I am dealing with the ordinary men, not all who are scattered around the district. I know their numbers are larger, but some of them are in other parts of the State. At the present time some of these men are filling public positions to which they have been elected by the ratepayers of the district. More than one of them have filled positions as members of municipal councils, and I maintain that that body of 600 men should have privileges similar to those of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie. I maintain that any man who might be appointed from a union such as this, would not only study the best interests of the workers but would consider the interests of the State, because he would realise that the better the harbour was made for shipping the better name the harbour would get throughout the world, and as a consequence the shipping trade would

be bound to increase. A great wrong has been done to these men in the past in not giving them just representation, not only for their own sakes, but because their knowledge of working the harbour, added to the knowledge of the business and shipping men on the board, would have been beneficial to the State as a whole. I trust the Government, when making the next appointments to the Harbour Trust at Fremantle will give this question just consideration. I notice from the Governor's Speech that it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Trading Accounts Bill. I was hoping when the Minister for Lands was speaking the other night that he would have given us some information with regard to the Donnybrook Co-operative Society. It is known that this society started a factory at Donnybrook for the purpose of manufacturing jam on the co-operative principle, but it was such a side issue as far as co-operation was concerned that they could not co-operate together without getting some financial assistance from the Government to carry on. What is the position to-day? There are some rumours about, and I have heard that the factory is closed down, and I have also heard that a meeting has been called to wind up the concern. If such is the case, and the Government have advanced several hundreds of pounds towards these works, I consider it is necessary that we should have some information with regard to the security which is held for the money advanced. If the Trading Accounts Bill is for the express purpose of assisting industries such as this, I only trust that hon. members may give close attention to it when it comes before them for consideration. There is no doubt that if this Bill should come into force the Government will give more consideration to the manufacture of agricultural implements. I will be in accord with them if the Government will take on this work. I am confident in my own mind that it would be a matter of impossibility for any firm to manufacture agricultural implements to any degree in Western Australia. We were told three years ago when this question was raised that there was going to be a factory started at Victoria Park.

What has been done there to-day? Has a harvester been manufactured in Western Australia or have strippers been manufactured? Even winnowers which were being made some years ago are not being made here now. The time has arrived, having found that private enterprise do not manufacture these implements here, when the State should step in and derive benefits from the establishment of such an industry. To prove that profits are to be derived from the manufacture of agricultural implements, I might read to members a few questions which were put to a representative of a large firm of implement manufacturers in the other States, and the answers which he gave. After having been questioned on several matters regarding the manufacture of agricultural implements, these questions were put to him and answered as follows:—

You said that the manufacturers in the Eastern States would not allow new manufactures to spring up here?—They would not if they could possibly help it.

Do you think that the Government should take the matter in hand?—They are the only people who could do anything, I think, as regards starting.

Do you think there would be a desire on the part of the importer from the East to prevent the establishment of such industries here?—I think there would. I do not think they would allow an opposition firm to start here if they could possibly prevent it; it would affect them very much. At present Western Australia is, I suppose, one of the best markets they have outside their own.

Do you think that manufacturers starting here would have to face dumping?—I think so. Rather than lose the trade here the Eastern manufacturers would do as much dumping as they possibly could. They would get all their surplus machines down to a low rate. These were questions put and the answers given by the representative of a large firm of agricultural implement manufacturers. It shows, to my mind, that it is the intention of those in the Eastern States to retain at all costs the manufacture of the implements which are re-

quired for Western Australia. Only the other day, in reading the *Daily News* I think it was, I saw it pointed out that there are in the Eastern States close on 10,000 men engaged in manufacture for Western Australia; and I maintain that if private enterprise will not start in Western Australia, then it is the duty of the Government to get those 10,000 workmen in Western Australia to carry on the manufacture of the implements here. I maintain that the Ministry have been lag-gard in this direction. True, they got a Bill passed last session to provide for the granting of money for the purposes of agricultural machinery, and I pointed out then to the Minister that this might mean the making of a few ploughs but it would not increase the industry. For years past manufacturers here have been making ploughs and harrows, but we want the larger machines, and we want the hundreds of thousands of pounds that are being sent out of this State for implements manufactured elsewhere. There is another matter I wish to refer to, and that is the settlement which has been known as Tammin or Yorkrakine. I am very much disappointed in the Minister for Lands regarding settlements such as this one. We cannot get beyond the fact that the Minister gave a definite promise that if the settlement at Tammin turned out successfully he would increase the area and open up other settlements on the same system.

