

When the time comes I will endeavour to show that the building of that line is not only justifiable, but in the best interests of Western Australia, I again thank hon. members for the fairness which has characterised their criticism. I appreciate the manner in which they have discussed the Address-in-reply without displaying, as far as I have been able to see, the slightest party bias. I hope that that good feeling will continue to the end of the session, and that though we may differ on many questions, nothing will occur to disturb the good feeling which has existed between us all.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

ADJOURNMENT—SPECIAL.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 26th August.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 8.5 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 7th August, 1913.

	PAOR
Questions: Railway workman's train, Boulder ..	416
Railway construction, Bolgart extension ..	416
Address-in-reply, seventh day, conclusion.	415

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY WORKMAN'S TRAIN, BOULDER.

Mr. MUNSIE asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Has he received an estimate of the cost of running a workman's train to Boulder Block? 2, By whom was the estimate prepared? 3, What was the amount of the estimate?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, The Commissioner of Railways. 3, To run a passenger service from Kalgoorlie to the mines would necessitate the laying down of an additional line and making alterations to certain of the mine sidings, which is estimated to cost £4,079. It is estimated that six trains per day would be required; this would mean an approximate expenditure of £50 per week, exclusive of interest on cost of alterations first mentioned. If 200 persons travelled daily (which is a most liberal estimate), at an average fare of 1s. 6d. per week, the revenue would be £15 per week.

QUESTION—RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION, BOLGART EXTENSION.

Mr. MOORE asked the Minister for Works: 1, Does he intend to continue the Bolgart Railway so as to bring the Ducklin mining settlers within reach of railway conveniences? 2, Does he realise that this settlement, and a large one at that, is more than 18 miles from any railway? 3, The surveyors being now on the spot, does he intend to order the continuance of the survey?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, 2, and 3, Further extension of the Bolgart line will be considered when the present authorised extension is under construction.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON (Williams-Narrogin): One cannot but regret the tone the hon. members for Sussex (Hon. Frank Wilson), and Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) attempted to impart to this debate in their remarks, and I think one can congratulate the other 48 members of this House on having refused to follow on similar lines. For my part, I appreciate the action of those members of the Opposition who said they did not endorse the innuendoes and insinuations which the members for Northam and

Sussex saw fit to fling at the Ministry, a Ministry which has the confidence of the people of the country. I think we have arrived at a time when throughout Western Australia the people are prepared to give credit for good intentions and honest work to the members of this Cabinet.

Mr. Underwood : The leader of the Opposition will do well to take a leaf out of the Premier's book.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : I hope we will now settle down to that work the country has sent us here to carry out, without bearing any more such speeches delivered by those two gentlemen to whom I have referred, speeches which, to my mind, cause Parliament to be looked on unfavourably by the people of the State. I am not going to touch on any of the charges made against Ministers but I do wish to refer to one point in connection with the Eucla land which has not been given proper publicity. A lot has been said about the Eucla land grab, but what is the tenure that Mr. Scaddan possesses ? The land is 40 miles from a railway and if ever it is required for settlement the Government have the absolute right to resume it on giving one year's notice to Mr. Scaddan in writing. At the end of one year the Government can take possession of the whole of that land and Mr. Scaddan gets no compensation except the value of the improvements he has effected, if any. So that it will be seen, when these leases were granted to Mr. Scaddan, he got no security of tenure for the land beyond one year. If it is ever required, and I hope it will be, for closer settlement, the hon. gentleman has to walk off it as soon as he gets a year's notice in writing. I hope this fact will be remembered whenever people refer in future to the Eucla land transaction. I regret that the Government have not seen fit to have day sittings of Parliament because I think now that members are paid for attending to their Parliamentary duties, and now that the majority of members do not have any other business to attend to, at any rate, those on this side of the House, I think the proceedings would be far more effec-

tively carried out if we were able to sit more during the day time.

The Premier : What about the Ministers getting through their work ?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : In Victoria where there is a Conservative Government in power, on one day—Thursdays—Parliament meets at 10 o'clock in the morning and sits until 4.30 in the afternoon. If we were to follow a similar procedure it would give those members living in the country a chance of getting home to their constituents. I believe also some of the gentlemen on the Treasury bench held this view when they were in Opposition. The most distinguishing feature of this debate has been the absolute pessimism and want of faith in the country which has been expressed in what I can only term the wails of the members of the Opposition. Since they got on that side of the House they can see nothing but ruin staring the country in the face. Sometime ago the member for Northam was known throughout this country as a breezy optimist but to-day he is nothing of the kind. He was a breezy optimist when he was drawing £1,300 a year from the public purse and when he was in the position which enabled him to divide up a fine repurchased estate amongst the members of his own family.

Mr. Monger : That is quite enough about that.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Since he has got on to the Opposition bench he claims that the country is going to ruin. Perhaps there is some reason for members of the Liberal party to feel that their party at any rate is doomed, because since last election another body has come into existence. I refer to the Farmers' and Settlers' Association, which in the farming districts promises to swallow up the whole of the Liberal party; in fact, I think that association has pretty well settled the fate of many of the gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Male : You included.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : I am quite content to leave my services to the judgment of the electors of that great district I represent, and I do not think the mem-

ber for Kimberley knows their views. At any rate when he was a member of the Ministry in this House it was a Ministry that neglected that district in a way that I believe it will never be neglected again. It was a Ministry which refused to build those railways in the Narrogin district, which were recommended for special priority of construction by the professional advisers of the Government, namely, the Wickepin-Merredin and Yilliminning-Kondinin railways. They were a Ministry who refused to build the railways in the Narrogin district that had been recommended for special priority of consideration by the professional advisers of the Government, which railways, I am glad to say since the Labour party came into office are in course of construction and one of them is very nearly completed.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They ought all to be completed.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The hon. member never even authorised the Yilliminning-Kondinin railway. During the recent Federal election campaign the tightness of money in Western Australia was ascribed to the Labour party being in power, but I have had an opportunity of visiting other States lately, and I find that the money is equally tight in other States of the Commonwealth, and perhaps particularly so in those States where there are Liberal or Conservative Governments in office. For instance, we find, and it is an unfortunate thing to have to say, that the Premier of South Australia was not able to obtain in London the money which he went there to borrow, also that the Premier of Victoria was not even able to obtain on the London market all the money he required in order to convert certain loans falling due. In those circumstances we in Western Australia, a State that certainly offers greater advantages to the money lender since we have a more economical and careful Government in power, ought to feel proud that the Premier was able to go to London and successfully float a loan for two million pounds. We wish to congratulate the Premier on the success that attended his ef-

forts in regard to this loan, and also on the highly capable way in which he represented Western Australia and the views and aspirations of the people here when he was in the capital of our Empire. Despite the pessimism of the members of the Opposition as to the future of this country, I say that this country is all right and that the agricultural districts of this State were never in a more solid position than they are to-day, because to-day production is higher than it ever was in the history of the State. We find this year that the production of wheat was 9,168,594 bushels as compared with 4,358,594 bushels in 1912. Of course, 1912 will be remembered as the year in which we had an unfortunate failure of crops in the dry portions of the wheat belt. The oat production this year was 2,105,812 bushels as compared with 961,138 bushels in 1912. In regard to the clearing of land also it is shown that under the capable administration of the present Minister for Lands the policy of getting a lot of land taken up at any cost and by any means has been superseded by a policy of genuine assistance and proper help to the producers already on the land. As a result, the area of cropped land increased in 1913 to almost 1,200,000 acres as compared with 1,072,653 acres in 1912, and only 855,024 acres in February, 1911, the year before the Labour party came into power. So that it will be seen that in two years under the Labour Administration there has been an increase of over 300,000 acres in the area of land under crop; and not only that, but clearing is continuing and farmers are adopting better methods. There is a far greater area of fallowed land under cultivation this year, with the result that the return per acre will be better than ever it was in the past. It is satisfactory to note also as a sign of the progress that our leading industry, agriculture, is making, that the average wheat yield increased this year in a favourable season to 11.56 bushels per acre as compared with 7.12 bushels in 1912, when unfortunately we had a disastrous season in the wheat belt. The average return of oats also increased last harvest to 16.61 bushels per acre as compared with 10.10 bushels per acre for the

previous year. Western Australia is now taking her place gradually as a great wheat producing country, and this State will be in the proud place of being the premier wheat producer amongst the States of the Commonwealth in a few years. In the season 1910 we exported wheat to the value of £406,326, in 1911 the wheat export was worth £386,922, and in 1912, owing to the failure in the dry districts, the value of wheat exported decreased to £100,148. This year already we have exported wheat to the value of £671,276, and the tremendous increase this year under the sympathetic administration of the Labour Government is but a small thing compared to what we may expect in a few years' time. I confidently believe that this State will be the greatest wheat producing portion of the Commonwealth. Particularly may we look to this distinction coming soon if the present season and the following one turn out as well as they already promise to do. Land selection is proceeding on a very satisfactory basis. It is true that the land boom in the dry areas has fizzled out. The figures show that in 1911 under conditional purchase 1,956,499 acres was selected; in 1912, 1,728,041 acres, and for the first half of this year 612,162 acres. But although there has been a decrease in the actual area of selection, I wish to say that the records of the Lands Department show that there has also been a decrease in the number of forfeitures, and that ought to be taken into consideration when these figures are gauged. I say that to-day the settlers go on the land under far better conditions than ever before in the history of Western Australia. To-day the Minister for Lands requires districts to be proved before unsuspecting people are sent to them; to-day water is provided before land is thrown open for selection; a railway is approved and surveyed, and if the line does not go within 15 miles of any area of land that area is withheld from selection.

Hon. J. Mitchell: You look at the maps.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I have looked at the maps, and I am able to say that I only found one railway route on each map, whereas we had maps issued by the hon. member when he was Minister for

Lands which showed as many as five railway routes for one particular line. I refer to the Wickepin-Merredin line, in connection with which the late Government undertook five different surveys and were afraid to face the responsibility of deciding which of the five would be built, and that was why the line was not built by them.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Well, the wrong line has been built now.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON. I am sure that whichever line was selected by the present Government the hon. member would say that it was the wrong one, and it is certain that many people would be dissatisfied, no matter which of the five routes was adopted. But as a member of the select committee which inquired into the route of this railway, and obtained evidence which perhaps has not come under the notice of every member of the House, I wish to say that the right route was selected for that particular line. It is a trunk line that is to connect the whole of the southern part of the State with the great goldfields markets, and I am glad to say that the present Government chose for that trunk railway the shortest and most direct route, and refused to penalise the producers of the South for all time by adding 10 or 12 miles to the route to the goldfields market. I wish to say, too, that under the present policy in the Lands Department the valuations of the officers who see the land are adopted in regard to the price of that land. I still believe that in many cases the valuations are too high, but I am glad that the system by which 3s. or 4s. was added to the land by a "breezy optimist" sitting in a comfortable office in Perth has ended for ever. Also roads are now provided throughout the new districts where land is about to be thrown open.

Mr. Broun: That was so under the Liberals.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They were very slow about it. The Liberal Government certainly did adopt the policy a few years before they went out of office, but not until the member for Northam became a Minister. I would like to compare the present policy which I have outlined with the system obtaining

under the administration of the member for Northam when revenue, the extortion of money from the settlers, was put before any other consideration. The settler was sent on the land without water being provided; he was sent out then without railways being provided for. Promises of railways were made, but the member for Northam did not deliver the goods. Even to-day the present Government are hard at work building railways promised by their predecessors, but never constructed or provided for.

Mr. Heitmann: A good many of his settlers did not worry about the water; they were in the Terrace.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That is quite correct. A few years ago unsuspecting new arrivals from the goldfields, the Eastern States, and elsewhere, were sent on the land in dry areas, although it had never been proved that that land was fit for settlement, as I believe it ultimately will be proved. At that time they were told by the hon. member for Northam that it was not necessary to possess any capital other than brave hearts and stout arms to go on the land in this country. We had fortunately in Western Australia at that time as Director of Agriculture a gentleman of great knowledge and experience in the settlement of wheat areas. I refer to Professor Lowrie, and that gentleman contradicted the late Minister for Lands publicly and openly and refused to recommend people to go on the land unless they had a capital of £300. I am sure that the member for Katanning will agree with me that most men who go on the land in this country ought to have that amount of capital. The new settler now has water provided for him, whereas in the member for Northam's time he would have to cart his water 25 miles.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We put in the dams.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The hon. member for Northam just got out of office in time, when the dry season was arriving and left the Government with the responsibility of providing seed wheat and water for all the people whom he had put on the land without proper provision being made for them there. The present Government were faced with the position

of having to hold over thousands of pounds of rents and I am glad to say they did so, and they are also holding over Agricultural Bank interests due by people outback who are unable to meet their obligations. This Government has a policy of assisting genuine settlement on the land in this country, which it is carrying out to the satisfaction of the people of the agricultural districts, and I am glad the Minister for Lands is holding over from present selection the one million acres of surveyed land, much of which was surveyed before he came into office, until its value for settlement can be established and water can be provided throughout the new areas, and until it can be definitely decided both where and when the railways to serve those areas are to be built. In regard to the administration of the Lands Department, it is apparent that the decreased selection must reflect itself on the district land offices, that there is a little less work for the officers there to do. I take it, therefore, this is an opportune time to make the district land and survey offices complete and to decentralise, giving district officers more power than they have in regard to the approval of applications. Where applications are lodged for surveyed blocks and the price is fixed, and where the land is vacant, and the district surveyor knows it to be vacant, I do not see why the officers in the district offices cannot approve of the application if it is formal, that is on behalf of the Minister. At present the district offices are only receiving offices, not offices of record; you cannot get information even as to the absolute amount paid on any selection in the district offices. I do think that a lot of books and records should be transferred from Perth to the district offices where they have capable officers in charge; a great deal of duplication and unnecessary work would be avoided if that were done. The high price put on the land prior to the advent of this Government to power is still giving great concern in the agricultural districts and I say definitely, and with some knowledge of what I am talking about, that it is impossible for

the man with limited means to go on the land in this country and at the end of three years have to pay a rental of up to £75 a year on 1,000 acres.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: In many cases it will have to be reduced.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, in many cases it will have to be reduced. A lot of the extra price was put on the land when the late Minister for Lands was in office, and the price was thus increased above the recommendations of the officers who inspected and valued the land, and to-day the settlers are not paying the land rents and cannot hope to do so situated as many of them are 20 miles from existing railways. I was pleased to hear the Minister for Lands promise, in his speech the other night, that there would be a reclassification of land on the basis of average seasons. This ought to be done quickly and where the department made a mistake in over-valuing the land the settlers should not be charged the reclassification fee. It is a fair thing perhaps to collect the fee from the settler when he applies for reclassification, and where the reclassification is an individual one, but if the settler's claim is upheld, and the price of the block is reduced, the settler should have the fee for reclassification refunded to him, and I hope the Minister for Lands will bear this in mind. I suggest, and strongly urge, that the Government should consider the advisability of increasing the time over which the payment of land rents should extend. The settlers in the new areas are quite unable to pay more than 6d. per acre per annum land rent. It is like wringing blood money out of them in many cases to find it at the present time. Where the land is valued at more than 10s. an acre the term of the lease should be increased beyond 20 years, and only 6d. per annum charged for the whole of the term of the lease. This would mean, in the case where the land was valued at 15s. per acre, that the settler would have 30 years in which to pay for it at 6d. per acre per annum, and although it would mean a little delay to the Government in collecting the money, still they would be sure of getting it, which they are not

sure of at the present time. The settlers cannot afford to pay it at the present time. They are facing great difficulties, struggling in the back blocks to stay upon their holdings. It really means, if the Government accept this suggestion, they will be putting the principle of encouraging bona fide land settlement above revenue consideration, and that is what I claim they ought to do.

The Minister for Lands: What would you do in the case of a man who had bought at 15s. and sold to another person at £1 or 25s.?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If that is done and the difference in price is not accounted for by improvements on the land, I would consent gladly to a provision in the lease that on transfer the conditions should be altered and the concession for future time withdrawn. That would be a workable proposition, I think, and while there may be odd cases of that kind I do not know of many. Look at the thousands of men on the land who cannot meet, and who are not meeting, their obligations to the Government to-day. The fact is this: men cannot pay more than 6d. per acre per year, and the Government in the early stages of settlement are lucky if they get it. It has been suggested by evilly disposed persons that the Labour party are responsible for the present depression in the agricultural areas, but I say this, that the worst set-back the agricultural districts in Western Australia ever had in regard to progress was when the hon. member for Northam put up the price of land far from existing settlement from ten shillings to £1 and 25s. per acre.

Mr. George: Did he not do it on the advice of his officers?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No, in many cases he increased the price contrary to their advice.

Mr. George: That should be looked into.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, it is a thing that should be looked into, and in many cases it has had attention, and in some cases the Minister has made the proper reduction where it has occurred.

Mr. George: More power to him.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am glad the member for Murray-Wellington admits that. I say we would have had a lot more progress on the part of the settlers going on the land if they had been able to spend the whole of their capital in the improvement of their holdings instead of having to pay such exorbitant rents to the Government. I wish to remind members that our splendid Land Act Amendment Bill, which was passed through this Chamber last session, provided for helping settlers in this respect. Under that measure, which I can only describe as one of the best that has passed in this Chamber since I have been here, it was provided that every settler should have his land for the first three years rent free; on poison lands, which to-day practically are withheld from selection through the member for Northam abolishing the poison lease clauses of the Land Act, our Bill provided that every selector should have the land 10 years rent free; in both cases under compulsory conditions of improvement.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Would you make the conditions retrospective?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Bill gave them the opportunity to bring the land under these conditions. I think it was a very bad thing for Western Australia that the Bill met the fate which it did in another place. I hope the Government will reintroduce these two proposals this session. For my part I would like to see the leasehold carried into effect, but if another place will not permit that to be done, let us have these two amendments to the existing law. Even if the freehold is granted eventually, give the settlers the land rent free for the first three years, and 10 years on poison leases. The member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) knows full well that the Upper House could have accepted these two amendments and given the settlers this relief, if they did not wish to accept the principle of the non-alienation of land.

Mr. A. E. Piesse: Why not apply the conditions to the present condition of affairs.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I say, why not apply them to the present conditional purchase leases which carry freehold

rights, for at present they have no relief at all. At present poison on vacant Crown lands is a menace to the people who have settled in these districts. I have to congratulate the Minister for Lands and Agriculture on the establishment of the State agricultural machinery works. He has told us that an up-to-date plant has been erected at North Fremantle. This action of the Government shows a very genuine desire on their part to assist the man on the land and relieve him from the operations of those gentlemen who, for so many years, have charged him exorbitant prices for his machinery.

Mr. S. Stubbs: It will never be a success.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It will be, and the hon. member for Wagin, in a few years' time, will be claiming credit on the hustings for the establishment of these works. He will be saying, "I was a member of Parliament when this was done," and I venture to assert that when that gentleman goes to Wagin, he will not be heard saying that this work of the Government will not be a success.

Mr. S. Stubbs: It will be the same success as the butchers' shops.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They are all right: I hope the Government recognise that in establishing machinery works they have to compete with great aggregations of capital, and it is, therefore, necessary for these works to be the most complete and up-to-date that can be had.

Mr. George: I hope they will sell the parts cheaper; that is the greatest robbery I know.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They will do that. This work will be pushed on so that the farmers will have the best agricultural machinery, on good terms, as soon as possible. I am proud to be associated with a Government which is extending practical assistance to the farmer in this splendid way. The expert who has charge of these works, Mr. Davies, recommended that the distributing depot for the Great Southern Railway should be in a very suitable spot for that purpose, and I need hardly say that I hope the Government will accept his advice in this particular connection.