The Minister for Lands: I said to make other settlements possible.

Mr. ANGWIN: That might have been an afterthought, but I will not contradict the Minister. I will say, however, that was the belief not only of myself but of a large number of men who were anxious to take up land under these conditions. Not only on one occasion but on several occasions I have seen statements made by the Minister with regard to the Tammin settlement, and we have come to the conclusion that that settlement is going to turn out a success; in fact, it was very successful in its first year. With a good season this year there is no doubt that the success will be proved in its entirety. But the Minister has not kept his promise as we understood in regard to extending

this settlement, and I want to say that great dissatisfaction has existed among the men who put in applications at that time but who were not fortunate enough to be included among the first 50 who were chosen. I want the Minister to give this matter consideration because, as I have said previously here, I think that settlements such as this is are far better than paying the passages of people from oversea, because if you create a demand for labour, a legitimate demand, then there is not the least doubt in my mind that there will not be any necessity to pay the passages of the people to come here to find that labour. Where there is work and wages, men will follow, and if we use the money that we are paying the shipping companies to-day in the direction of assisting our own people to get on the land and help them over the first year or two, we will be sure of successful settlement. I hope that the Minister will also be successful with his Civil Service settlement, but while he is providing far better terms for these people than have been provided for those outside, I still find that a large number of the men are anxious to get on areas similar to those at Tammin. I was pleased last night to hear the Minister refer to the abattoirs he intended to construct at Fremantle. On two occasions we have passed sums on the Estimates for this work, but we have come to think at Fremantle that the abattoirs have been virtually forgotten, and now we see nothing of them in the Governor's Speech. We see that wheat sheds are to be erected, but abattoirs and freezing works are entirely omitted. However, no doubt last night the Minister for Lands encouraged us to some extent by saying that he intended to call tenders for these abattoirs in a few days. I hope the few days will not extend to a few years as has been the case in the past. I am pleased to see also that it is intended to build new railways. This development policy has always had my support; and no matter whether it is the present Government or those from this side of the House who occupy the Treasury bench, I hope the developmental policy which was inaugurated by this side of the House will

be carried out. The other day the member for Fremantle in a sneering way said he would not be mean and contemptible with regard to a railway on the South side of the Swan river; but there is no need for me to dwell much on a railway there, because it must become a recognised fact. It could not have been much more clearly put than it was put last night by the member for Balkatta, who pointed out the danger to the lives of the men in the Perth goods yard and other places on the existing railway. When we realise the development taking place in agriculture throughout the State, it is useless for us to depend upon the existing bottle-necked railway. At present all the traffic goes into a bottle-neck, and the existing railway must be relieved of some of the burdens cast upon it. I have not the least doubt that, although the Premier has not included the South-side railway in his policy or in the Governor's Speech, the time is not far distant when there will be no choice for the Ministry, but it will be compulsory for the development of the State that the line shall be an accomplished fact. No doubt thousands of pounds would be saved at the port with regard to the handling of wheat if that railway were built. We have solid foundations there, and grades that will do away with much of the machinery that is necessary when ships and wharves are on the same level. If the opinion of the Minister for Lands about the development of the country is to be fulfilled, then it will be unnecessary for me to ask members to join hands in forcing this railway, because it will force itself, it will be a matter of compulsion. If the Ministry desire that no deadlock shall take place in the near future in regard to dealing with railway traffic, all I can say is that the sooner they put the South-side railway in hand the better. Now, dealing with the question that I put to the Premier the other day, I wish to refer to the Fire Brigades Act passed last session. I do not think any member was of opinion last session that there would be the increased cost which has been brought about to the local authorities through the passing of the measure. Local governing bodies had been maintaining fire brigades for a con-