Mr. George: What about Bunbury?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Mr. Davies recommended that the distributing depot should be at Narrogin, the Ballarat of Western Australia, the capital of the Great Southern districts.

The Minister for Lands: A very good suggestion, too.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I commend that suggestion to the quick approval of the Government. That expert is a disinterested and reliable officer, and since he says Narrogin is the most suitable spot for these distributing works, I am reminding the Government of the fact. I desire to see that depot established at Narrogin, because the expert and professional officer says it is the most suitable in the interests of the people of the Great Southern districts.

Mr. George: The hon. member's friend Mr. Thomas says Bunbury is the best place.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I stick to the expert's opinion on this matter against that of any hon. member, and I believe the Government will in this case, as they have already done in regard to the establishment of the works. Another matter which I understand is engaging the attention of the Government, and one which is of immense importance to this State, is the bulk handling of wheat. I have had an opportunity lately of seeing a little, from the point of view of the outsider, of the mistakes made in the Eastern States, admittedly, in regard to this matter. The Victorian Government propose to spend £1,500,000 when they can raise it, on a scheme of establishing elevators and the bulk system of handling throughout Victoria. New South Wales has lately had an expert from Chicago, Mr. Burrell, reporting on a comprehensive system for bulk handling throughout that great State. I was told that this scheme would probably run into £2,000,000, and that the country has to face it. In conversation with the expert, Mr. Burrell, and other gentlemen interested in this matter, I found a unanimous consensus of opinion that the time when Western Australia ought to adopt a policy of elevators and go in for the bulk handling of wheat is now, before vested interests are built

up any more in favour of the present system. At present we could do it for comparatively little cost. I am sorry the Minister for Lands did not see his way to adopt a suggestion I made that Mr. Burrell should visit Western Australia, and report as to the exact expense of instituting the bulk system of handling wheat in Western Australia.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The cost seems pretty large in the other States.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes, because they have left it so long, but we are really at the commencement of our wheat export trade, and it could be done much cheaper now; and although it does mean a large capital expenditure, we have to face that. The saving made to producers in relieving them of the cost of bags and most of the cost of handling, would very soon cover the whole of the initial cost of the scheme. I have it, however, from the Minister for Lands, that the matter is under the consideration of the Government. I am pleased to hear that a committee is reporting on the question. Under the present condition of affairs the farmers are being absolutely robbed in connection with the purchase of bags; now is the time when we should initiate the modern system of bulk handling, which has been approved throughout Canada and the United States, where wheat production takes place on a scale which we eventually hope to attain.

Mr. George: You have to get the ships.

[*Mr. Male took the Chair.*]

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There is no objection much from the point of view of the ships. The report of the commission in Victoria says that is a very small objection. There is another matter in connection with the Department of Agriculture which I wish to bring before the notice of the Minister for Agriculture. One of the grave and calamitous mistakes made in connection with the Department of Agriculture by the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell) was the abolition of the *Journal of Agriculture*, although I think the cost was only £300 a year. Under the proper management it would have cost nothing, as advertisements would have paid for it. We have a num-

ber of highly paid and capable officers in our Department of Agriculture, the various agricultural commissioners, and yet the hon. member for Northam broke off all connection between the department and the settlers when he abolished the *Journal of Agriculture*.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Are not bulletins much better?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They are not one-tenth as useful to the farmer as the monthly paper.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Can you name one really good article in the *Journal*?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It was an admirable publication and reminded the settler, month by month, what to do, and helped him in every way. Throughout the agricultural districts to-day people objected to this publication having been stopped.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What was the circulation?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do not know; but if I had been in the place of the hon. member for Northam at the time, it would have had a circulation equivalent to the number of farmers in this State. It was his fault if that *Journal* was not to be found on every farm in Western Australia. In New South Wales they give away 15,000 copies of their journal every month. Even the Hawkesbury Agricultural College can issue a college journal, and yet the hon. member for Northam thinks that in Western Australia, where we have special climatic conditions to deal with and special conditions of settlement and agricultural problems in all our new areas, we should be deprived of the *Journal of Agriculture*.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Well, I move that it be reinstated.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Then I second the motion. Coming to the question of expenditure for the development of agriculture, I am pleased that under the present Minister that it is increasing at a satisfactory rate. For the 12 months ended the 30th June, 1911, the total expenditure on the development of agriculture was £266,405.

Hon. J. Mitchell: It is not what you spend, but what you get for it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We are getting better value than ever for our money. For the year ended 30th June, 1912, the expenditure had increased to £451,827, while for the 12 months ended 30th June last, the total was no less than £575,184, so it will be seen that in the first year of Labour Administration the increase was £185,422, and in the second year £308,679.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Whatever did they do with it? They must have bought the steamers out of that money.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: No; it was spent on abattoirs, immigration, and other things of that kind. The hon. member knows what it is expended on. In regard to railway construction I wish to say we need more and more railways, because I am sure hon. members are agreed that the future prosperity of this country depends upon quickly opening up our agricultural areas and supplying the settlers now there with the long-needed lines. For the year ended June 30th, 1910, we spent £454,121 on railways construction and improvements to existing railways; for the year ended 30th June, 1911, the amount was £747,748, and for the year ended 30th June, 1912, this amount was almost doubled, and according to the *Statistical Register* was £1,316,800.

Hon. J. Mitchell: More money—less railways.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Most of the big railways built by the present Government are not yet thrown open for traffic; although the Wickepin-Merredin line is almost finished it has not yet been thrown open for traffic. The hon. member for Northam, by interjection, is seeking to deprive the Government of the credit of having built that and other lines. During the first year the Government were in power they spent double what the previous Government spent and got much better value for the money. The Minister for Works can show us that the record for the first year has been eclipsed. The Wongan and Mullewa lines are nearing completion. Of course the people are singing out for more railways, and I would like to see many more authorised and built. But when we remember that we are a population of 313,428 persons and that at the end of last year we had a

public debt of £23,624,205, with a net indebtedness of £77 5s. 2d. per head—when we remember these facts, we can be proud of what successive Governments have done and are doing in regard to opening up and developing this country.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What is the rate of progress to-day?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Our Governments are doing more than double what you did, and I am proud of it. I hope they will in the near future do four times as much. At the same time I wish to say the rate of progress made in regard to one particular railway is not satisfying me. I need hardly say I refer to the Yilliminning-Kondinin railway.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): What district is that in?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is in the districts represented by the member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) and myself. I wish to say it is nearly two years since this railway was authorised. On the 14th June, 1912, a deputation on the subject waited on the Minister for Works, and that gentleman then promised that the railway would be started not later than March, 1913. I need hardly say, because the House has accepted the facts, that this is a railway to open up a new and great province for Western Australia. The promise of the Minister for Works was made on behalf of the Premier. It was a deputation to the Premier, but he was called away and so the Minister for Works took the deputation, and the promise that hon. gentleman made at that time is reported in the *West Australian* on the 15th June, 1912, as follows:—

He could tell the deputation, however, that the construction of the railway would be commenced by next March. He reckoned that when they did get a start they would go along at the rate of seven miles per month.

The Minister then went on to say—

Your line is being passed quicker than any other line passed by Parliament. It will be a record, leaving out the Bullfinch line. I have told you the railway will be started by March, and if things go along well we will be able to make a commencement earlier.

The promise was a definite one made in the Premier's office on behalf of the Government, and as such it deserves to be faithfully observed. Relying on that promise, the men in the district have put thousands of acres under crop, but how they are to get their harvest away I do not know, unless the construction of the line from now onwards is pushed on with much faster than has been done. The promise was that the line should be started last March and pushed on at the rate of seven miles a month, but I am sorry to have to admit that although the material is on the ground not a mile of that railway has been laid yet. It is a serious matter to these people, and I do hope the Government will take it into consideration.

The Minister for Lands: Getting the material there is part of the work.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: But you can hardly call that starting the railway. The promise was that after March the line would be built at the rate of seven miles per month. The people have put their crops in and are relying on the railway to take the harvest away. The Minister for Railways has visited the district lately and he knows the people will have ruin thrust upon them unless the railway comes to their rescue.

The Minister for Railways: But if it is finished in time for the harvest?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That will be alright, but I claim that the Government ought to make a special case of this seeing that they promised definitely that the thing would be done.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): It has been started.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: What about the seven miles per month?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The material is getting there.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That is not a relief to the people.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: By building a mile a day they will average that.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If I could get an assurance from the Minister that this mile a day would be averaged I would be satisfied, but there is grave dissatisfaction in the district, and I am beginning to fear that the railway will not be finished in

time to take the harvest. It is a serious matter, and I hope the Government will see that their promise, on which these people have relied so implicitly, is honoured.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Was a promise given as to the time it should be completed?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: We had the promise that the line would be started not later than March, 1913, and that it would go on at the rate of seven miles per month. Here five months have gone by, and that railway ought to be out 35 miles.

The Minister for Lands: No. He did not say seven miles every month.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That was promised. I have just read it from the *West Australian*. I am pleased to learn from an answer made by the Minister yesterday that he proposes to extend the Yilliminning-Kondinin railway in order to serve the settlers east of Emu Hill. These people are not in my electorate, but I know there is a great population there, and I would urge that the pushing on of the work between Yilliminning and Kondinin is the more necessary, in view of the Government's promise to continue it onwards.

Mr. Underwood: Which is the more necessary, that or the Esperance railway?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There is no comparison. The Yilliminning-Kondinin railway is an authorised public work which Parliament has approved, and the Government have promised to put in hand, and have actually started, and I want it pushed on with. When the Esperance railway is approved by Parliament I hope construction will follow approval in that case a little more quickly than it has in this instance. There is another railway to which I would like to draw the attention of the Government, and that is the project of a railway from Narrogin to Armadale. The Premier has promised to have a permanent survey of this railway undertaken. That is a great step forward, but the construction of the line is also required.

Mr. Underwood: There is no wheat there.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Yes; it is good wheat land. But apart from that, this railway is required to shorten the distance between the Great Southern and Fremantle by 57 miles. It will mean a saving of freight over 57 miles on the wheat production of the whole of the Great Southern district in reaching the port of export, Fremantle. This is also required to serve existing and future settlement within the area under review, in which there are no less than 761,000 acres of good land, a large proportion of which is owned by the Crown. These are the Advisory Board's figures. Half of this area is owned by the people of this country.

Mr. Turvey: Do you not think the line should go to Brookton?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The two projects are not antagonistic, since the Advisory Board recommends a connection with Brookton also, and I hope they will be carried out on the Advisory Board's recommendation. I would like to say also that this railway is required to relieve the traffic on the northern portion of the Great Southern railway, to provide shorter routes to a port, and to serve the whole of the wheat areas lying easterly from Narrogin and Wickepin. The Minister for Railways is aware of the great congestion which takes place each summer on the Great Southern. At the rate at which our wheat production is increasing it is impossible for the existing railway to cope with the traffic. On these grounds I hope the railway will soon be built. In the meantime, I am encouraged by the Premier's promise that a permanent survey will be made. I would urge the Minister for Works to continue his present policy of serving the agricultural districts with water supplies. The experience of the last two or three years has shown us more than ever how necessary it is that this should be done on a comprehensive scale right through the whole of our wheat districts. I hope that, this session, Parliament will approve the suggestion for a Public Works Committee. This has been before Parliament several times, and I take this opportunity of thanking the Minister for Lands for the

promise he made at Williams that the question of railway facilities for the Quindanning district should be referred to that committee as soon as it was appointed. There is a very big settlement there. A few months ago the Premier went to Wandering, and was surprised to find there one of the oldest settlements, neglected and never yet served by a railway. A similarly deserving settlement is to be found at Quindanning. The Agricultural Bank has done good work during the past few months, but I hope that an even more liberal policy will be adopted. I understand the Government propose to add another million to the capital of the Bank, and this, I am sure, Parliament will agree to very readily. It is satisfactory to know that last year over £630,000 was advanced to our producers through the Agricultural Bank, as compared with £285,000, which was the highest amount the Liberal Government ever advanced to our settlers through this institution in any one year. The Education Department are doing good work in providing schools in the new districts and I am pleased to know that the secondary schools of the State are to become free after the end of this year. I hope the Minister, whom I know is sympathetic with the proposal, will soon find himself in a position financially to supply the children at State Schools with books and stationery free of cost. In regard to the local courts, I trust that the Attorney General will introduce a Bill to extend their powers. I think the Minister promised that our local courts should have their jurisdiction extended up to an amount of £500 instead of £100, which is the limit with which they can deal to-day. In the Great Southern districts and other parts of the State we have highly competent magistrates. Mr. Burt is a man who has the confidence of the people and the people desire that he should have power to deal with cases up to £500 in value, instead of litigants in these cases having to come to Perth. As regards the regulations that have been made against the sale of patent medicines, I am sorry to say I do not see eye to eye with the Government

on this subject. I regret that a regulation has been made which is going to prevent household remedies of proved and standard value from being used by people out-back who are unable to reach a doctor. That is the effect which one of these regulations is having.

The Minister for Lands: No, it does not prevent the people from getting them.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Simply because people owning valuable formulæ will not deposit them with the Public Health Department they are not to be allowed to sell their medicines.

The Minister for Lands: What about the manufacturers of explosives? They lodge their formulæ.

Mr. Dwyer: Why should they object to deposit their formulæ?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Perhaps the hon. member for Perth might know that in France there are monks who have a formulæ of certain liqueurs. One of these was sold for a sum of £100,000, or some such amount.

Mr. Dwyer: But you were talking of something which ministers to the requirements of the people.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Where a person has a valuable formula whether for a patent medicine for the people or a liquor which the wealthy wish to drink, that person will not give it away.

The Minister for Lands: That is not the point. It is to prevent trading under false pretences.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I am with the Government in that and I am with the Government in the effort to stop quackery, because I consider there is no one worse than a person who will wring blood-money out of sick people by false pretences.

Mr. Heitmann: Should not the Government demand what is right from them?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The Government have overlooked the inter-State aspect of this question.

Mr. Heitmann: The inter-State conference supports it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the inter-State commission can put the thing into order throughout the Commonwealth then it will be all right. To-day, however, advertisements are still appearing in the

Press—I have a bundle of them before me now—and every one of them tells the people how they can get these patent medicines as before except that they have to send their money out of the country and the local trader is deprived of the benefit of it.

Mr. Heitmann: Let them send it out of the State.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: If the regulation is made operative throughout the Commonwealth there might be some reason for the argument, but at present it is not preventing the sale of these medicines and there are widespread complaints from people who have been accustomed to using standard remedies for years that they are now unable to get them locally.

Mr. Heitmann: What do you call a standard remedy, Warner's safe cure?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There are a number of infants' foods which are prohibited under this regulation.

Mr. Heitmann: Which are absolutely cruel and murderous; the worst of all forms.

The Minister for Mines: You are anticipating your troubles.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: These foods are included in the prohibition, and there are mothers in the back blocks who are unable in many cases to get fresh milk, and have brought up children successfully on patent foods of approved value, and they should be allowed to use them to-day.

Mr. Heitmann: They can get suitable foods to-day.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: This regulation may suit the wealthy people and the people in the towns who have doctors at hand all the time, but in the backblocks the people cannot reach doctors so easily and very often they are not even within reach of a chemist. In the case of people living 25 miles from a railway, what are they to do for little ailments if they are deprived of these medicines to which they are accustomed, and of which they know the properties?

The Minister for Lands: They could get any one of them for one-fiftieth of the cost.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Where? Perhaps they would have to go 20 miles to a railway station and travel 30 miles by a train to reach the doctor, and then they would have to pay the doctor half-a-guinea and the chemist 5s. for dispensing the medicine, when previously they could get some patent medicine from a store-keeper for about 3s. 6d.

The Minister for Lands: They could buy the ingredients for one-fiftieth of the cost.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They do not know the ingredients. Some of these medicines have been before the people for a century, and their value has been proved.

Mr. Heitmann: If they used less in the way of patent medicines they would never require a doctor.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That is all right for the hon. member who is associated with doctors and nurses and who has them always at hand. I am referring to people who cannot reach them. This regulation is simply forcing the trade in patent medicines to the Eastern States. People now are writing to the other States for half a dozen bottles of this medicine or that, and I say if they are to be allowed to obtain it by post, they should be allowed to get it here. If these medicines are not fit to be sold here why should the manufacturers be allowed to advertise in this way when the only result is that the money goes to Adelaide or Sydney?

Mr. Heitmann: Because a conservative Government in Victoria will not bring in these regulations is that any reason why we should not?

Hon. J. Mitchell: Yes, there is a reason.

Mr. Heitmann: I will argue the question with the hon. member for Northam on any platform.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: The name of Mr. W. W. Garner has been mentioned and I have a newspaper extract regarding that gentleman's evidence which I will read, though I did not intend to read it

until his name was introduced. Mr. Garner, according to a report in the *West Australian* on Friday last pointed out that a certain proprietary medicine was one of the best selling proprietary medicines on the market. He said—

It had been sold by chemists, storekeepers, and department stores, and had been sold to the Government under contract for hospital purposes. Only about two of the saleable proprietary lines had deposited their formulæ under the regulations. The Government had made contracts since November of last year in respect to articles which were not now complying with the regulations. He instanced two articles and described other patent medicines which he said had not complied with the regulations, but which had been supplied to departments under the Government.

That was sworn evidence.

Mr. Heitmann: What firm does he represent?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That has nothing to do with it at all.

Mr. Heitmann: From the same firm you can buy abortifacients by the score.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: Are the Government buying proprietary medicines for the hospitals to-day which under the regulation they will not allow to be sold?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): They are not doing it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They are doing it if this sworn evidence by Mr. Garner is correct, and I have no reason to believe that a gentleman—I have never seen him as far as I know—would go into a court and swear to anything that was incorrect.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Read the other portion of the evidence.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: This is a matter which should be settled. If we are going to prevent country storekeepers outback from selling and country settlers from obtaining these proprietary medicines we should prevent the Government institutions under the Public Health Department where doctors are available from buying these self same medicines.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister):

Read the other portion of the evidence.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That does not qualify this particular statement. I say this matter requires investigation. I believe the settler ought to be able to have standard medicines of proved value.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You do not believe anything of the kind.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I do. I have been on the land, and I know what it is to rely on Eno's fruit salt and other preparations of that kind, and I would like to say that if it is necessary to purchase these medicines for Government institutions, settlers in the outback country should not be deprived of them.

Mr. Monger: Hear hear!

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Williams-Narrogin must first address the Chair and the frequent interruptions must cease. I consider that members are going too far.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I regret that I have been led astray by interjections and interruptions. I have quoted a statement which was sworn to in the police court to the effect that these proprietary medicines are being sold to the Government departments for use in public institutions in this State. If these medicines are required in these public institutions at which there are medical officers always present I say the people outback who cannot reach a doctor and who perhaps live 50 miles from a chemist should be allowed to buy the same medicines. As far as quacks are concerned, I am against them just as strongly as the Honorary Minister.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): I tell you that that evidence states in another portion that these medicines are not supplied.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I believe Mr. Garner's statement is true.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): You believe one man and not the other.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: What I have quoted was sworn evidence.

Mr. Dwyer: The other was sworn evidence also.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Does the Honorary Minister deny that this was sworn evidence ?

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) : I say the sworn evidence is that the Government hospitals are not supplied with the medicines, and have not been since the regulations came into force.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Do the Government buy them ?

Mr. Nanson : They were supplied with them before the regulation came in.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) : They are in the tender list.

Hon. J. Mitchell : And are used now.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) : No.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : The matter requires investigation. I hope that the interests of the people out back will be considered before anything further is done. I want to speak now on a question of Federal concern and that is in regard to the way in which the interests of Western Australia are being overlooked by the present Federal Government. In the first place we find that this State, remote from the great centres in the East, has now only one representative in the Federal Ministry, whereas under the Labour Administration for years past we have had two Western Australian members in the Cabinet.