siderable time and we know the Government assisted them to a small extent, and I think I can safely say that it was thought generally by the local governing bodies that by bringing the insurance bodies in to pay their share the additional revenue derived in that way would meet the full cost of carrying on by the board to be created by the Act. But what do we find? In East Fremantle for some years we have managed an efficient fire brigade, and there have never been any complaints, and the brigade was costing the district only from £50 to £70 per annum. In fact this year, to the middle of July last, the total cost to the municipality was only £32. But now that municipality is billed by the Fire Brigades Board for a sum of £157 for the year. Not only this, but the insurance companies have also to pay £157, and in addition the Government have to bear their subsidy. Whereas the local authority was carrying on the fire brigade in that district at a cost of from £50 to £70 per annum, immediately on the creation of the new board payments have to be made for the same brigade amounting to £240 per annum. It is scandalous, I maintain. There is in the East Fremantle electorate a district called the Melville road district with an area of about 13,000 acres, and the whole of this area has to pay rates for the maintenance of the fire brigade. There are only about 93 houses in the area, but the subsidy required by the Fire Brigades Board is over £100 per annum. The reason advanced by the Colonial Secretary's Department for including this road district is that a portion of the area consists of 1,800 acres that might have protection from the East Fremantle fire station. I think I am safe in saying that the nearest house to the station or even to a telephone is a four-roomed wooden house a mile from the station; and if a fire took place, by the time a man ran a mile to the fire station and the brigade ran out to the fire, where would the house be? It shows the necessity for something being done to avoid this large waste of money. I do not know what the Government proportion will be this year. I know that for a year or two it has been a

couple of thousand pounds for assisting fire brigades. This year it will probably be £7,000 or £8,000. So it will be necessary for the Government to take steps to protect the funds of the State from a board like this. I was asked by the Minister who has charge of this matter why we did not apply for exemption for the Melville roads board, but prior to the gazetting of the notice including the Melville road district the Minister told me he was going into the whole question, as he realised that large areas of roads boards should not be brought under the board, but only certain portions where it was necessary. A provision was made in the Act for that.

The Premier: That was the reason why that section was inserted.

Mr. ANGWIN: I know it has not been done.

The Premier: The roads board had the option.

Mr. ANGWIN: They did not know anything about it. I asked the Minister to exempt us or to go into the question before the *Gazette* notices came out, but the roads board knew nothing until they got a notice from the Fire Brigades Board pointing out that they were gazetted as a fire district, and they immediately asked to be exempted. I ask the Premier, on the grounds given by the Fire Brigades Board, that there is a possibility of a little district called Palmyra, which has 23 houses and comprises an area of 1,353 acres, being affected, is it fair that this small area should have fire protection and that the whole 13,000 acres in the road district should contribute on an annual value to the Fire Brigades Board? I say it is almost robbery. As far as the roads boards are concerned it is going to wipe them out entirely. The large mileage of roads they have to keep in existence and for which they are now taxed as far as the Act will allow them, will have to get into disrepair for the very purpose of keeping up the Fire Brigades Board. It would be better for the Government and the roads boards to combine to insure all the houses in the district than to ask for contributions in the way they are required by the Fire Brigades Board. I notice the

Government intend to bring in again this session the Liquor Law Reform Bill. I think that if wine licenses had been included in the last measure the Government put through it would have been sufficient. That Bill provided that no licenses should be issued to hotels. I think wine licenses should have been included, and things could have continued as they are. I trust the Attorney General, when introducing this Bill, will take into consideration these wine licenses and provide a clause that if a person is licensed to sell wine it should not be in a fruit shop. I contend that where fruit shops and wine shops are combined they are a far greater curse than hotels in any district. They do not carry out the closing law as hotels do. Of course hotels are under stricter supervision from the police. I have been instrumental on more than one occasion in getting the early closing inspector to go to Fremantle on Saturday night to look after the wine and fruit shops and see that they are closed. It is a fact that long after the hotels are closed these places remain open. When a man selling fruit only kept open after hours, he was quickly seized on. Last Easter when the hotels were closed people were going in purchasing bottles of wine at these shops; I saw it myself; and we find these shops scattered about at every corner and between every hotel. I maintain the time has arrived when some steps should be taken to curtail these wine licenses to a large extent. It has been said they should be granted to open up an industry, but if we look in the shop windows we do not find that granting these licenses opens up very much of an industry as far as this State is concerned. In regard to the Licensing Bill I expected from the member for Fremantle a great difference of opinion about compensation as compared with myself, but to a large degree we are in accord. I realise that justice is a virtue as well as temperance, and it is necessary in dealing with a question such as this we should do justice to those who put their money into the buildings which are in existence. I must express my regret that the Government are not at the present time proceeding with the sewer-

age works at Fremantle in the manner we had expected. We are told, according to the Governor's Speech, that the work is going ahead, very rapidly as far as Perth is concerned, and in many parts of Perth the work is drawing to a completion, while in Fremantle, after having the principal sewerage works and the septic tank constructed, the work has practically ceased; the reticulation work or tributaries, which would make the service effective, are not being gone on with. This work should go on in conjunction with the other work; there is no use delaying the work at Fremantle. People want the work gone on with at once, and I hope it will be done. There is one matter I would like to refer to, dealing with the charity issued by the Government. I expected to see a very large decrease this year in the amount voted for charities owing to the old-age pension scheme having been brought into existence. I am afraid the old people of the State have not had that consideration in regard to old-age pensions which they are entitled to. Many cases have been brought under my notice in which great difficulty has been experienced by people in getting pensions under the Old-Age Pensions Act, and after a good deal of fighting and worry some have succeeded in getting a portion and others have been blocked entirely. I will give one instance, which I think I mentioned previously, to show that the Old-Age Pensions Act has not been administered in a way that it should be. An old man who has been a pioneer in the North-West, I believe he is known well to Ministers, received from the State Government 10s. a week, that was from the Charities Vote, and he also received some little rations, and a few months ago the Premier kindly put up a room for him to live in. When the old-age pension scheme came into force this man was told by the Charities Department that he must apply for an old-age pension so as to relieve the Government of the pension which they were paying him. The old man did so. The State Government had been charitable to this man in giving him rations as well as 10s. a week, but those in charge of the old-

age pensions scheme reduced the amount of pension payable to this man by 1s. 6d. a week because he was receiving rations. This old pioneer to-day is 92 years of age, and I am pleased to state that the Government officers saw the injustice, and they have paid this man 3s. a fortnight to make up the difference in the amount which the Federal Government pay. It is time, now that we realise our Charities Vote is not decreasing owing to the old-age pensions, that the Government should make some increase and see that the people are justly treated by the Federal Parliament. The Premier, when speaking to-night, referred to the Land Act previous to 1906, and he pointed out that large areas of land could be taken up under that Act. We cannot get away from the fact that the present Federal Government will have the possibility of removing the privileges that exist under our Land Act previous to 1906, because, according to a Bill which is to be passed by the Federal Government, those persons holding 30,000 or 40,000 acres of land will have to pay a fairly good land tax or subdivide their land. No doubt this will be of benefit to the State if some of the large areas are subdivided. I only want to say in conclusion that I trust the Treasurer, in bringing down his Loan Bill at the end of the session, will not only provide for the loan which he intends to redeem, but will also include an amount of money to carry out a work in the interests of the State, that is the building of a railway on the South side of the Swan river.

On motion by Mr. Scaddan, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.21 p.m.