Mr. Monger : What did they do ?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : The effect of the reduced representation of this State is already making itself felt, and it is shown in regard to the appointments lately made to the inter-State commission. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Labour Government intended to appoint a West Australian on the inter-State Commission, and we have even the name of the gentleman who was proposed for that appointment.

Hon. J. Mitchell : They had plenty of time in which to do it.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : And it is a pity they did not do it, because there would have been better appointments made. We find even the *West Australian* to-day is criticising the Federal Ministry for its action in the matter, but I venture to say its criticism would have been more severe if a Labour

Government had made the appointments the Liberals have just made. Why were the claims of the leader of the Opposition overlooked when the appointments were being made ? We know that it was not that his claims were forgotten, because he went to Melbourne, and I am glad to think he did his utmost to see that Western Australia was represented on that occasion. We are told that Sir John Forrest promised that the leader of the Opposition in this State should have one of those seats, but the influence of the Eastern members in the Cabinet would not allow that promise to be carried out.

Mr. Monger : Who made that statement ?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : I have it on reliable authority. I do not know whether it is true or not, but I do say that Western Australia should have been represented on the inter-State Commission. As the *West Australian* contends, we have peculiar problems of our own, and our State should not have been overlooked.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister) : Do you say that the leader of the Opposition should have been appointed to that Commission ?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : I am advocating that Western Australia should have been represented on the Commission. The advice of the Sydney Chamber of Commerce and that of the Perth Chamber of Commerce was given very little notice by the new Federal Government, and altogether we seem to have been ignored by them. In regard to the Naval Base we find that since the change of Government has taken place a large number of men have been withdrawn from the work.

Mr. Foley : They want to get rid of Henshaw, that is all.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : Another matter I want to refer to is the general prohibition which has been issued regarding the trapping of opossums. Ever since September, 1910, that prohibition has existed.

Mr. Broun : Quite right, too.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON : It has now lasted three years, and opossums have re-established themselves in some localities.

Mr. Brown: Not sufficiently.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: They are becoming a nuisance to the settlers in some districts, and wherever that is the case the settlers should be permitted to trap them. I do not think the prohibition should extend over the whole of the State, and in districts where they are plentiful, and there are such districts, I hope the Government will permit them to be trapped. In the Game Act Amendment Act, passed last session, an unfortunate error crept in. Until that measure became law it had been the practice to allow settlers without restriction to kill kangaroos for meat. This is very necessary, because kangaroo is the poor man's sheep, and in parts of the State where settlers are hard up they have to look to kangaroo for their meat supply.

Mr. Lander: They often kill them for their skins.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: That should be prevented. This is a matter, however, which needs the attention of the Minister for Lands.

The Minister for Lands: It is under the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: I was going to say that the Colonial Secretary's Department has informed me that an amending Bill is being introduced to remedy the error.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Then why mention it if you know that is being done?

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: It is just as well to have these things on record sometimes, and I hope the Honorary Minister does not mind my referring to it in my own way. Another question I wish to bring under notice is one which engaged the attention of the Federal authorities and would have been dealt with had Mr. Fisher remained in power. I refer to the restriction of marriage imposed upon bank clerks. I think Ministers are aware that bank clerks are an under-paid and over-worked section of the community, and that we cannot assist them as much as we would like to do unless they form themselves into unions.

Mr. Foley: The banks will not allow them to do that.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON: There is a restriction placed upon these officers which prevents them from marrying unless they are in receipt of £200 per annum. The member for Capricornia, Mr. Higgs, asked a series of questions in the House of Representatives on this matter. He desired to know whether it was true that bank clerks were not allowed to marry until they were in receipt of £200 per annum, and he also suggested that the Prime Minister should introduce a marriage law providing that any bank director who directly or indirectly prevented a man of 21 years of age from marrying should be liable to imprisonment for a period of six months without the option of a fine. The reply of the Prime Minister was that he was of opinion that conditions of employment which restricted the marriage of adults, except in rare cases, were generally not in the best interests of the State, and he added that the matter could best be dealt with when a Bill to make a uniform marriage law for Australia was under consideration. The *Federal Hansard* also published several replies from leading banks in Australia which indicated what those banks did in the way of placing restrictions against their clerks on the subject of matrimony. The Union Bank of Australia, amongst others, replied to Mr. Fisher as under—

It is a rule of this bank that no officer is allowed to marry unless his remuneration amounts to £200 per annum or upwards or unless his own, combined with his intended wife's income, inclusive of his remuneration from the bank, amounts to £200 per annum or upwards—a rule which it must be recognised is a salutary one in the interests of the officers themselves.

I cannot recognise that, and I am sure that hon. members will agree that it is against public policy to allow these banks to continue to adopt such regulations. It is a matter for the persons interested to decide for themselves, and I do not think any employer, whether he is a director of a bank or anyone else should be allowed to exercise this prohibition over the private life of employees. Unfortunately the Federal Government has not yet dealt with the marriage question. It

is still one of State concern, the marriage laws being under State control. Therefore I would urge the Government to take this matter up and try and give relief to a worthy section of the community. I do not wish to say very much more except that I am in accord with the policy which the Government have laid before Parliament and I believe it is a policy that the people approve of and that it is in the best interests of the great majority of our citizens. It is a policy of active development. The Government intend to open up the country. They intend, as far as legislation can do it, to protect the poor against the rich and the weak against the strong. That is the object of the Labour party, and in pursuance of it they are also bringing in legislation to protect the producer against the middleman wherever the middleman is acting to the detriment of the producer. This Government is the only State party that has a definite policy of progress and a humanitarian policy as well. The Ministry desire to help the whole of the people of Western Australia whether they are engaged on our agricultural areas, on our mining fields, on our timber mills, or even in our cities. I will admit that the Government's aim to put this broad, humane and progressive policy of the Labour party into operation is somewhat limited by financial stringency, which undoubtedly exists all over the world, and it is also limited by the actions of the conservative propertied Upper House. In spite of these difficulties, however, it must be admitted by everyone that the Ministry are doing good work for the people of Western Australia and are deserving of the thanks and the continued confidence and support of the community.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Mr. PRICE (Albany) : In rising to address myself to the matter at present before this Chamber. I do not intend to occupy a great deal of the time of hon. members, for the reason that the previous speakers have dealt with most of

the questions which are at present, and have been for some time past, agitating the mind of the public. I must, however, take this, the first opportunity of expressing my sincere appreciation of the Premier's action during his recent visit to the Old Land, and also my pleasure at the success which attended his representation of the interests of this State in England. There is a further matter which I might at this juncture refer to, namely, the re-appointment of Sir Newton Moore. I think that in taking this step the Government have done something which is wise, and which will undoubtedly redound to the credit and welfare of this State. As I have previously mentioned in this Chamber, I look upon Sir Newton Moore as undoubtedly one of the best, if not actually the best man that can possibly be found for the position he now occupies. Those who have had an opportunity of judging his work as a representative of the State in the Old Land must indeed appreciate it, and I am sure one and all will join with me in expressing pleasure at the fact that he has been re-appointed for a further term of three years. I also desire to refer to another matter in connection with the representation of this State in London, which was dealt with during the Premier's visit to England, and that is the securing of premises for the Agent General and his staff. It will be within the memory of hon. members that I advocated securing a lease of Savoy House in preference to the previously expressed intention of the present Government to occupy portion of the Commonwealth Buildings in London. I am sure that the step taken by the Government in this direction is a wise one.

Mr. Underwood: Did you get any ring-barking in London?

Mr. PRICE: I did not hunt for it, so I cannot answer the hon. member's inquiry. However, when we consider that it was intended that the office of the Agent General for this State should be located on the third floor of the Commonwealth Buildings, that we had no conveniences for advertising this State in the way of windows for show purposes, and that

the floor space of the Commonwealth Building would be occupied entirely by shops which it is intended to let to tenants, I think it is certainly a wise move for the Government to secure a lease of Savoy House where they have a large window frontage to the Strand on two sides, and where also there is a large basement. I may explain that at the present time the exhibits of all kinds sent to the Agent General have to be stored in specially rented premises and cannot be kept under the observation of that gentleman and his officers. This disability will be obviated by the leasing of Savoy House, providing, as it does, ample accommodation for all exhibits which may be sent from this State to the Old Land. I now desire to refer at this stage to a matter which I, together with the member for Moore, regret is not appearing in any way in His Excellency's Speech. I refer particularly to the fact that no reference has been made to the Government's intention regarding immigration. I am one of those who believe that the more immigrants we bring into Western Australia the better it will be for the State. To check immigration undoubtedly means to check the development of this State.

Mr. Underwood: What sort of immigration?

Mr. PRICE: Advertising, and the possibilities of people engaging in remunerative occupations.

Mr. Underwood: Advertising should be reserved for soap vendors.

Mr. PRICE: If we are genuine in our desire to develop the huge waste spaces of this State, we cannot for a moment check the free flow of immigration, and it is with a certain degree of alarm that we note that no reference whatever has been made to this subject.

The Minister for Mines: Quite unnecessary. We have an immigration policy which we are pursuing.

Mr. PRICE: The Minister says our alarm is quite unnecessary, but the public might be allowed to know that it is the intention of the Government to continue that policy. We have no indication that it is the Government's policy to continue immigration.

The Minister for Mines: If we contemplated a departure from that policy it might be mentioned.

Mr. PRICE: The very silence of the gentlemen responsible for putting that Speech into the mouth of His Excellency causes some alarm in the minds of those who are anxious to see the State develop. I am pleased to take the assurance of the Minister for Mines that there is no need for that alarm, and that it is the intention of the Government to continue the immigration policy which has undoubtedly redounded to the advantage of this State.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The other States have called a halt to some extent.

Mr. PRICE: In Western Australia we are moulders of our own destiny, and we have no right to consider what may or may not be done elsewhere.

Mr. O'Loughlen: We have a right to consider our own people.

Mr. PRICE: We owe a duty to our own people, and in developing this State and using every possible power to do so we are serving the best interests of our people and of the State. I feared the possibility of some checking of our immigration policy, but from the interjection of the Minister for Mines, I have every reason to assume that my fear is groundless, and that the same vigorous policy will be continued in future as has operated in the past.

Mr. George: Following our lead.

Mr. PRICE: I respectfully submit to the hon. member that I am now, I think, occupying the stand which I have always taken in regard to this question, and just here may I express my regret that the hon. member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson) so far forgot what is due from one member to another in this Chamber as to deliberately mis-quote utterances of mine made on this question in the House a little over three years ago. I have always advocated a vigorous immigration policy, and at the close of last session that hon. member deliberately mis-quoted some remarks made by me, in order to make it clear that I had at one time opposed this policy, and he expressed his pleasure that a visit to the Old Country had broadened my mind on at least one subject. To sup-

port his allegations he mis-quoted a speech of mine, as I said before, made something like three and a half years ago. However, I join issue with the opponents of the present Government who during the past nine or ten months have travelled throughout the length and breadth of this State and deliberately mis-represented the actions of the Government. A perusal of the returns printed by the Government Statistician will prove that the influx of immigrants into this State has been continued just as vigorously under the present Government up to the present time as it was during the life of any previous Government.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: More vigorously.

Mr. PRICE: I am not prepared to go so far as that. I say that the immigration policy has been carried out as vigorously as under any previous Government, and I hope that the same policy will continue. Just here may I call attention to the fact that during the time the Premier was absent in England some hon. members at present sitting on the Opposition side, when addressing public meetings, said that one object of the Premier's visit was to arrange for loans from the financiers in Europe to assist in the development of this State.

Mr. George: That is true.

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member who interjected was one of them, and they expressed an emphatic opinion that the Premier would raise no loan.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Oh, no.

Mr. PRICE: I can produce to them a copy of their printed utterances. They stated emphatically that the Premier would not secure the loan he was seeking.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Produce the copy.

Mr. PRICE: I am quite prepared to do so, but I did not think that hon. members would even challenge that statement.

Mr. O'Loughlen: The Liberal candidate for the Senate used it everywhere.

Mr. PRICE: It was used throughout the election campaign until the loan was absolutely floated.

Mr. George: Sir Newton Moore got the money, and you know that as well as I do.

Mr. PRICE: We were told first of all by hon. members opposite that the Premier had gone to London to raise a loan. That was the first statement they made. They followed that up by saying he would fail to get it. When he succeeded they say he had nothing to do with it, it was Sir Newton Moore. It was alleged by members of the Opposition that the policy of the present Government was such that the financiers would not touch our loans and would have nothing to do with this State.

Mr. George: Never.

Mr. PRICE: One cannot help marvelling at the extraordinary effrontery of hon. members coming here to-night and repudiating their utterances, which were published throughout the length and breadth of the State.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why do not you produce the utterances?

Mr. PRICE: I am prepared to produce them, and the hon. member knows it. An utterance was made by the leader of the Opposition at Collie.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I defy you to prove it.

Mr. PRICE: I wish to point to a fact which was referred to briefly by one hon. member, I think the hon. member for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) last night. The financiers of Great Britain or any part of the civilised world are not concerned with the policy of the Government here or anywhere else. What they are concerned about is security for their loan, and security for their loan, as pointed out by the hon. member last night, is represented by the population in the State requiring the money. If the people are not here to develop the State how are they going to get security for the loan?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Why did not South Australia succeed with a bigger population?

Mr. PRICE: Just at the juncture when the Premier was in England he had absolute and undoubted proof of the fact that financiers are not concerned with the brand of politics adopted by any Government seeking assistance from them. We had New Zealand represented by Sir Joseph Ward in

London at the time endeavouring to raise a loan, which proved one of the greatest frosts of any loan ever attempted to be raised by the Dominion of New Zealand.

Mr. George: Why?

Mr. PRICE: Because they could not raise the money. If the brand of politics of a country had anything to do with raising of a loan I would say it was because New Zealand had a Conservative Government and a Conservative representative.

Mr. George: It was what they had before and the financiers had not recovered from the shock.

Mr. PRICE: The Government in New Zealand at the time and previously were essentially conservative. The Government of South Australia are Conservative. They also failed in London. Here in Western Australia, where we have essentially a Labour Government, they succeeded, so I repeat that it is not the brand of politics that interests the financiers.

Hon. J. Mitchell: How did New South Wales get on?

Mr. PRICE: They failed. It is a question of the security for the loan. Speaking in this Chamber a few nights ago the hon. member for Murray-Wellington (Mr. George) said he was trying all he could to sell up and get out.

Mr. George: Not get out. I said I was trying to keep my money so that your chaps should not get it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Murray-Wellington cannot refer to other hon. members as "your chaps."

Mr. George: I apologise. Perhaps I may be allowed to use the term "your gentlemen."

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member's statement was about selling up and getting out—getting out of the State. Evidently people who have never seen Western Australia show by the fact that they are prepared to speculate their money in it that they have more faith in the country than the hon. gentlemen. A great deal of objection to a vigorous immigration policy comes from the fact that too many of the immigrants

when they landed in Western Australia are to be found remaining the greater portion of their time in the city.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Can you blame them when farmers want to pay them 5s. a week?

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member for Forrest is altogether too impatient; I am coming to that point. We find immigrants coming into this State and when they arrive they must invariably be credited with an endeavour to secure employment in the agricultural districts. Many of them go out on to farms where they find the conditions such that they have practically no decent or reasonable accommodation in all too many cases.

Mr. Broun: Not one-third of them are agricultural men or know anything about it.

Mr. PRICE: With that I agree. A very large number of them are not, and I will give the hon. member the reason why they are not. The reason why they are not agricultural men is because the great bulk of the agricultural labourers in Great Britain to-day are too well off to come out here and labour for the hon. member. I am going to blame farmers who when getting a labourer do not provide him with reasonable accommodation.

Mr. Broun: How do you know?

Mr. PRICE: I have been over as much of this State as the hon. member. I have been throughout the South-West.

Mr. Broun: Name some of the instances where you find inadequate accommodation.

Mr. PRICE: One might far more easily name those who have the accommodation than those who have not, but it is a notorious fact, of which the hon. member would be well aware if he would on some occasion drag himself away from the little district where he is always to be found, and go through the length and breadth of the State to ascertain for himself. Accommodation is not provided for the farm labourer, with the result that he drifts into the city where he can secure reasonable accommodation. Upon drifting into the City he is brought into direct com-

petition with the wage earner there, and we hear an outcry. We find that the general labourers and workers in the town are not able to secure employment. They complain that the immigrants receive preference. One can hardly wonder at this complaining. The immigrant himself evinces a desire to follow the occupation which he intended to follow when he came out here. But he has met with so much unnecessary discomfort and low wages, that he has decided to try the city.

Mr. George: What do you call low wages?

Mr. PRICE: Some instances were given by the Honorary Minister in the letters he quoted last night.

Mr. George: I challenge you to prove where any farmer is giving such wages, or desires to employ men at such wages.

Mr. O'Loughlen: I will give the hon. member instances and prove them for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. George: The wage down in the South-West is 8s. a day.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Absolutely wrong.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I said this afternoon that I have been rather tolerant during this debate. I must, however, insist upon order being kept. If I call for order hon. members must keep order. If not I will take the necessary action.

Mr. PRICE: I repeat that it is the low wages and lack of reasonable accommodation provided by the great bulk of the farmers of this State which causes the immigrants to flock from the farms to the town. In proof of the low wages we have the letters read in this Chamber only last night by the Honorary Minister. May I go further and point out that even the Government themselves are not altogether free from blame in this matter, that is, in providing for agricultural labourers, married men, when they arrive in the State. Some time ago I had occasion to visit the State farm at Brunswick, where there is accommodation in the shape of very neat and comfortable little cottages for married men and families. There are three such cottages on the farm.

Mr. Brown: Do you expect the struggling settler to provide the same accommodation as the Government.

Mr. PRICE: I say suitable accommodation for married men, not necessarily the same as at the State farm. I say the Brunswick State farm should undoubtedly be used for the training up of future agriculturists. On the occasion of my visit, instead of finding married men were engaged I found one of those cottages was empty, the other had one single man living in it, while the third was occupied by, I think, four single men. Not one married man was engaged on the Brunswick State farm, despite the fact that we have splendid accommodation there. If married men were engaged there, those men would, in the process of time, undoubtedly go out themselves and become settlers in the country, whereas one of the single men candidly admitted to me that he was saving up to take a trip back to the old country. He had no intention of going on the land. I suggest to the Government that this matter should receive their attention. I brought it under the notice of the officers of the Agricultural Department. Whether those officers are acting upon their own initiative or are following out a defined policy laid down by the Minister in charge of the department, I do not know, but it certainly is to be regretted that single men are engaged on that farm when we have splendid accommodation there for married men.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Where are you going to get the married men?

Mr. PRICE: I was waiting for some such interjection. As a matter of fact the hon. member must be well aware that there are any number of married men in this State who would be only too pleased to secure employment on a farm like the Brunswick State farm, where accommodation is provided for their wives and families. I myself am prepared to let every one of those cottages to-morrow, if the Government are prepared to employ married men instead of single men.

Mr. O'Loughlen: But the married men come drifting in out of the country and blocking the town.

Mr. PRICE: I have already pointed out that if we insist upon proper accommodation for them on the farms, they will remain there and not come into the town. Furthermore, to-day, instead of building up a yeomanry, a farming population, we are relying wholly and solely either on those who come into the State as immigrants, with a little capital, or men who take up farming after having followed some other pursuit and saved a little money to enable them to invest in farming. Every interjection that is made only serves to prove the necessity for proper accommodation being provided. What I wish to draw particular attention to is the fact that young men, the children growing up in Western Australia to-day, have no chance of learning the various branches of the agricultural industry. That is borne out by the interjection of my friend on the right, who said they know nothing about the work. Granted that the new chum in England does not understand the work. But what attempt is being made to see that his children shall understand the work?

Mr. O'Loughlen: Parliament has no power to compel them to employ married men.

Mr. PRICE: But Parliament has power to say that reasonable accommodation shall be provided. Parliament has the power to prevent the pernicious advertisements which sometimes appear in the newspapers, stating that a married couple without incumbence is required; and it is a matter which might well be considered.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: How would you stop it?

Mr. PRICE: We know that the Government have power to stop the pernicious advertisements regarding certain drugs, and they can stop any advertisement if they choose to secure the necessary power to do so. If we are to have agricultural labourers who are capable of carrying out the work, then we must give them a chance of learning, and instead of compelling a man to keep

his wife and family in town, give him an opportunity of taking them out on the farm, so that his children as they grow up may learn something of farming. I am sure hon. members will see the necessity of something of that kind being done. But, unfortunately, we find there are altogether too many of our farming community who are prepared to do anything which lies within their power to damn this country, in the hope that they may succeed in removing the present Government from power. Nothing is too strong, I was almost going to say too contemptible, for them. I cannot help calling to mind an occasion on which Mr. McCallum wrote a letter to the English Press in reference to the number of unemployed in the city of Perth. Now I do not wish to express an opinion as to the justice of the action taken by Mr. McCallum, or rather by those responsible for the letter; because after all Mr. McCallum was but the hand which carried out the duties imposed by those controlling him. But I wish to call attention to the fact that even if Mr. McCallum was guilty of doing an injury to this State, how much more so was the writer of a letter, which I have here in a copy of the overseas edition of the London *Daily Mail*. I will read some of the statements made by this individual, who had not the courage displayed by Mr. McCallum when the latter gentleman signed his name. This writer does not sign his name to his literary effusion; he simply signs himself "A farmer on the Great Southern Railway of Western Australia."

Mr. Broun: Probably he was not a farmer at all.

Mr. PRICE: Perhaps not. Would the hon. member suggest that it was a Labourite who wrote what I am going to read?

Mr. Broun: No, but there is no reason why, because the letter is signed that way, you should accuse the farmers of being responsible for the unemployed in Perth.

Mr. PRICE: I have only suggested that the farmers are responsible for a lack of agricultural labourers, by reason of the fact that in a vast majority of

cases they do not supply sufficient accommodation.

Mr. Broun: How can you expect the struggling settler to provide it?

Mr. PRICE: The struggling settler is frequently not a large employer of labour, and it is the largest employers of labour who very often are the worst offenders, especially seeing that they could provide the accommodation if they so desired. However, let me read these statements made to the London *Daily Mail* by this farmer on the Great Southern. The letter reads as follows:—

Some of the Eastern States of Australia are under Labour Governments, which are openly socialistic. Their ultimate aim is for the Government to own or control every trade, profession or calling, and although our own Government—

That is the West Australian Government.

have only been in office for a little over 12 months they have incurred a deficit of £200,000

This was written at the end of last year.

Which, with our population of 300,000, will take some wiping off. They have stopped all sales of Crown lands, and land may only now be leased from the Government by settlers. They openly profess their determination to do away with all freehold titles already granted. If they cannot legally take away freeholds already granted by previous Governments, they can and will impose land taxes until the unfortunate owner is forced to sell, and that will be to the Government at their own (the Government's) price. We are already paying two land taxes on the same land. Evidently he was a gentleman, like my friend from Beverley, farming on a large scale.

We are already paying two land taxes on the same land, one to the Federal (Australian) Government, which is also Labour, and one to our State Government, in addition to the income tax, roads boards rates, etcetera. Our Government have bought steamships, cattle stations,

dairy farms, etcetera, in order to compete with private enterprise. They purpose taking over all banks, insurance business, iron, sugar, and other industries, the consequence being that money is very tight indeed. As the existing banks, naturally, do not care to make any advances under the present conditions, all undertakings are in the same uncertain state, waiting and watching to see to what extremes the Government will go. Preference to unionists is openly practised by the same Government. In the near future we are promised a rural workers' union, which means that those engaged in the pastoral or agricultural calling will have to submit to an arbitrary and impossible log for their employees, who are trying to get a six hours' day, which seems to go a long way towards proving that the present Australian working man cannot, or will not, which is worse, do as good a day's work as his predecessors.

Mr. Broun: Where is the log now?

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member was keenly interested in it 12 months ago and he will probably hear a good deal more about it in the near future. However, that letter will serve to show the extremes to which so-called farmers, or individuals signing themselves as farmers in this State will go in their efforts to besmirch the fair fame of this country in the old land, in their endeavour to check immigration to this State, in their narrow cry of stinking fish.

Mr. Monger: Do not use that dirty phrase again.

Mr. PRICE: The hon. member who objects to that phrase has used it pretty often himself, particularly in regard to a letter of which we have heard this evening, namely, that by Mr. McCallum, who was honest enough and frank enough to sign his name to it, whereas the writer of this letter does not sign his name. Here is the paper in which it appeared, a reputable English publication. Yet we wonder why it is that we are not getting the right class of immigrants, according to many of our friends in this Chamber. I contend that so long as we

have land to develop, we must find people to develop it. To-day we have something like 600,000,000 acres of land awaiting development; we have 426,000,000 acres not yet taken from the Crown in any way whatever.

Hon. J. Mitchell: That is fine. I like to hear you talk like that.

Mr. PRICE: It is a fact.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Nothing could be more correct, it is a fact.

Mr. PRICE: Only 20 odd million acres are in process of alienation from the Crown out of a total of 624,000,000 acres. Another 180 odd million acres is represented by leases of various kinds, but we have no less than 400,000,000 acres of land awaiting development, and yet we hear members say we should not encourage immigration.

Mr. Underwood: How many millions of it is impossible country?

Mr. PRICE: How many millions of it? Go into the South-West and see the thousands and thousands of acres of first-class land there awaiting development.

Mr. Swan: Lots of it which has been alienated is not developed.

Mr. PRICE: With that remark I agree, but that is no reason why we should not draw attention to the fact that we have these hundreds of millions of acres awaiting development which have not been alienated from the Crown. Now, attention has been drawn by various speakers to the fact that quite recently and at the present time, this State is suffering from financial stringency. All sorts of reasons as I previously pointed out, have been given for this. The Labour Government were alleged to be responsible, but I think if hon. members will turn up the *Statistical Abstract* they will there find one of the main reasons why we are passing through this period of financial stringency. They will find on page 10 of the number published in June last a record of the imports and exports of this State, and they will find that, for the last 12 months, ended 30th June last, we imported nearly one million pounds, worth more goods than we exported. In other words, we have to

send out of this country over one million pounds for goods imported into it.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We borrowed millions.

Mr. PRICE: It is true we have also borrowed millions, and when our imports are greater than our exports it shows that we have not only to send away capital to pay for the goods which we import but also money to pay interest on our borrowing.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Canada imports more than she exports.

Mr. PRICE: But Canada for some time past has been importing into the Dominion an enormous number of immigrants. The Dominion has been developing by leaps and bounds, and although financially Canada is going backward at the present time and has to borrow in order to keep going, yet the development of the Dominion is such that in years to come she will reap the benefit of the borrowing in which she is now indulging.

The Minister for Works: That will apply to Western Australia.

Mr. PRICE: It would apply to Western Australia if we were engaging in an immigration policy to the same extent as Canada.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: What is the population of Canada? About seven millions.

Mr. PRICE: Undoubtedly one of the causes of the financial stringency of this State is the fact that last year our wool clip and wheat crop were such as to bring about a very serious loss in the value of our exports. I repeat that we had to send away over a million pounds for the excess of imports over exports.

Hon. J. Mitchell: We did not send it out of the country; we borrowed it.

Mr. PRICE: Whether we sent the money away or borrowed it, the fact remains that that amount had to be found. If we imported nine millions worth of goods and only exported eight million pounds' worth, we have to find a million pounds somewhere. If the money was borrowed, as the member for Northam says, it has to be paid off somehow. I would point out, however, that money spent in importing goods into

the country does not bring such direct benefit to the community as the borrowing of money which is spent in the State and gives employment to the people. That is one of the facts that should not be lost sight of by hon. members who are continually criticising the Government in connection with the development of this State. There is one matter which I desire to refer to, as showing that the people of this State are far better off financially than hon. members on the Opposition side would lead us to believe, and certainly much better off than they intended to lead the people to imagine during the late Federal election campaign. I find that out of a population of 313,000 no less than 101,000 people have accounts in the Government Savings Bank, or, in other words, just one-third of the people of Western Australia have accounts in that institution, the proportion being infinitely greater than that in any other portion of Australia, and showing that although we may be passing through a period of slight financial depression, the people generally in this State are far better off than those in any other part of Australia. This is the bank which hon. members opposite assured the people during the election campaign, would be handed over by the present Government to the Commonwealth authorities, although those hon. members well knew when making those assertions, that the State Government had no intention whatever of allowing the bank to be transferred to the Commonwealth.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Oh! What about the Minister for Lands?

Mr. PRICE: Hon. members opposite knew that the present Government had no intention whatever of handing over the Savings Bank to the Commonwealth Government except under conditions which would conserve to the State every privilege we are at present enjoying.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Nonsense!

Mr. PRICE: Then why is it that the proposal was turned down long before the Federal party assumed office?

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Minister for Lands was over in Melbourne last May.

Mr. PRICE: He was over before the Federal elections, and the hon. member knows that the proposal to transfer the bank was turned down.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Are you going to hand it over now?

Mr. PRICE: I take it that if the Government could secure such conditions as would conserve to this State the privilege which we at present enjoy through the operation of our State Savings Bank they would be quite prepared to hand it over.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What did the Minister for Lands go over for?

Mr. Munsie: Not to get a seat on the Inter-State Commission.

Mr. PRICE: He went over to see if he could secure from the Federal Government such conditions as would warrant him in allowing the bank to be transferred.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Just so; he was going to hand it over.

The Attorney General: On conditions fair to the State.

Mr. PRICE: He was going to hand it over on conditions which would secure to the State the same benefits from the Commonwealth Bank as those we enjoy under the operation of the bank by the State Government.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What are the conditions wanted?

Mr. PRICE: As the hon. member well knows, at the present time, through the operation of the Savings Bank we are able to use its funds for the financing of our Agricultural Bank, and we desire that the same object shall be attained if the Savings Bank is handed over to the Commonwealth, and the transfer will only be agreed to by the present Government if that condition is granted.

Hon. J. Mitchell: What about the future deposits?

Mr. PRICE: That condition applies to future deposits. The exact terms of the conditions I am not aware of, but the main point I desire to make is that certain hon. members went throughout this State telling the people that the Government intended handing over the State Savings Bank to the Commonwealth, when they well knew that that proposal had been

turned down by the Government and that all negotiations had lapsed.

Hon. J. Mitchell: In May of this year?

Mr. PRICE: Before the Federal elections took place.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It had not been turned down because the Minister for Lands said on his return from Melbourne that he would not disclose the nature of his negotiations.

Mr. PRICE: Probably, in view of the fact that first of all members opposite denied that they ever made the statements that the present Government were the cause of the depression, and that the Premier could not get his loan because of the policy of the Government, and also in view of the fact that they alleged that the present Government handed the Savings Bank over to the Commonwealth, they will now deny that they or their supporters have quite recently been howling in Western Australia about the alleged organised fraud and impersonation carried out by the Labour party in connection with the Federal elections.

Mr. Munsie: They struck a beautiful mare's nest.

Mr. PRICE: But now an enquiry has been held by their own Liberal Government—probably as the Leader of the Opposition was in Melbourne at the time the matter was dealt with he may know something of the facts connected with the case—we find that practically nothing of the kind has occurred. So far as the reports up to date go, undoubtedly no organised fraud took place and in every instance it has been said that the supposed impersonation may be possible of reasonable explanation. Now I desire to touch thoroughly upon the railway policy of the present Government. We were told by the Premier a few days ago something of the intention of the Government in connection with the opening up of the South-West. I wish to say here that I am more concerned with the opening up of that portion of the State than the opening up of any other part of Western Australia, because it is my firm and honest conviction that when we people

the south-west portion, we shall be at the commencement of such an era of prosperity as has hitherto been unknown in our State. To-day we are importing over 1½ million pounds worth of bacon, hams, cheese, wheat, bran, pollard, potatoes, onions, and other agricultural products, the whole of which could and would be produced in the south-western portion of the State if this land were thrown open and we had the people here to develop it. I readily admit that the main need at the present time is population; we require people more than anything else, but there is also need for the opening up of that country by railways. Unlike the great wheat-growing belts of this State, roads are very costly in the South-west and the amount of money which it would be necessary to spend on roads for the proper opening up of the South-west might be largely used in the construction of railways. May I express my regret that the Government last year saw fit to stop the work which was being done on the Denmark-Nornalup Inlet road, which was essentially a pioneering road and constructed chiefly for opening up the land between Denmark and that inlet. The member for Northam knows something of what travelling there meant before the road was in existence, and I regret that last year the work on this road was stopped. I am to-day in possession of information to the effect that a very large quantity of the timber cut and made ready for the construction of bridges and culverts is either destroyed by fire or washed away by floods. And an enormous length of earth works on the road has been washed away. Had the road been completed this would not have occurred. When the timber was procured the bridges and culverts should have been built, and the timber should not have been left lying on the roadside until bush fires destroyed it or floods washed it away. However, that by the way. The great need of the South-west is a comprehensive railway scheme which will open up the whole of that country, and only a couple of days ago the Premier, in reply to a deputation, announced that the Government have such a policy

in hand at the present time. I hope they will persevere with it, and that before the close of the present session we shall hear from the Government that some definite scheme has been adopted for the opening up of that country.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Hear, hear! It is absolutely necessary, and ought to be carried out at once.

Mr. PRICE: I am pleased that at last I have struck a theme that meets with the approval of my hon. friend; it is not often that we are in accord. On this subject I know I ought to receive the support of the member for Northam (Hon. J. Mitchell), because he, together with myself, recognises the difficulties existing in that district for would-be settlers. A comprehensive railway scheme would not only make the timber supply available, but would make it possible for settlers to follow up the railway and get on to the land. Just here there is another matter which should receive the attention of the Government in regard to the opening up of the vast swamp land right around the south-western portion of this State. I refer particularly to the lime deposits. These have been talked about by the previous Government, and unfortunately their successors in office are continuing to talk about them too and no action has been taken so far as we are aware. The ex-Minister for Lands, the member for Northam, had this matter brought under his notice, and it has been brought under the notice of the present Minister for Lands. Reports have been sent in by the responsible officers of the department, but—

The Minister for Works: And they are waiting for the next one.

Mr. PRICE: And as the Minister interjects, they are waiting for the next Minister. In the meantime, while these reports are awaiting consideration, the farmers are unable to make the best use of their land.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Where are these deposits?

Mr. PRICE: Near Lake Clifton.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Never heard of the Lake Clifton deposits.

Mr. PRICE: Did the hon. member ever hear of the deposits just out from Denmark?

The Minister for Works: You do not expect him to know this State.

Mr. PRICE: There are enormous lime deposits in the Albany district, Lake Clifton, and not far from Denmark.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why do not the Government get to work on them?

Mr. PRICE: I hope that the reports secured in connection with these lime deposits will receive consideration, and that the members of the Government will not be so tardy in considering them as they have been in connection with some other matters to which I shall refer before resuming my seat.

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Government had better look out now.

Mr. PRICE: There is undoubtedly a great need for a cheap lime supply, and this has been proved by the investigations of the experts of the Agricultural department. They agree that the great need of our swamp land in the South-west is not so much manure as lime, and those settlers in the southern portion of the State and in the south-western portion who are in a position to procure lime have already found the benefit of it, but unfortunately the price of lime to-day is so high that only a very small proportion of the settlers and those in the best financial position are able to take advantage of it. The Government should undoubtedly take early steps to provide this cheap lime supply, so that the struggling settler may be able to make the best use of his land.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Yes, help the struggling settlers.

Mr. PRICE: I am not greatly concerned in regard to those settlers who are in a good, sound financial position.

Hon. J. Mitchell: They all want lime.

Mr. PRICE: Yes, but unfortunately the majority of those who settle in the south-western and southern portions of this State are men with very little capital who go there in the hope of getting a quick return from the land. Their financial position prevents them from taking up the large areas necessary to go in for lucrative wheat production

and they take up small areas where they can grow potatoes, and other crops of a similar nature. We have a very large number of this class of settle- between Torbay and Denmark, but particularly is this the case in the Torbay district. Some three years ago steps were taken by the then Government to drain the Torbay district, the draining of that district being eventually carried out by the department under the control of the Minister for Works. Despite the fact that a very large sum of money has been spent on these drainage works, I have, during the past few weeks, received scores of letters setting forth the fact that whereas in years past the settlers at this time of the year were able to go on to their land by opening up the sand bar, this season, despite the fact that a comprehensive drainage scheme has been carried out, they have not been able to get on to their land, and the flooding is infinitely worse than it was before the Works Department took this scheme in hand. In the Torbay district, the scheme for which was brought under the notice of the department by the hon. member himself, floodgates have been put in the sand bar, with the result that the land instead of being drained, is kept continually under flood water. Scores of settlers are unable to cultivate their land, and I am now trying to secure employment for men who have been settled in that district for years, but who are suffering from the recent floods, as a result of which they are now unable to get on to their land because the drainage scheme proved inoperative. These men are now looking for work in different portions of the State and at the present time I am endeavouring to procure work for four of them. I have urged the Minister to visit that district and see the effect of this scheme for himself, and I hope that in the very near future he will do so, because in that portion of the State we have undoubtedly one of the finest potato districts in the whole of Western Australia. Yet, to-day, the settlers, with about three or four exceptions, are being forced out of that district. There is only one other matter to which I desire to refer, and that is

embraced in a series of questions which on Tuesday I submitted to the Minister for Works, namely, the improvement of the harbour at Albany. I must express my regret that the Minister for Works made an attempt to evade the very definite and direct questions which I submitted to him.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Did he do that? The Minister for Works: Never.

Mr. PRICE: On a perusal of the Notice Paper it will be found that No. 1 question submitted by me to the Minister on Tuesday last was—

Have plans and specifications providing for extensive harbour improvements at Albany been prepared?

That is a definite, explicit, direct question, to which a reply was given as follows—

A comprehensive report has been furnished to the Government by the responsible officers.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What a shame! You were not asking for a report.

Mr. PRICE: I simply wanted to know—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Where are the plans?

Mr. PRICE: I am not concerned as to whether or not the Government are in possession of a report. I presume, and I might say I had the assurance of the Minister for Works months ago, that the Government had a report. The people of Albany were informed by the Minister for Lands that such a report was in existence.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: The hon. member will have an opportunity of perusing the file.

Mr. PRICE: I regret exceedingly that the Minister having assured the people of Albany both directly and indirectly on several different occasions that the plans for the harbour improvement would be made available in the very near future, I regret, I say, to find that at the present stage all the satisfaction I can get is that a report has been received from the responsible officers.

The Minister for Works: It is not fair; it is a comprehensive report including plans, specifications, *etcetera*.

Mr. PRICE: Then I regret that that information was not included in the reply given by the Minister to my question.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I think it is shameful.

Mr. PRICE: If I am to take it that a report includes plans and specifications it is the first time that I ever heard of the word embracing those things.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is often done.

Mr. PRICE: I notice that for once the leader of the Opposition agrees with the Minister for Works. Evidently a fellow feeling makes them wondrous kind. They have both been there; they both know the little dodges, and are able to sympathise with each other. In drawing the attention of the Minister to this matter, I think the time has arrived when a definite answer should be given. I have been continually urging upon the present Government, as I urged upon the previous Government, the need for effecting improvements to the harbour of Albany. The present leader of the Opposition, when in office, promised that such improvements should be carried out.

Hon. Frank Wilson: So they would have been if we had remained in office.

Mr. PRICE: Yet when the hon. member went out of office it was found that despite the fact that he had been to Albany and had assured the people that £200,000 would be spent on the harbour—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you sure?

Mr. PRICE: Yes.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You had better turn it up.

Mr. PRICE: Despite the fact that the hon. member had assured the people that £20,000 or a sum approximating it would be spent on harbour improvements there—this statement was made on the eve of the elections—when the elections were over it was found that there was no report in existence.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Plans were in preparation, and pretty well finished too.

Mr. PRICE: It was found that the present Government had to start *de novo* upon the question, and although the previous occupant of the office of Minister for Works had assured the people

that immediate action would be taken; no provision whatever had been made for such action. Not only do I regret the fact that so much delay has recently occurred, but I deplore the action of the Government in placing upon the Estimates 12 months ago an item of £5,000 for harbour improvements at Albany, and in the meantime have done nothing whatever to carry out those improvements. I do not intend to deal further with this question at the present juncture. Over and over again promises have been made—by the Premier, by the Minister for Agriculture, and by the Minister for Works himself—that this work would be carried out, and I sincerely hope that in the very near future action will be taken, because we cannot continue to place reliance in the Government if they, on their part, repeatedly make promises which they know cannot, and will not, be fulfilled. The only action which will cause confidence to be continued in the Government is the redemption of their promises made to the people, no matter in what portion of the State the people may reside. It is distinctly unfair for the present or any other Government, to make definite promises to the people if they do not intend that those promises shall be fulfilled. In February last the Minister for Agriculture assured the people of Albany that immediately the Minister for Works returned from New Zealand the plan setting forth improvements to the harbour at Albany would be dealt with, and the work placed in hand a very few weeks after. Nothing, however, has been done up to the present time.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Not a tap has been done.

Mr. PRICE: I say, Mr. Speaker, that when definite promises of that character have been made some definite steps should be taken to redeem those promises. I do not intend to take up any further time of hon. members in dealing with this question. I refer to it now, more particularly because of the answers given to me by the Minister for Works on Tuesday last, which answers I am assured now did not convey

what they were intended to convey. The Minister now says that plans and specifications—

The Minister for Works: A comprehensive report.

Mr. PRICE: I have the assurance of the Minister that the term used in connection with my question means plans and specifications. Is the Minister sincere or not? Has he deliberately misled a large number of the people of this State in regard to this matter?

The Minister for Works: I assure you that I was sincere.

Mr. PRICE: Does the Minister for Works consider that it redounds to the dignity of his position to belittle a claim made on behalf of people who have been continually suppressed in their laudable desire to do their best for their portion of the State? If the Minister thinks he ought to belittle their claim let him do it.

The Minister for Works: The hon. member questions my sincerity?

Mr. PRICE: I do not question the Minister's sincerity in the way he believes, but ask whether or not I am to accept his assurance, because I have his printed answer which certainly does not convey what the Minister now states. This answer has gone forth to the people whom I represent.

The Minister for Works: They are perfectly satisfied.

Mr. PRICE: They are so well satisfied at the present moment that they are organising an indignation meeting in the town. I do not intend to delay the House further on this question. If it is one which Ministers think should be dealt with lightly then the consequence rests with them. As soon as I am convinced that Ministers are not sincere in this matter I have but one course open. I have done my best. I have urged Ministers to redeem their promises in this matter, promises made not by one, but by three Ministers.

The Minister for Works: And by the leader of the Opposition previously.

Mr. PRICE: Up to the present those promises have not been kept. If Ministers cannot keep their promises I have,

in justice to the people I represent, but one course open. I have endeavoured by every means in my power to bring about the work the people are desirous of seeing carried out, because they recognise, and I recognise, that it is so much in the interests of the State generally that these harbour improvements should be given effect to.

The Minister for Works: That is a unanimous opinion.

Mr. PRICE: Then let us have it done. Let the promises so repeatedly made be fulfilled, and let it be shown to the people that when promises are made by the present Government, Ministers have every desire to carry them out, and will do so. So long as that is done I have no complaint, but this matter has been held up so long, and I have been made the subject of so much deliberate misrepresentation in regard to it, that I feel the time has come when there should be no further misrepresentation.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Are you going to the indignation meeting?

Mr. PRICE: That is a matter which concerns not the hon. member, but myself.

Hon. Frank Wilson: I am very much concerned about it.

Mr. PRICE: It is not a matter which concerns the hon. member for Sussex. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I sincerely hope the present Government will continue the immigration policy which has obtained right up to the present juncture, and also that as a result of their efforts, this State will continue to progress and prosper.

Mr. BROUN (Beverley): In rising to speak for the third occasion in this House upon the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply I would like to say that I am not going to let the opportunity pass without making a few remarks upon the attitude adopted by hon. members in this Chamber in colouring their speeches with a certain amount of personal insinuation. I myself will certainly keep clear of it, and I think hon. members should set a better example by refraining on every occasion from personal insinuation, more especially those upon the Ministerial side of the House.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: I thought you were chastising your leader.

Mr. BROWN: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. McDowall: It has all been from that side.

Mr. BROWN: No it has not. Remarks that have come from hon. gentlemen in this Chamber are unworthy of them and are degrading to their political life. The electors of Western Australia should certainly take stock of those responsible for these insinuations, and by all means turn them down on each occasion when an election comes round. By doing so they will enable us to have hon. members in this House who will devote their time to the business of the country instead of spending hours, days, and weeks in doing nothing else but passing insinuations from one side of the House to the other.

Mr. McDowall: A beginning should be made on the hon. member's side of the House.

Mr. BROWN: The Premier, the Minister for Lands, and others have remarked that those on this side of the House are "the rabble known as the Liberal party," "atoms of humanity," and so forth, and I think it is ill-becoming for any Minister of the Crown to make such remarks in any Chamber and pass such a reflection on the Opposition. Although the Opposition are small in number, they represent per head a much larger number of electors than do those on the Ministerial side of the House. We have a perfect right as an Opposition party to criticise the socialistic undertakings of the Labour Government and it is only right that we should do so. At the same time, I am not going to put all blame on the Ministerial side of the House. I think we should criticise them in their works without indulging in any personal matters whatever, and in future I hope these will be left alone by hon. members, so that we can get right down to bed rock and endeavour to do some good for the country and the people as a whole. In looking at the Governor's Speech, I notice the re-appearance of several Bills that were introduced last session. I hope that when they come before this Chamber those measures will be so modified that Ministers

will find the Opposition party to a very great extent assisting them in passing most of those Bills. I am not in accord with them all, naturally, but there are several of them that the Opposition party supported last session that were passed on to another place, and through a compromise not being made by the Ministry, these Bills were thrown out altogether, whereas if there had been a compromise made, and some arrangement come to, these Bills, especially the Irrigation Bill, would have been in force to-day. I notice there are no new railway Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, but that there is mention made of the intention to re-introduce the Bill for the construction of the Esperance line. In my opinion, the construction of that railway is not warranted at the present time, but as I shall have the opportunity when the Bill is introduced of speaking on the subject I will refrain from making any further reference to it just now. We have heard it said in many directions that the railways at the present time are not paying, and that there are a certain number of miles of railway under construction which will take some time to complete, and it has also been pointed out by Ministers that some of the agricultural railways already built are not paying. There is not an hon. member in this Chamber, I feel certain, who will expect an agricultural railway to pay from the outset, for the reason that development does not take place until the railway is actually running. The country is then settled, and those who are on the land set to work and improve their properties, knowing that there is a railway which will take their produce to the market. It is only natural, therefore, that it should take two or three years, or perhaps longer, before agricultural railways become paying propositions. It must be realised by all that that is so because it has been proved to be the case in the past. In mentioning that the railways are not paying propositions we must take into consideration the fact that the unskilled hands in the service have received an increase in wages amounting to a large sum.

Mr. Dwyer: Would you take from them that extra 1s. a day?

Mr. BROWN: I would not take it away from those who are worthy of it, but I do not consider that all the unskilled hands were entitled to receive it.

Mr. Lander: Do you not think that they should all get 9s. a day?

Mr. BROWN: The hon. member would like to give them 10s. or 15s. a day without considering the state of the finances.

Mr. Lander: No, I would give them a fair wage.

Mr. BROWN: In referring to land settlement, which has been alluded to by the Minister for Lands and others, and the association of deferred rents to the deficit, I will give credit where it is due. I admit that the Government have been doing a considerable amount in that direction. They have assisted the settlers in many ways but any other Government would have been compelled to do likewise if they had been placed in the same position. It was owing a great deal to the bad season of the year before last that the settlers found themselves in financial difficulties and they had either to be helped by the Government or leave the land. I will not admit for a moment that the deficit is entirely owing to the assistance given to the farmers. I am not going to refrain from mentioning the socialistic enterprises which have been undertaken by the Government.

Mr. Lander: Do you not want to see the small squatter assisted?

Mr. BROWN: The Government are playing into the hands of the big squatters and the small man is no better off to-day than he was before the advent of the State steamers.

Mr. Gardiner: That is not so.

Mr. BROWN: It is so, according to the evidence which was given the other day. I would like to refer to the assistance which has already been given to the settlers in the dry areas. There are a number of them who should receive even greater assistance from the Minister for Lands in the direction of a reclassification of the lands which they have taken up, to the extent of bringing the values down to something like a reasonable figure.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): Who put on those values?

Mr. BROWN: I am going to admit, and it has also been admitted by others, that the values placed on those lands were too high, and there is no reason because the late Minister for Lands overvalued many of those areas, why the Government now in power should refrain from making a reclassification.

[Mr. McDowall took the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The late Minister will not admit that they have been over-valued.

Mr. BROWN: Undoubtedly they are over-valued, and one has only to go to those parts to find out that such is the case. It has always been my opinion that land valuations should be regular. In opening up a new area the Government should classify that land and put on it a value according to the classification. In regard to the classification, I would have three classes of land, first, second, and third, and poison leases.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Has that not been done?

Mr. BROWN: In opening up new areas the Government should never ask more than 10s. per acre.

Hon. Frank Wilson: For the best land?

Mr. BROWN: For all the land divided into three classes there should be a fixed value, and we should let people take it up under conditional purchase clauses at 6d. per acre per annum. It was mentioned only a few moments ago by the member for Albany that we have millions of acres of land already surveyed and four hundred millions of acres of land suitable for settlement.

Mr. Underwood: Where is it?

Mr. BROWN: If the hon. member had been in his place in the House when the statement was made he would have heard. In referring to the values which I consider should be put on the land, I do so because I think that if my idea were carried out everyone in the State would be treated in the same manner. We must remember that all the old settled areas were taken up under the conditional purchase clauses at 10s. per acre, and while I admit that the country is prospering,

and that the value of land is going up, at the same time I will advocate and will always consider that the Government should not value first-class land at more than 10s. per acre. I have been asked the question that if this were done, where would the State obtain its revenue.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That would depreciate all values.

Mr. BROWN: It would not in my opinion. The Government always have the option of binding settlers down to carry out certain improvements and we have now on our statute book the Land and Income Tax Bill. The land tax will undoubtedly deal with all the land in these areas and they can be valued according to the valuation of land throughout Western Australia. Even at the present time there are many selections which are being taken up at 10s. an acre while others have had to pay up to 27s. 6d. for land of a similar quality. The valuations can be made on this land according to the improvements and the Government can obtain their revenue in that direction. Whilst on the subject of the land question I would like to refer particularly to railways in the district which I represent, and one railway particularly, the Yillimining-Kondinin extension. As hon. members know, the Wickepin-Merredin line, which has been a burning subject in this House is already completed, and therefore it would be fruitless for me to say anything about it.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Not completed right through?

Mr. BROWN: Yes. I consider that the Government should push on the Yillimining-Kondinin railway as speedily as possible. The matter has already been referred to by the member for Williams-Narrogin, and I agree with him that it is most essential that this line should be speedily constructed in order to serve those settlers in that eastern area who are practically at the end of their tether. With one or two exceptions, they went on to the land with a limited amount of capital and railway communication was actually promised them, even before they took up the land. They have been waiting for this line for years, and it seems to me from the answers

the Minister for Works gave to my questions yesterday that it will be some time yet before these people will receive railway communication. I regret very much that this is likely to be the case, because I feel certain that a number of these settlers will not be there when the railway goes through. The Minister for Works is so vague in his replies that one is at a loss to know even when the railway is likely to be started. The survey has not yet been made and I believe the Yillimining-Kondinin line itself has hardly been started, although the Government promised it would be started last March and pushed on as speedily as possible. I hope that the Ministry will do their best to assist the settlers by hurrying on with the construction of this railway, and I hope that the Minister for Lands will take into consideration the advisableness of reclassifying that area and bringing it down to the same basis as selections in other parts of Western Australia. I would also like to refer while on the rural topic, to that great belt of country on the west side of my electorate. That is the Dale District. Only a short time ago the Minister for Works made an inspection of that district, and I feel certain he recognises that railway communication should be given to those settlers on the west side of Beverley. We find they are very much in the same position as those settlers in the Eastern areas, with the essential difference that they are a little more fortunate in respect to rainfall. Although these settlers have been there for a number of years they have been and still are carting up to 40 miles to a railway. They are fairly sound financially, and I think they have paid up all their rents, and owe practically nothing. This speaks well for the district, and surely the Government should take into consideration the building of a line through there, more especially as it would serve to couple up the Great Southern with Armadale, and so shorten by a considerable distance the railage of the wheat from the Great Southern district.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! When the Minister for Mines and the Government Whip, the leader of the Op-

position and the member for Northam shall have finished their respective conversations the hon. member will be able to resume his speech.

Mr. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Now, I would like to refer to one or two little matters connected with the settlement in that eastern area. The only serious pests down there are the wild dogs. Quite recently I received a letter from a number of settlers in the district, and I understand that most of them have had to sell their sheep on account of the destruction caused by the wild dogs. I believe the rabbit-proof fence is now being made dog and fox-proof by the department; if this is the case I think the Government might well take into consideration that rich area lying this side of the fence and see if it is not possible to increase the bonus on the dogs in order that their extermination might be hastened. I am well aware that a fair amount is paid in bonuses to-day; but there is not the slightest doubt that the provisions of the Act have been infringed on many occasions by those who destroy dogs and, skinning them, make up the skins into a number of tails, so that instead of being paid for one dog they are paid for a dozen or more. Several cases of this sort have been known. Although I have not taken the trouble to look into the law, I believe there is in the Act special provision against this offence by making those claiming the bonus produce the whole skin. Of course that does away with the difficulty at once, but I think this is a matter which, in justice to the settlers, the Government should give special consideration to, by increasing the bonus on the dogs. If it were decided to treat the district as a special case, the boundary could easily be defined this side of the rabbit-proof fence, where the dogs are so destructive, and I feel certain it would not be many years before the pest was eradicated altogether. Sheep are a factor necessary to successful farming. Sheep and cultivation must be combined to make farming profitable, and therefore I think settlers should be given every encouragement to carry sheep. At the present time, although the settlers are hold-

ing a number of acres uncleared and unutilised, they have not a head of stock on their property, and if hon. members would go along there they would find those settlers living on tinned meat instead of being able to live upon meat produced on their holdings. Now, I want to refer to a matter already mentioned this evening by the member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston), namely, the bulk handling of wheat. I am pleased to see that a board of inquiry has been appointed to consider the bulk handling of wheat. I think the time has arrived for the Government to take this question in hand, and to do all they possibly can to assist the farmer in exporting bulk wheat at as low a cost as possible. The farmers have to take advantage of every opportunity to place their wheat on the market at the lowest possible cost. I admit that the method of handling bulk wheat is a very costly one, but, nevertheless, sooner or later it must be taken in hand. I must congratulate the Minister for Railways on the splendid manner in which he handled the harvest over the railways last season. I think there were very few complaints.

Mr. Foley: You are throwing quite a lot of bouquets.

Mr. BROWN: Only where they are due. I heard of very few complaints during the past year in respect to the railways, and from my own experience I think the whole of the settlers in my electorate, and those around it, were perfectly satisfied with the manner in which their wheat was handled. We had no difficulty whatever, on most occasions, in securing our trucks, and very little delay in transit. I admit we did have a few delays at first; but it was not the fault of the Minister or the responsible officers at this end, and after the matter was mentioned to those responsible nearest to the sidings, things were soon rectified and we had no trouble at all. It is a refreshing pleasure for the farmers to find no difficulty in this direction, because in the past we have experienced the utmost difficulty in obtaining trucks, and on many occasions wheat has been stacked at the sidings and, very often, a large percentage of it destroyed by rain or by stock. I hope that it will not be very long before the bulk handling

system is in vogue in this country; more especially do I support it on the ground that it will relieve us of the necessity of buying our bags in the Calcutta market. We all know that the price of jute goods is very high just now. We have to pay up to 7d. and 8d. per bag for the bagging of our wheat, and in some instances I have known of small farmers paying up to 9d. per bag to bag their wheat and get away. This is a very great disadvantage to the wheat grower, especially when he is exporting; it amounts practically to 2d. or 3d. per bushel for the bags. I admit that those who get in early are able to obtain bags at from 6½d. to 7d., but those fortunate people are the men who are able to pay the cash, and who are indeed better able to pay a bigger price than the small settler who has to wait until near the end of the season before giving his order because he has not the cash to pay for the goods, the result being that he then has to pay 9d. On top of this we found last year another difficulty in obtaining oversea freight. The increase in freights last year amounted to the large sum of 3½d. per bushel; that, together with 2d. or 3d. for bags, is a very large amount to be deducted from the price the farmers receive for their wheat. Therefore, it will be seen that the adoption of the bulk handling system of wheat will be a very great advantage to the settlers, and I hope this great problem will be undertaken by the Government as soon as possible, and that they will see their way clear to establish elevators at Fremantle. I did not intend to touch upon matters in regard to the Farmers' and Settlers' Association this evening, nor would I have done so had it not been for the remarks made by the member for Williams-Narrogin, who stated that the Farmers and Settlers' party was going to swallow up the Liberal party. I may say right away that in my opinion the farmers and settlers have no such intention, neither have they any hope. I am confident of that. I feel certain they have no intention whatever of swallowing up the Liberal party, or even of playing spoils with them. No doubts hon. members on the Ministerial side are a little bit afraid of the Farmers and Settlers' party, be-

cause we all feel, and many of us are absolutely confident, that as coming events often cast their shadows before, so it is certain that some members on that side of the House will be missing after the next election.

The Minister for Mines: That was a serious charge made by a prominent member of the association when he said that the Liberals were not sincere.

Mr. BROWN: It was not made by a prominent member of that association, as far as I know, and I doubt whether the gentleman himself knew what sincerity meant. The member for Williams-Narrogin also referred to the Government machinery works, and he declared that the farmers would be able to obtain cheaper and better agricultural implements than they were getting to-day. In my opinion they will do nothing of the sort. The Government machinery works will be *a la* the State Steamship Service; there is not the slightest doubt about that. And the Government will be showing the same amount of deficit on this new prospect as they are showing on their socialistic scheme known as the State Steamship Service.

Mr. Underwood: Do you think the settlers in the North-West want the steamers knocked off?

Mr. BROWN: No, not the big settlers, because the steamers are being run absolutely to suit them, and not to suit the small settlers.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: But you hope that the implement works will be a success?

Mr. BROWN: Certainly I do, but I have my doubts about it, because the farmer is going to buy a machine according to its worth, and the Government will have to secure royalties and patents to manufacture good machinery.

The Minister for Works: We have got them already.

Mr. BROWN: And unless they are able to get those patents it will be impossible for them to produce a machine that will find favour with the farmers. The farmers go for the best article, and it pays them to do so—the most efficient article, the article that will take

the most ground off during the eight hours it is working, and the article that will last the longest. Instead of the Government starting machinery works in our State it would have been better had they negotiated with the Federal Government to have the protective duty taken off harvester machinery and so have brought the price down.

The Minister for Mines : Your Liberal Government in the Federal Parliament will do it now.

Mr. BROWN : It is useless for them to do it now that the State Government have undertaken to start State machinery works. I do hope the venture will be a success, but, as I said before, I have my doubts, because it is certain the Government will have a big problem before them, and they will realise that such is the case before they have run the works for very long. There will be a number of farmers who are not in a position to pay cash to other merchants for good machinery, and the Government will have all the settlers in poor circumstances obtaining machinery for which in most cases the State will not be paid.

The Minister for Mines : You are not impugning the honesty of the settlers, are you?

Mr. BROWN : Not by any means, but we have often heard machinery agents say that in many cases farmers purchase machines and at the end of the term when they are supposed to pay, through circumstances unforeseen, they are not able to meet their obligations, and the agent has to take the machinery back without the purchase price having been paid. Of course, a certain amount has to be paid down, but that is nothing to the damage that has been done to the machine. I notice that during the past year a large amount has been spent on workers' homes. That is very gratifying indeed, and I do not want hon. members on the Government side to think that I am objecting to them spending money on workers' homes. I say it is very pleasing, and goes to show that even the workers are not in sympathy with the little pet baby of the Minister for

lands, non-alienation of Crown lands, for in nearly all these instances the workers' homes have been built on freehold property. That proves that the best policy for any Government to adopt is to grant the freehold to all those who require land. Another matter which I wish to speak on is that of State flour mills. This was one of the planks on the platform of the Labour party when they first came into power, and we heard that they were going to build State flour mills in many districts throughout the State.

Mr. E. B. Johnston : They are badly wanted.

Mr. BROWN : Undoubtedly, but so far the Government have not built one, and I would like to know what their intention is in this regard.

The Minister for Mines : I thought you were opposed to State enterprise.

Mr. BROWN : So I am, but at the same time, when the Government adopt a policy and tell the people about it, I would like to see them carry it out. My reason for advocating the building of State flour mills was that I anticipated a mill being built in my electorate, because it is one of the best agricultural districts on the Great Southern railway, and I feel that if a State mill is built in that centre it will be a paying proposition.

Mr. Underwood : What about State brickworks?

Mr. BROWN : I do not want any bricks. I would also like to call the attention of the Government to the matter of grants to roads boards for roads leading to railways in newly settled areas. I believe the Minister for Works already has a scheme before him in that connection, and I hope he will do his best to have good roads made so as to enable those settlers who are beyond the 12½-miles radius to reach the railways without any difficulty. The Minister for Works has informed me that during the session a new Roads Bill will come before Parliament. This measure is absolutely necessary, because the existing Act should have been amended in many directions long ago. I am pleased to see that the department is giving credit

to those boards to whom credit is due, in the form of extra assistance where they have put a fair valuation on their land. In the past there have been certain grants to roads boards, irrespective of whether they were striking a fair rate or not, and I think it is only fair to those boards which are striking a fair rate and putting a fair valuation on the land, that they should have greater consideration from the department than those which are striking only a nominal rate. If the roads boards like to rate up to the maximum they will get the full amount from the Government without any penalty being imposed upon them. Whilst on the subject of rating, I would like to refer to Government estates. The Avondale estate, situated in the Beverley roads board district, is a property from which the board at one time obtained a large amount in rates. At the present time the Government are carrying a considerable quantity of wheat over the roads in the direction of Beverley, and are doing a good deal of damage to the roads, but the board receives no compensation, neither is it able to rate this Government estate. I do not mean to urge that Government property should be rated in every direction, but where a farm is purchased by the Government and it is not intended to be sold, it should be rated the same as any other property in the district. In regard to immigration, it has been stated by the member for Albany that to a great extent the farmer-employer is responsible for the unemployed in the city. I desire to say that the statement is not correct. As I have already stated, there are a number of immigrants coming to the country who are supposed to be experienced farm hands, but who know absolutely nothing at all about farming in this country. I am pleased to see that immigrants are still pouring into the State, and I hope they will continue to come, but I certainly think that the Agent General should be more cautious in selecting the immigrants, and not send out unreliable hands who go to him and say they are farm hands, but who, on arrival here, show that they know nothing about farming.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): There are very few of them.

Mr. BROUN: I have had experience of them. I admit that a number of the immigrants who come to Western Australia are only too willing to learn, and it does not take them long to learn how to go to work on a farm. But it has been said by different speakers that the farmers are taking advantage of these men by offering them a wage of 10s. a week. No farmer with any experience or common sense would ever adopt such an attitude, because it never pays to put an inexperienced hand on machinery. Hon. members must admit that, and it is only in few cases that a wage of 10s. per week is paid to immigrants. I do not know of one immigrant who is receiving less than £1 per week on a farm, and those are men who do clearing and other outside work besides the ordinary farm work.

Mr. Underwood: How is it you do not get good men on the farms? Because you will not pay good wages.

Mr. BROUN: We do get them.

Mr. Underwood: Again and again you cannot get them.

Mr. BROUN: Because they are not here to get.

Mr. Underwood: Because you will not pay them good wages.

Mr. BROUN: They are not numerous enough in the State. Does the hon. member wish to infer that the farmer should pay 8s. a day to men totally inexperienced and put them on machinery to which they might do £100 worth of damage in one day? Many of them are receiving 8s. per day, and housing, and are allowed to keep fowls for which they are provided with feed. No farmer refrains from paying a good wage to a man who is worth it, but it does not pay the farmer to offer good wages unless the men are experienced. It is very seldom one sees a good man leave a farm, because the farmer would sooner increase the man's wages than lose his services. According to the Speech, a Land and Income Tax Bill is to be introduced again this year, and while it is necessary for the Government to obtain as much revenue as they possibly can, I hope they

have no intention of increasing the taxation on land. It seems to me a most iniquitous thing that the Federal Government should be allowed to impose a second tax on land in this country. There should be some arrangement between the State and the Federal Governments to do away with the Federal land tax, and to allow the State Government to have the benefit of the revenue which the Commonwealth is now receiving. If it is their intention to break up large estates; as it is undoubtedly is, the State Government should have that extra penny per pound imposed on estates valued at £5,000 and upwards, and though the owner would have to pay the same amount of tax he would know that the State Government instead of the Federal Government were receiving the revenue. Whilst there are a number of large holders who object to paying the Federal tax, they would not object if they knew that the revenue was to be spent in the State.

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): No Federal Government will give up any money they once get hold of.

Mr. BROUN: I do not wish to delay the House any longer, but I do hope that during the coming year we will have a bountiful harvest, and I feel certain that with all the socialistic legislation, the big deficit that has been piled up by the Government at present in power to the tune of something like £190,000 per annum—with all these difficulties, the resources of the country are so great that we shall still continue to prosper. And I sincerely hope that the Government will do their utmost during the next financial year to cut down expenditure sufficiently to reduce considerably the deficit that is now showing. I feel certain that with a little care this can be done, and it is only right that the farming community or those holding land in Western Australia should be alarmed at the state of affairs, because it is undoubtedly the land holder in the State who will have to pay the taxes in the end. Therefore, we have reason to complain of the different socialistic enterprises undertaken by the Government, and I hope that they will go slowly, and only undertake those good

works which are necessary for the progress and welfare of our State.

Mr. FOLEY (Leonora): We are told somewhere that there is nothing new under the sun. Each and every one of the members who has spoken on the Address-in-reply has endeavoured to bring in something that he considered new to the arguments already advanced during the course of this debate, but the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, to my mind, certainly brought in something new, or at least he has given the case away from the Liberal standpoint, as regards the cause of the deficit in this State. When the member for Pilbara interjected about the State agricultural implement works being a success or otherwise, the member for Beverley said the Government would not make a success of them—although he trusted that they would—because the poorest class of settler, the man who is in need of money, and who is in strenuous circumstances would be coming to the Government and the Government would go to his assistance, and by so doing would pauperise this State to a very great extent.

Hon. J. Mitchell: Why make a song about it?

Mr. FOLEY: There will be something to make a song about when I mention that if this condition of affairs will be brought about by the State manufacture of implements, which is really socialistic, how much more so has it happened as far as farmers are concerned in regard to the use they made of the Agricultural Bank during the recent dry season. When the farmers were not in a position to pay back the money advanced to them and in fact practically forced on them by the Associated banks of Western Australia, they went to the State institution, the Agricultural Bank, the conditions of which were liberalised by the present Government. The position is that in consequence of the associated banks closing down on those in need of money the Government came to their assistance to a greater extent than has ever been the case in Western Australia, and if the hon. gentleman bases his arguments on the fact that the poorest men requiring agricultural machinery under the best

conditions will be able to obtain it under State enterprise or socialism on the part of the present or any other Government then this socialism is thoroughly justified. I intend to touch at length upon only one subject, namely that of mining, but before doing so, there are a few little things which I wish to bring before the Chamber. Although members have criticised each other and party have criticised party and perhaps criticism has been indulged in which has not redounded to the credit of the side from which it emanated, there is criticism which legislators irrespective of which side they are on have been subjected to by gentlemen in this State who should be and are beyond criticism, I refer to the judges of the Supreme Court. The judges are beyond criticism and rightly so, but at the same time they are, or should be, in their positions only to administer the law as the legislators give it to them to administer, and I consider that as legislators our position should be as high and honourable and free from criticism by them as their position is free from criticism by legislators. I intend to say no more on that matter. I know that a substantive motion is to be moved in this House and perhaps the whole thing will then be discussed, but these in general are my opinions on the question. A few nights ago I asked a question in the House regarding the employment of one of the members of the *Hansard* staff. In opening this question I wish it to be fully and completely understood that I have nothing against the gentleman who was appointed or against any member of that staff. There is no doubt that at times the *Hansard* staff are very good to hon. members. They have been good to me, and they have made my speeches sometimes such that I could hardly recognise them—it has been for the better. We thank them for that, but at the same time, I have heard it stated inside this House and outside of it that the State of Western Australia should have equal opportunity with the other States. I have heard hon. members of this Chamber say during this debate that State rights should be their first consideration. We believe in it, but there are

different ideas as to how those State rights can be given effect to to the fullest extent. Nevertheless if members are sincere in their advocacy of State rights, they will give me credit also for being sincere. As far as the employment of a member of the *Hansard* staff is concerned, I know we have men in Western Australia fitted in every possible way to fill the position that was rendered vacant by the resignation of one of the members of the staff. I recognise that this is work at which the men have to serve a long apprenticeship. They have to be men with a knowledge that is not possessed by many other men in this State, but I say distinctly that at the time the appointment of another man to our *Hansard* staff was necessary there was a gentleman whom I knew was then resident in Western Australia, and who was willing to submit himself for any examination before any judges or before any board or before any experts in this work, and if the results of the examination did not prove satisfactory he would have been ready to withdraw his application. I do not wish to see Western Australia get any advantage over any other State, because I am an Australian first, and no man can be a good West Australian without being first a good Australian, but I hold that we should conserve our State rights to this extent that our men should have an equal opportunity in filling any position that might become vacant through movements consequent upon the Federal Parliament sending to Western Australia for a man. The Federal position was advertised throughout the length and breadth of Australia and from dozens of applicants who competed for the position a member of the Western Australian *Hansard* staff was appointed to fill it. If it is possible for the Federal Government to find a man in Western Australia good enough to take a position on the Federal *Hansard* staff, I consider that it should be good enough for the Government to exercise the State rights principle to the extent of giving Western Australians equal opportunity to compete for any position locally that might become vacant.

[The Speaker resumed the Chair.]

Hon. W. C. Angwin (Honorary Minister): The Government did not make the appointment.

Mr. FOLEY: I did not say that they did. When I asked the question I asked the information from the Printing Committee. Parliament, and not the Government, had the deciding of the question. There is another matter that will be discussed at length, and according to the Governor's Speech a Bill will be introduced during the session dealing with the Factories Act. This is sadly needed in Western Australia. There is a certain amount of child labour that should not be employed in our factories, there is a certain class of adult labour that is objectionable and there are also certain conditions that obtain in our factories that we as legislators should do our best to eradicate. If a man or a woman is forced to earn his or her livelihood in a factory it should be the duty of Parliament to see that he or she works under good conditions. If factory employees have to work for eight hours a day harm may be done to them which may render them worse men or women for the State unless we guard their welfare and if we are going to build up Western Australia as part of the Australian nation we want to have good healthful people and by having good healthful people we can expect to take our place among the other States. I trust that when this measure comes before the House members on both sides will study it from the point of view of how it will affect the nationhood of Australia. I know the fate that some of the same class of measures met with last session, and I trust that there will not be a repetition of it when this Bill is brought down for consideration. There is another measure which affects, not only the business people of this State, but also the home life and the earning capacity of men, especially in remote districts. When the Commonwealth Constitution was framed it was decided that all weights and measures should come under the legislation of the Federal Government. They have not taken them over yet, nor do I know that there is any intention on the part of the

Federal authorities to do so in the near future, but until the Federal Government do take over these matters it would be wise even if it is socialistic, to devote attention to the regulation of weights and measures. If this were done instead of leaving the matter in the hands of municipalities as at present the Government would secure profit for the Treasury and would not only benefit the funds of the State, but would raise the purchasing value of money received by men and women in the shape of wages. It is computed by men who know, men who have been in this trade all their lives, and who know every part of a scale, how to test and how to make scales and everything connected with the use of scales that 90 per cent. of those in use in the metropolitan area and the areas in the vicinity of the metropolis would not be allowed by the Board of Trade of Great Britain. In Great Britain all small goods, such as tea, tobacco, etcetera, must be weighed only on beam scales. I have had a demonstration during the past few weeks of spring scales that weigh, for instance, $1\frac{1}{2}$ ounces out so that when a housewife buys a pound or two pounds of meat or tea the indicator would be right at the figure 0, and these scales which can be manipulated by men who know a little about them are being used to the detriment of women when spending the men's earnings for the necessities of life. There is another phase of this question. There are thousands of scales in Western Australia that have never been tested. A certain charge is made by the municipality for the testing of these scales, but in very few instances have the men practical knowledge enough to test them.

Mr. George: The city council of Perth stopped the use of spring balances about ten years ago; I do not know what they are doing now.

Mr. FOLEY: Yet it is computed that about sixty per cent. of the scales in the metropolitan area are spring balance scales. For that matter, there are thousands of scales used throughout the country districts that have never been tested since they were first purchased from the maker. I saw one weight this week which,

although it had been in ordinary use for a term of only 18 months, was 2½ ounces out, and yet it bears the stamp of the last man who tested it. Therefore, hon. members will see that there is something in this question of weights and measures as affecting the pockets of the poorer classes in this State. I am led to believe on the same authority, which I think cannot be doubted, that on one of our mines in Collie at the present time, where the men are paid for coal by weight, one of the scales weighs 10wt. on the side of the mine as against the men. I am not going to say for one moment that the mistake is always on the side of the seller. In this instance it is on the side of a company that get paid perhaps for coal that is being weighed over a Government weighbridge. If the coal company are getting the advantage of 10wt. in every ton of coal hewn by the men, and get paid a fair rate by having the coal weighed on the Government scale, and they know it, then there is no penalty or punishment that would be too harsh for them.

Mr. George: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOLEY: With the lax methods of municipal handling of weights and measures at present, it is just possible that that scale for 18 months is weighing to the advantage of the men and therefore is quite as unjust and inequitable. I believe the Attorney General has some data on this question, and I trust that he will use it. It is a question which affects each and every one of us alike. It affects the purchasing power of the sovereign, and there are too many of them knocking about in Western Australia among the working people. There is another little matter, and it relates to what the hon. member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) said about labour in this State. He said labour is much more deficient now than it was years back. I intend to touch on that a little later on. When the hon. member for Pingelly sat down the hon. member for Wagin (Mr. S. Stubbs) rose in his place and gave all the credit for the raising of the loan in London to the Agent General, and he put all the blame and discredit, if discredit there be,

of having a deficit in Western Australia, at the feet of the present Government.

Mr. Monger: Was not that quite right?

Mr. FOLEY: No, or I would not be speaking on it at the present time. The hon. member for Wagin said we had a good season last year, that is when he wanted to discredit the Government's action in the matter of how they assisted the farmers; but at the end of his speech, when he wished to point out that his district was requiring something, and wanted his little part of Western Australia to get something from the Government, he said, "What did the Government do when there was a drought in my electorate last year?" If there was a drought in the hon. member's electorate last year, and he wanted Government assistance to the extent he spoke of, then I contend he was not fair in his criticism of the Government in accusing them of showing a deficit, although having a good season. Coming to the subject of charities and hospitals, I would like to say that I hope the day will come when the word "charity" will be wiped clean off the slate of Australian politics, and that, if any assistance is necessary, people will get it as a right and not as a charity, but because their manhood or womanhood in this State will entitle them to it. Still, while we have need of charity, I am positive we have never had a gentleman administering the Medical Department who has done one-tenth of what the Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) has done in this respect. We find a gentleman, Mr. Speaker, backed up by the Government—because if he did not have a sympathetic Government he could do nothing—we find a gentleman whose actions have been the means of keeping the home life of this State more sacred than it used to be kept. If a man through ill-fortune, sickness, death, or some other cause is rendered incapable of keeping the home going, the wife or widow, as the case might be, had to do her share towards maintaining the children, but it is to the everlasting credit of the Hon. W. C. Angwin that those children are being kept under better conditions, are being kept at their mother's knee, and if there is any sentiment or love at all in this life, then we

realise that the bringing up of children at the mother's knee is a better scheme than bringing them up in a public or subsidised home, no matter how much that institution may be endeavouring to do its work. So far as the hospitals are concerned, I know that the Honorary Minister has a hard row to hoe. In the metropolitan and closely populated centres, the people do practically nothing to keep their hospitals going. If they do any such work it is most likely a collection in the street, which is not right, but in the remote districts the people themselves do a great deal for their hospitals. Two instances are the Sandstone and Leonora hospitals, to which has been subscribed a great deal more money than the Government subsidies amounted to for their upkeep and the work of helping indigent patients in the district. In the metropolitan area the people have greater facilities, and there is a board in connection with the most important hospital in the State. They are not to my mind serving the best interests of the State, as they should do, instead of wrangling at almost every meeting. They never seem desirous to do anything for themselves but decide that the good old Government have to do the lot. The Honorary Minister (Hon. W. C. Angwin) has in many cases been of assistance to the hospitals. When the Hon. J. D. Connolly was Colonial Secretary in a previous Government, and refrenchment was needed in Western Australia, the first direction in which he showed his teeth were the hospital subsidies, the very hospitals that were doing a little to help themselves. That gentleman said that if they were doing a little to help themselves, he would force them to do more. The Honorary Minister in the present Government has done a great deal, but I am sure that more will be wanted, and if so I trust that it will be forthcoming to those hospital committees who are endeavouring to help themselves. The hon. member for Moore (Hon. R. B. Lefroy) said he believed a great deal of unrest and some of the deficit was caused by the fact that the Government went in for day labour and never did anything by contract. This has for many years been a subject that one could

argue upon, but when we get down to true economics one never knows how it is going to pan out. Some men have grown rich on the contract system, but how many workers have grown rich on it? The employers have grown rich, those who do comparatively nothing, although I admit that a man must have brains and ability for contracting, but it cannot be claimed that this alleged ability is of vastly greater importance than the life blood and brawn of the men who do the hard work.

Mr. Monger: We have heard that tale told very frequently.

Mr. FOLEY: You will hear it more frequently. I think the people of this State recognise the Government are endeavouring to do something on this question. Under the contract system if a little road job has to be done and six men undertake it, they take it on by contract. The six men reap the benefit of their labour through the extra strength Providence has provided them with, but when a contractor takes this work, how does he carry it out? He carries it out by day labour. The hon. member said that he gets better work done; he does in some instances, I grant that, and I wish to use that as an argument why some of the day labour work of the present Government is not being carried out under such advantageous conditions as the Government would wish. The hon. member said in effect that they get better work. How? The supervision might be better. With a fair knowledge on this question I say that the men in charge of some of the works which are being done by day labour are not giving the Government a fair deal. There are many men in charge of these jobs who are diametrically opposed to the day labour system and who are doing their best to see that it is not going to be made a success. These are the men who are being paid by the Government to supervise the work. The cause is one thing; we want the effect. I say that the cure for the complaint will be that if a Government believes in day labour, it should have the right to sack those men who are not giving them a fair deal.

Mr. Monger: Why don't you?

Mr. FOLEY: Because past Governments have been of the same political opinions as the hon. member, and because they were allowed to remain too long on this side of the House, and many of the gentlemen to whom I have referred are great friends of those who were in power and were in their confidence to a great extent. That is why the present Administration have not been getting a fair deal. As far as the Civil Service are concerned—and these men to whom I have been referring are practically civil servants—I say that until the Government have the right to sack as well as to employ, they are not going to get the best results out of the governmental construction of any work. I would like to see every branch of the civil service temporarily employed. I do not want to cast any reflection on the work of the civil service, speaking generally, but I say the instances of men who do not do their work well are many, and this kind of thing is not fair to others in the service or to the Government who employ them. But through having had Conservative Governments in power too long the positions of these people about whom I am complaining were made so secure that those who are now in authority find themselves powerless to do what ought to be done. The only other question to which I desire to refer is that of mining. Mining in this State is now confined to a question of labour and anti-labour politically. I have in my hand an extract from the *Monthly Journal* of the Chamber of Mines, and I believe it represents the opinions of most of the various mine managers in this State. It is written well from their point of view. No one can question the ability of the gentleman who writes this pamphlet. During the recess the present Minister for Mines was twitted with not administering the Mining Acts of this State altogether to the advantage of Western Australia, and he was criticised from a purely party point of view.

Mr. Monger: By whom?

Mr. FOLEY: By the man who wrote for the Chamber of Mines in this publication, one of the officials of the Chamber of Mines, the past secretary. The

workers in the mining industry are not ashamed to own that they belong to unions and they are not ashamed of their official organ which voices sometimes the views of those men and the views of democracy generally. I refer to the *Worker*. It may be a paper that does not suit every one; it might not suit us, and we might want to see it improved, but still we are willing to stand by it. The miners are all Labourites.

Mr. Monger: Are they?

Mr. FOLEY: And well the hon. member knows it from the last election, and I trust he will know it to a greater extent at the next. As far as the members of the Chamber of Mines are concerned they are anti-labour to the backbone: they want to patronise the Government in power. One has only to read their pamphlet on the Federal elections to find that not one line of it gives credit to any man who holds labour views, no matter what sound arguments there might be in the opinions of these gentlemen. On the other hand they laud to the skies one gentleman who has left Federal politics, but I do not wish to enter into a personal controversy. I want just to say that I recognise and speak from the point of view that miners are Labourites, and employers are anti-Labourites. After hearing almost every speaker in this Chamber one would imagine that the foremost industry in Western Australia was quite non-existent. Without being boomed, but backed up by practical and sympathetic administration, the industry is causing wealth to be poured into the agricultural areas of the State which are making great strides at the present time. Those connected with the mining industry are not parochial or narrow-minded. We know that the wealth which is accruing from this industry is being sent to the agricultural areas to help the battler who is doing his share towards the development of the State. The miners and the people on the goldfields are doing their share towards opening up the country, but I am sorry to say that during the recess they have been criticised unmercifully because they were said to be narrow-

mind and one-eyed, and had no sympathy with the farmers.

Mr. Monger : Where did those sentiments emanate from ?

Mr. FOLEY : From the Liberal League.

Mr. Monger : No.

Mr. FOLEY : I am going on what I have heard. I do not know that a goldfields member has at any time ever voted against the construction of an agricultural railway in this State, and that being the case it cannot be said as far as the development of the State is concerned, that the goldfields members were doing anything that is detrimental to the agricultural industry. On the other hand, when some gentlemen expressed the opinion that railways should go before settlement, they never had a better opportunity of supporting that view than when the proposal to construct the Esperance line was put before them. How many members on the Opposition side voted for that railway? Not one, and I doubt whether they ever will, just because the measure for the railway originated from this side.

Mr. Monger : Give us a few figures.

Mr. FOLEY : Figures have already been given and I do not desire to weary the House with them. There are some figures of recent date which are contained in various reports and my friend can peruse them if he likes. We find that when the Federal Government took over the Northern Territory and constructed a railway to make the inland portion accessible—the only portion that can be worked at the present time—when they did that they were twitted with the criticism that the place was peopled by officers, and that there was a debt on the Territory of so many pounds per head, which had to be carried by the people of Australia. If it is good for Western Australia to build railways before settlement hon. members ought to cease their endless criticism of the administration of the Northern Territory, so far as the Federal Government are concerned. Coming back to mining, we find that at Wiluna there are refractory ores, and that mines have been closed down for

many years because this ore could not be treated at a profit. A gentleman named Howe has devised a scheme whereby the ore can be treated, and it is to the credit of that gentleman, and to Western Australia, that that treatment has proved an absolute success. It is now only a question as to how much it will cost to work these big ore bodies existing at Wiluna. I am sure the hon. member will be gratified to know this. Not only will this experiment benefit Wiluna, but it will be the means of causing hundreds of men to be employed at the Bellevue mine at Mount Sir Samuel, and at the Lancefield mine, which has been a bone of contention for many years. These mines will be worked because their ore is of a higher grade than the ore at Wiluna. It will be seen that if the Government can assist that company, and they have placed no bar on them in their endeavours to produce this result, then I say they are doing something practical to assist the mining industry. I do not say that no other Government would have done it, but we have found a Government that have done it with very little talk. I trust the people of the State will learn once and for all to say that a man need not necessarily own a big business to be a business man. He can have a good business capacity and yet be working in a mine, as in the case of the men who have been directly responsible for the results which have been brought about in the Wiluna mine. Quite a number of hon. members lose no opportunity of declaring that the mining industry is going down, and that our fields are petering out, yet these hon. members call themselves optimists. If they are optimists, I would like to know what a pessimist is. One hon. member last year got in his say after all the others had spoken. He cried stinking fish as far as the goldfields were concerned, and declared that scarcely anything was being done on the mines; yet we find that our mines are going down to 3,000 feet and over, and good values are being obtained. The hon. member I refer to, the member for Pingelly (Mr. Harper) with his long experience in the

mining industry should be the last in the world to adversely criticise any mining field when it was in such a developmental stage as were Kalgoorlie and the other fields when he criticised them.

Mr. Monger : He has never criticised them adversely.

Mr. FOLEY : Oh yes, he did. Many of our mines are working at 3,000 feet and over. They are looking well, and sampling and crushing well. There is Ora Banda, with oxidised ores in the top levels, giving way to sulphides, and we find at Ora Banda that telluride was discovered a little while ago. Hitherto we were led to believe that there were only two places in the world at which telluride was to be found, namely, Kalgoorlie, and a State in America. but I wish to say that many years ago in the Broad Arrow district, which lies directly between Kalgoorlie and Ora Banda, telluride was found by the men working under Captain Truscott in the Credo mine near Broad Arrow. That being the case, and telluride being found at Ora Banda and Kalgoorlie, and at Broad Arrow situated between these two places, leads us to believe that there are still a few Golden Miles lying dormant only waiting to respond to the pick or the machine of the prospector. There has been a much firmer tone lately in Boulder and Kalgoorlie in respect to mining shares. It is good to know this. For many years past in this State the mining industry has been regarded as a speculation, but I believe, judging from the way our mines are crushing and sampling, that to a greater extent than in any other Australian State will the mining industry of this State come to be looked upon as an investment rather than a speculation. We find that Coolgardie is looking up, and that Southern Cross, which was supposed to have petered out many years ago—which my friend the member for Pingelly, as mine manager, turned down as far as profits were concerned, many years ago—we find that Southern Cross is today producing more gold than heretofore and under better conditions than previously obtained. Then look also at the values being obtained in my own district.

I have it on the authority of Mr. Loring, the head in Australia of Bewick, Moreing & Co., that he considers the Sons of Gwalia one of the best mines in Australia, and the best under the control of his firm. Then let us go to the Meekatharra field and see the development taking place there. When we look at the development of the Fingall mine, the criticism of the member for Pingelly seems a very small voice indeed. The present Ministry have done much to assist mining, and much more, we hope, is to follow. Even if many of our socialistic schemes have to be brought in, the mines must be opened up. Prospecting parties have been equipped, and some of the parties that have been sent out, or have obtained camels with which to go out, comprise men who have never seen Perth, men who came overland from South Australia and who have never been to the capital of Western Australia. Some of them have been along the route of the trans-Australian railway, and I am very hopeful that at a certain distance along that line a new goldfield will be opened up. I know of one prospector who got gold out there, and I only trust that when he returns to that place he and others will get more, with the result that Western Australia will benefit.

Mr. Green : When he is ready to go out he will not be able to get the camels.

Mr. FOLEY : I think he will. One prospector just back from that district told me it was absolutely of no use going out there, because the water difficulty was against him. When the time arrives for him to return I am quite sure that if he requires camels he will get the assistance of the Government. My friend the member for Kalgoorlie said the other night that no prospector could get camels, because they were all being used on the dam at Kalgoorlie. It only goes to prove that the Government are endeavouring to do some good for the State. Only a few months back a new goldfield broke out in part of my own electorate, and it was impossible to cart the ore with teams to a battery to see whether it was worth anything. As soon as I put the case before the Minister for Mines he said he would do something. I suggested the loan of

camels, and they were immediately forthcoming, and only about three months ago the prospectors, after receiving their return from the battery, paid to the Mines Department £300 for the loan of these camels, because they said they did not want anybody to do anything for them for nothing. I hope my farmer friends will take notice of that. I would like to refer to one aspect of how mining can be assisted. The men who go prospecting certainly require assistance. There is another class of man equally as essential as the prospector, the man with the small show. He, too, requires assistance, and then again there is the rich man or company.

Hon. Frank Wilson: You do not want them.

Mr. FOLEY: That remark shows the capacity of the hon. member. I scarcely thought it was possible for him to get so low as to make that interjection. The man with money, and big companies, have just as much right to consideration, and are getting it from the present Government.

Hon. Frank Wilson: That is heresy.

Mr. FOLEY: It may be heresy, and perhaps there may be a heresy hunt for me, like there is said to be for the man who obtained the powellising agreement out of the department. These big men and companies should be assisted, and I will give an instance of how they have been assisted. There was a company in my own district, and there was a danger of the mine closing down. Capital was needed to sink a shaft and it was estimated that the work would take about £10,000. The Minister for Mines authorised me to put a proposition to them on a pound for pound basis. I went there and put the proposition to them, and had the cost of sinking that shaft been £10,000 the Government would have provided up to £5,000 on a pound for pound basis. But the offer was not accepted. It was not because the Government would not assist them, and I mention this to show that so long as assistance like that is offered to the big companies they have no cause for fear, so far as the present Government are concerned.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Many of them are coming in with capital, are they not?

Mr. FOLEY: We want them, and they are welcome. Many a time exemption is needed to enable a scheme to be formulated whereby the big ore bodies can be worked, and I would ask any member of the House to point to one instance since the present Minister for Mines has had control of the department where that exemption has not been forthcoming. Such was not always the case when the leader of the Opposition was Premier, and was backed up by a gentleman now in Federal politics. At that time exemption was given to companies who held large areas of land. In my own district, as the records in the Mines Department will show, for a continuous period of nearly 10 years one man obtained exemption. I was in Parliament only about three months when I was up against about six solicitors in Perth trying to fight this company, and not until they finally tried to fight through the Agent General in London were they beaten at every point. This mine to-day is being prospected with what I believe will be excellent results.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: By the same company?

Mr. FOLEY: No, by prospectors. By giving exemption the Minister is not always doing a good turn.

Hon. Frank Wilson: He has never refused it, you say?

Mr. FOLEY: Not under the conditions I have spoken of, but there are men who have hundreds of acres of land that they scarcely do anything with. They use it as a dumping ground for machinery, and keep it locked up from the genuine prospector for many years.

Hon. Frank Wilson: What are they doing about it?

Mr. FOLEY: I am pleased to say that the Minister for Mines has forfeited a number of leases, and there are not so many leases being held up now as before.

Hon. Frank Wilson: But what about this company?

Mr. FOLEY: The company were put in their place by not getting exemption, because it had been proved to the Minister

that they never intended to work the property. To-day they are waiting for the prospectors on either end to do the development work, and when they strike something the company will step in and reap the result. That is happening on many mines in Western Australia to-day. The present Minister for Mines has shut down on this sort of thing in many cases, but his predecessor did not do so. The man who had the ear of the Minister and officials in Perth could get exemption, but the man outback who was doing the work could not get it. Only recently the West Australian Bank, representing some big mining man—not capital, because he has none—went into the Mines Department in Perth to ask for exemption. The Minister had said that certainly no more exemption should be given, but the bank through the Under Secretary (Mr. H. S. King) obtained exemption.

Mr. Price: Do you say that exemption was given after the Minister said it should not be given?

Mr. FOLEY: After the Minister said no more exemption was to be given until after the 2nd of the month; but when the Minister was absent in Ravensthorpe his officer gave protection to the West Australian Bank on the Great Western leases.

Mr. Monger: That is a very strong statement.

Mr. FOLEY: Yes, but it is true, and the Minister is not going to be led by the nose by his officials, and although that case was perhaps harmful to a few, it has resulted in a minute being written by the present Minister for Mines that no more exemption or protection is to be granted by officers in Perth, and consequently the men out back will in future have equal opportunities with the rich men in Perth, who have had every chance of obtaining the Ministerial ear in regard to exemptions.

Mr. E. B. Johnston: Whatever he did, he did for the best.

Mr. Monger: It is a very nasty innuendo.

Mr. FOLEY: It is not an innuendo, but a plain statement which can be backed up by inquiry at the department. There is another class of prospector and that is the tributer. The tributer has done much

in Western Australia to open up the various mines, but, unlike Victoria, where tributers do not fulfil the labour covenants, in Western Australia they do fulfil them, and sometimes work for nothing or up to a paltry £2 a week, which is not a living wage on the goldfields, especially when out of it they have to find tools and fractureur to develop the ground for some company, and when sometimes they get something worth having, the company can step in and take the tributers off the work. Such a condition does not prevail in any other State.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It depends upon their agreement, does it not?

Mr. FOLEY: That is all the law provides. The law should be altered in order to allow them at least four pounds a week before any royalty is taken from them, because they are doing the work which a company would have to pay wages men to do, and if the work is not worth wages it is not worth having. In the matter of encouraging prospectors, it is a fact that on new fields speculative pegging goes on to a large extent. The Government ought to take a hand in this matter and see that when there is a new rush a few men do not have the opportunity of pegging out all the claims to the detriment of good men who at the time might be prospecting in remote parts of the State and reach the field late. As regards forfeitures, there have been instances respecting which a difference of opinion has existed between members on this side of the House, but there has never been any forfeiture case brought before the Minister which any Labour member ever regarded with the slightest suspicion. If the Minister made mistakes they were simply mistakes, the experience of which would prevent him from committing similar errors again. I wish to say a few words on the matter of prospecting areas. At the present time it is possible for a prospecting area to be held only for a certain period, but some associations want the Government to determine that prospecting areas shall be prospecting areas for practically all time. This in my opinion would be wrong, because no mine inspector can say whether

a prospecting area is payable. Some men might work well and others might not, and it should not be left to the inspector to say whether an area is payable. At the expiration of the term for the prospecting area the lessee should have the right to apply for a continuance on that area, and under such conditions, I believe prospecting in this State would be benefited. The old question of battery charges has cropped up again recently, and in this connection the Minister for Mines—

Mr. Monger called attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr. FOLEY: In connection with battery charges, the Minister has taken a step which no other Minister has ever taken, and I consider it a wise one. It has been suggested by supporters of the Government, and it is a fact that the present charges on State batteries all round cannot be reduced. At the prospectors' conference held at Coolgardie, there were not two men who held the same opinion as to how these charges could best be reduced. Each gave his opinion, based on the experience of working a little battery of his own, or one that he had known on the other side worked by a water-wheel or some other contrivance, but the Minister said, "You prove to me that it is possible for you to keep a mill going, and if you do, I believe I can reduce the charges." In the Coolgardie district this reduction of charges is being made, and if Coolgardie can prove that, the same may be done in other districts, and the all-round charges for crushing might thus be lessened. At the same time, I do not think there is any one institution in which the Government should not endeavour to make both ends meet. In the matter of assistance to prospectors, these men should be given an opportunity to prospect on areas on which they have a chance of gaining something, but we find that where there are big mines the ground to the extent of several hundred acres on either end is often held by the companies operating these big mines. The country is thus locked up at either end of the big leases, or amalgamation of leases,

the prospectors have not the right or the opportunity of pegging on the line of reef, which if it were allowed, would be of much benefit to them, and if opened up, of great benefit to the State. I consider that an extent of 96 acres is too much and if I had charge of this department with full authority I would never allow more than 60 acres to be held by any one company, because, with all the mining knowledge I have had throughout Australia, I have never found 60 acres of land worked by one company, even if it were a big alluvial mine in Victoria. If 60 acres under those conditions is too much for these companies to use legitimately we all know 96 acres is much more illegitimate, and I trust the Ministry will bring about in the new Mines Regulation Bill a reduction in the number of acres it is possible for any one leaseholder to hold in Western Australia. I consider that the Mines Office is slow in the matter of giving assistance to small show holders, not because the Minister or his officers desire to be slower than any other department, but we find that when an application for assistance is made by a small show holder, perhaps to sink or drive, the inspector in that district has to go and inspect the show and give his opinion in a report to the Chief Mining Engineer. The latter officer reports to the Under Secretary, who in turn reports to the Minister, but by that time perhaps in many instances the prospector is miles away from where he was when he made that application. If the formation of mining boards in any district can better that system I say it would be well to inaugurate mining boards, but so long as the inspector of the district has the say, and he is the only man who has the say, then we will have district prejudices, which must exist in the mind of every mining man, always prominent. I believe that if mining boards were formed to improve this, it would not be the opinion of only one man as to whether a show or line of reef was worthy of assistance from the Government, but the matter would be decided on the opinions of men who have given a great deal of their lives to the mining industry.

On the question of big mines I have given my opinion as to how I believe they can be assisted. I believe the big companies, the men with capital, and the small men in the State, can be assisted to a great extent, not by money given out to them to work their mines, but by the use of the laboratories connected with the Mines Department. The ores of Western Australia are refractory; they are different from any others existing in Australia, and a man might walk over one of the best and most profitable lodes and never be aware of it, because he does not know the nature of the stuff. In the old times a man went out with a pick, a shovel, a dish, and perhaps a small dolly pot, and he could test anything, but in Western Australia it has been proved that lodes exist that cannot be tested by this system. Each man who is prospecting has a different opinion on the question of how these tests should be made, and I consider it is the duty of a Government to step in and by work in the Government laboratory assist the mining industry to the fullest extent possible. To show that the mining industry is not going down is proven by the fact that to the end of July, 1912, gold to the value of £3,115,000 was obtained, and to the end of July, 1913, the total was £3,173,000, or nearly £60,000 more in favour of the seven months ended July this year, compared with the corresponding period of last year. That has come from a smaller number of leases. I am aware that the Minister for Mines has forfeited many leases of men who did not intend to work them. He said that if leases were to be held they were to be worked or else forfeited. In 1911 there were over 2,000 leases, and that was the year of the great Bullfinch boom, when much speculative pegging took place in that district. In 1912 there were 1,491 leases and in 1913, although there was a bigger output, there were only 1,313 leases in existence. That just shows how much gold has been got, but at what cost? In 1911 the tons of ore broken per man in this State amounted to 331, and in 1912 to 365. That is an answer to the hon. member for Pingelly

(Mr. Harper) when he says labour is inferior and deteriorating in the industries of Western Australia. Fortunately accidents have been fewer, and the reason for the falling off is the good administration of the Mines Department at present. In almost every instance the inspectors are the same, but under the Labour Administration they are not hampered in their work. The Minister for Mines was only in office a few weeks when he issued an instruction that the Mines Regulation Act and the Mining Act under the jurisdiction of the inspectors had to be rigidly enforced, and these men who were good men in almost every instance, were given the opportunity of doing good work. This has had the result of lessening to a great extent the number of accidents in our mines in Western Australia. What I have said in regard to the tonnage broken per man, show that our miners always work at top speed, and when that is so, that is the time that miners' phthisis, or, as it is commonly known, miner's complaint, seizes hold of them. In the sanatorium at Coolgardie, as well as at Subiaco and Kalgoorlie, there are to be found a number of men who are suffering from miners' phthisis, men who have been amongst our best workers. I know many of them, and the fact of their having been good workers who have had to carry on their labours under bad conditions is responsible for their present state of health. And now they are living on the charity of the people of Western Australia. What are the Government going to do? The present Government are building a sanatorium at Wooroloo. That institution will do much for these unfortunate men, but that is not altogether what is wanted. If we desire to do away with miners' phthisis, if we wish to do away with the harm that is being caused to these men—the member for Kalgoorlie said it would be a good thing if the Government saw their way to help the widows and orphans of these men, but I consider the proper thing to do is to make our mines clean, make the air in them pure, and thus prevent these women becoming widows and the children orphans. A royal commission

sat on this question of miner's phthisis, a couple of years ago in this State, but its work to my mind was scarcely worth the paper upon which the report was printed. There has been a work published in Victoria by Dr. Summons. One of the big men of that State made money out of mining in Victoria, and devoted a certain amount of it towards an investigation of miners' diseases, and towards ascertaining the best means of preventing these diseases, and the report of Dr. Summons, which was the outcome of the investigations, set out that if the air in mines were made pure there would be no need to worry about the quantity of it. In Western Australia there are many dry treatment plants, and the majority of the holes bored in the mines are dry. In Victoria it is illegal for a man to bore a dry hole in a mine. If there is a hole being bored there is to be a water jet played on the dust. That is the secret of the prevention of miner's phthisis, but I have heard it said that the humid atmosphere injures the men more than the other. As one who has worked underground for 22 years, I say that so long as a man uses plenty of water in the faces he is working in, he is safer; can wash his clothes, but it is impossible for him to wash his lungs. If it is possible in Victoria to bring in this regulation, it should be possible also here.

Mr. Monger called attention to the state of the House; bells rung and a quorum formed.

Mr. FOLEY: I was referring to the report of Dr. Summons which set out that if we could make the air in the mines pure there would be no need to worry about the quantity per man. Unfortunately, as I have stated, the dry treatment process in many of our mines prevents that to a great extent being done. The question in Victoria was settled at one time by the fact that if a man was working in a hot end or a wet end he worked six hours a day. It can be understood, however, that this is not a solution of the difficulty, though it may be a palliative. If a man is working in an end, and it is only possible to work there for six

hours, there will come a time when that end will get further away from the ventilation which is obtainable in the mine, and the question will arise whether it will be wise for him to work more than four hours, and so it will go on until he will not be able to work for more than three hours. This kind of thing does not make mining profitable, and if it were carried on to any extent the particular mine would have to close down. In some of the mines in Western Australia we are working on a level, and perhaps the winze or rise under which the men are working might be a downcast as far as the air current is concerned. Next day a man might be working in the same place and it might be an upcast. That is not ventilation. The air is only passing around, and the miner or the mullocker who is working behind has to stand the consequences of that. I was sorry that the question of ventilation did not enter into the discussion when the Royal Commission on miner's phthisis sat in this State. The miners themselves can do much, and there are mine owners who are willing to give as good conditions to work under as they can, but it is the duty of the miners themselves to see that all matter underground that is not healthy is put into one place, and that they are clean in their habits underground. Matters such as these would assist to a great degree. And then if these men are careful and it is found that the company owning that property are not keeping up their end so far as cleanliness is concerned, they should be prosecuted with the utmost rigour of the law. Everyone is in accord with the construction of the home for consumptives at Wooroloo. No one will say that the men who contract miner's complaint always contract tuberculosis; but it is highly necessary in the interests of the men that they should be segregated from those passing through the later stages of the disease. They should be given an opportunity of getting away to Wooroloo, which I understand is to be specially adapted for those suffering from the disease in a mild form. If any

assistance is needed by the dependants of such men it should be forthcoming from the industry. When the sufferers are in an advanced stage of consumption they should be kept away from others only slightly affected. If we can do that and if hon. members will give us their support for the passing of the Mines Regulation Act, and if that measure is treated with any consideration at all in another place, I believe this Parliament will have been the means of alleviating distress to a very great extent, and will have helped materially to remove the cause of much of the miner's phthisis and other complaints to which miners are subject in Western Australia. There are several questions I would like to touch upon were it not for the fact that they are, in my opinion, questions rather for the Arbitration Court than for the Legislature to deal with. I wish in conclusion to compliment the Minister for Mines on the patriotism displayed in his administration of the department. In my own electorate during the present year his administration has been the means of replacing very many foreigners in the mines by Britishers. The result is that although many of these Britishers are newly arrived immigrants who for the first week, at all events, do not understand much much about the work, the output of gold has gone up and the tonnage returns have increased at the same time. We often hear members of the Opposition declare it is wrong to place obstacles in the way of employing foreigners in the mines. The same solicitous gentlemen may sometimes be seen waving a British flag at some function, on which occasions they are regarded as patriots. But the only patriotism of which they are guilty is a patriotism which is not allowed to affect their pockets. When hon. members suggest that the foreigner in the mines is superior to the Britisher they are belittling the stock from which they themselves have sprung. When these newly arrived immigrants have had a few weeks in a mine, they prove themselves to be as good as other men, that is to say, at

shovelling and mullocking. In a very short time these Britishers are capable of doing better work than foreigners of long experience in the mines. In view of this, how can any objections be raised when we get the Mines Regulation Bill regulating the number of foreigners to be employed in a mine? Mr. Greenhart, an inspector of mines, on one occasion found that of 303 men employed in the Gwalia mine 201 were foreigners. I have been twitted many times with making inaccurate statements in regard to the employment of foreigners in the mines, but this testimony by Mr. Greenhart should serve to disabuse the minds of those who would like to think that the percentage of foreigners to Britishers in our mines is infinitesimal. I trust the present Minister for Mines will be long in office to administer the Mines Regulation Act, which is going to give preference to Britishers as against foreigners. I contend that every hundred foreigners in a mine is about equivalent to one more gun pointed at Great Britain. If ever the time arrives for Australians to take action, whether on behalf of Great Britain or for themselves, the action will be taken by good Australians and Britishers who in the past have been thrown aside in favour of the foreigners in our mines; and the foreigners themselves will then sit back on velvet and say, "We are not Britishers nor Australians, and, therefore, there is no call for us to fight." In conclusion I wish to say that as a goldfields member I am just as ardent a supporter of the Government to-day as when first I came into the House. It has now been shown that when they have an opportunity to prove their worth they seize it on every occasion, and although they may have made some few mistakes, yet their administration has been as clean and as able as any other administration known to Western Australia. I hope that when we get the result of the anticipated good season the farmers' representatives in Parliament will give some little credit to the Government

who have done so much for the farmers in their time of necessity.

Mr. MONGER: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Mr. Monger drew attention to the state of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that there is a quorum within the precincts of the House.

Mr. MONGER (York): I have been put to a slight disadvantage this evening. I expected the usual courtesy from the representatives of the Government in regard to my request for an adjournment of the debate. They have not agreed to this. I do think that we might have had meted out to us a small amount of ordinary courtesy from the Government benches. During this debate we have had constant reference to the kindness that has been meted out by the gentlemen on the Government side to Sir Newton Moore, and I think if there is one person in this Chamber who should congratulate himself upon Sir Newton's retention of the office of Agent General, it is the member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas). I am sorry that he is not here this evening, but I do think that he amongst other gentlemen on the Ministerial side should congratulate himself upon Sir Newton's re-appointment. I do not desire to refer to any of the controversial matters that have been given so much expression to by both members on the Opposition side and gentlemen occupying the Ministerial benches, but I do want to say that the time is not far distant when the Minister for Lands and the Minister for Works will be called upon to account to the country for their various, shall I say, suggestions. So far as the Minister for Works is concerned, I thought that he to-night would have been in his place and before the debate closed would have given a few explanations to the people of this State in regard to the attitude he has adopted, not on one question but on many questions appertaining to the general interests of the people of this country. He is not here, and we are told that the Address-in-reply is to be carried to-night. I am sorry that the

Minister for Works is not here, for if there is one gentleman on the Treasury benches whom I do desire to hear my few remarks with regard to the mal-administration of the present Government he is that Minister. I am glad to see, however, that the member for Subiaco has at last come in, and if I may be allowed to revert back to a little ancient history I will refer to that select committee which was appointed by this Chamber and placed in the hands of the hon. member for Subiaco—

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Very capable hands, too.

Mr. MONGER: I would not like to say very capable hands, but I will say that there was no mandate given to any section of the Government that was swallowed and taken up so kindly as that was by the member for Subiaco in the position to which he was appointed.

Mr. Dwyer: What did he swallow?

Hon. Frank Wilson: The Government.

Mr. MONGER: I do hope that the hon. member will attempt to give some little explanation of the verdict that he and his Government gave on that occasion. We have heard a good deal of the many kindnesses extended to the agricultural interests by our friends on the Ministerial side. I do want explicit information from them to-night as to the method by which they mean to deal out fairness to the people who were shown railway propositions in a certain direction, and afterwards saw the railways taken in a very opposite direction to that in which they were promised when the people went to settle in that particular locality.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: There were five routes for that line. How could you build a line on five routes?

Mr. MONGER: I am referring not only to that particular line but to every proposition for which authority was obtained by the previous Administration, and which was given effect to by the Minister during the last 12 or 18 months. During the debate on these agricultural railways nothing was more adversely discussed than the Tambellup-Oregerup line, the opening of which took place the other day. I think the Minister for Railways

was present and the usual congratulatory statements were made on that occasion. But if ever adverse criticism was advanced within the precincts of this Chamber it was on the occasion when that railway proposition was under consideration. I am sorry that the member for Albany (Mr. Price) is not in his seat at the present moment to support me in that statement. The point I desire to make is this: that while strong opposition was brought against that particular railway proposal, no such attitude was adopted like that taken up by the Minister for Works in regard to the Wickpin-Merredin line. I regret that the Minister for Works is not in his seat, because I am going to say that he has not played the game fairly in regard to the Wickpin-Merredin line. His attitude in the matter of the construction of roads as feeders to the railways is unfair, excepting where his own personal interests are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not say that.

Mr. MONGER: I am sorry the Minister is not here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not make such an imputation that the Minister is guided by his own personal interests.

Mr. MONGER: I will remember that direction in the future. I am sorry that the Minister is not present because he might have given reasons in regard to the intentions of his department in the matter of construction of roads as feeders to railways. I have heard a lot during the course of the debate on the Address-in-reply concerning the kindly efforts of the present Administration towards the people settling on the land. I have heard the wails and cries from the member for Subiaco and the Minister for Works and I want to say that I was never present at a more pitiable exhibition than when I saw Works and Lands occupying very prominent positions in one of our agricultural centres—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MONGER: In one of our agricultural centres—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not refer to Ministers as

Works and as Lands, but must refer to them as the hon. the Minister for Works and the hon. the Minister for Lands.

Mr. MONGER: I apologise. What I did intend to convey was that I never saw a more pitiable exhibition offered when the hon. Minister for Works and the hon. Minister for Mines attended a conference in the hon. Minister for Lands' electorate. And if you had only been there, Mr. Speaker, you would have sympathised with those two gentlemen. They have been telling us what they have done, and what they are going to do; but God help Western Australia if we depend upon the promises of those two gentlemen in what they are going to do for the advancement of the State. The hon. member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) told us in most eloquent style of what had been done. Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you what they offered. An attempt was made to do away—I will not say with the liberty of the subject—but if ever there was an attempt made to make our land settlement a hard proposition it was in the introduction of these regulations of the 18th October, 1911. The Minister for Lands, if he did not quite succeed, very nearly did so. This reminds me of the fact that I asked a few mild questions the other day and got replies. The effect of these replies was that land settlement has deteriorated out of all recognition since the conclusion of the regime of my friend, the ex-Minister for Lands.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Cultivation has gone ahead very fast. A great deal of land is under crop.

Mr. MONGER: Not so much as there should be.

[A pause ensued.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member resume his seat! Of course it is apparent to me and everyone else in this Chamber, that the hon. member is merely wasting time. This House is not one in which the proceedings can be carried on in a farcical manner, but is for doing the business of the country. If the hon. member does not make his speech in the ordinary manner, I will ask him to cease altogether. I am going to give him another chance, but cannot allow him to proceed

if he is going to bring the proceedings of this Chamber into ridicule and contempt.

Mr. MONGER: Before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I join issue—

Hon. Frank Wilson: Mr. Speaker has not ordered you to resume your seat, but only to resume your speech.

Mr. MONGER: Before resuming my seat, I would like to say that if there is one piece of congratulation that I can extend to my friends who occupy the Ministerial benches, it is in connection with the fine season and the great prospects before us, and I hope that the hon. members occupying the Ministerial benches will, when they go to the country in the course of another twelve months or so, be able to say, "Alone we did it."

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Mr. ALLEN: I second the motion.

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

Ayes	6
Noes	19

Majority against .. 13

AYES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Layman
Mr. Monger	(Teller).
Mr. A. N. Piesse	

NOES.

Mr. Collier	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Dwyer	Mr. Munzie
Mr. Foley	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Gill	Mr. Price
Mr. Green	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Holman	Mr. Swan
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Underwood
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Heltmann
Mr. McDowall	(Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

12 o'clock, midnight.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE (Toodyay): I am very loath to take up the time of the House at this hour of the night, and I might also say that I regret to be the cause of prolonging the hours of the *Hansard* staff and the officials of the House. I had an assurance from the Ministerial Whip

that this debate would be adjourned until next Tuesday and now I am told that owing to a disturbance of the debate it has been decided to proceed and terminate the discussion to-night. This is not the first time that a promise of this description has been made and then broken.

The Minister for Mines: It was announced by the Press this morning that the debate would be concluded to-night.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Your Whip made the arrangement with the hon. member last night.

The Minister for Mines: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The Minister for Mines: You encourage some of your men.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Hon. Frank Wilson: What about the arrangement with the Whip?

The Minister for Mines: There was no arrangement made; it was announced last night that the debate would terminate to-night.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I will suspend both hon. members if they persist in interrupting when I call order. I will not allow it, and I will suspend the hon. members without hesitation if their interruptions are repeated.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: It is my desire to get my views in *Hansard* and I deem it necessary that I should proceed with my short speech even at this late hour. When Parliament assembles people naturally look with some expectation to the Governor's Speech. The Speech we have before us establishes a record for emptiness. Take away the formal matters and what is there left in it? We might have expected the Governor to say, "My Ministers have done little during recess, and therefore we have very little to say now, and as they intend to do less in the future,"—enough said. The only matter that we may call important, and it is by way of diversion, is the Esperance railway, the old lame duck, and which, without any justification whatever, is to be brought before the House again this session.

Mr. Green: It will show the attitude of some hon. members to the rest of the State.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: We have had no pre-sessional speech from the Premier, and the Premier has had little to tell us. No doubt he is filled with anxiety as to the future of the State, although he covers up the position with a pleasant expression which he is fortunate enough always to be able to wear. I quite realise the feelings of the present Ministry. They have had very little in the way of success and they have very little to be proud of. Their speculations in the matter of socialistic ventures have been absolute failures, and they have plunged themselves into unnecessary worry and the country into great expense. The purchase of the trams has been a matter which has considerably hampered the Government, and hampered the development of the country as well. The Government have spent half a million or three parts of a million of money on works which were not essential, and in ventures which were not necessary in the progress of the country. If that money had been spent in the development of the agricultural resources, we would have been in a better position and the people would have had much greater heart, while the Government themselves would have been made happy. The Government have burdened themselves with these socialistic ventures, and have failed in their duty to the country. To hark back to the Speech, we find that splendid rains have fallen, and that the prospects of the harvest are good. This is unnecessary padding in the Speech. Of course we hope that we will have an abundant harvest, and if there is not, there will be further stagnation, and we shall suffer. To the Ministry of to-day we have little to be grateful for. I am sorry they have not realised their responsibilities. We have a large number of people in the agricultural areas in the back blocks who are in a starving condition, and no effort has been made to relieve them. Seed wheat and fertilisers were supplied last year, but this year these unfortunate people are left to shift for themselves. Further than that, they are burdened with liabilities due to the State and which amount to a considerable sum. There are two years' rent due and

also instalments on seed and fertilisers as well, and in some cases Agricultural Bank instalments are still due. If the present Government realise their duty to the State they will endeavour to place the position of these people on a sounder footing, and that I contend can be done by amending the Land Act so that in the case of a drought, or of necessity, the period of the loans can be extended, and time given to these people to meet their liabilities. Many of them are hopelessly involved. It really is too bad to think that the Ministry have not realised their responsibilities and the necessity to be up and doing. If it were not for the fact that these Ministers who hold land are in receipt of considerable money they themselves would have to throw up their holdings. If it were possible to place Ministers in the position of one of these settlers to whom I have referred, we would find that they would quickly starve. I venture to say that the position these people are in is really serious and I sincerely trust before this session is ended power will be sought to enable the Government to give relief to these people.

The Minister for Mines: In view of what has been done and the statement of the members for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) and Beverley (Mr. Brown) your remarks are most ungenerous.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Not ungenerous.

Mr. Green: They are worse than ungenerous.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I am just about weary of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green). He comes here with socialistic ideas which are beyond him. He has no conception of what socialism means. They are purely and simply his own ideas and it is for his own benefit that he pushes forward these views of his from time to time. Now to refer once more to the position of these people, certainly something will have to be done. The Minister has just told me my remarks are ungenerous. But he must remember that it is not the Government who have carried these people for the last six months; it is the merchants who have carried them, who have advanced to them. The other day there was a notification in the *West*

Australian to the effect that a bill of sale would have to be forthcoming to the department. This request for a bill of sale was most ill-timed, because so far as the Government liabilities are concerned there is ample security. If the people paid no rent their improvements are sufficient to justify the extension of time for the payment of these rents and to provide security for the liability. Arrangements have to be made whereby these people are expected to pay interest, and to assign a certain percentage of their crop, and the balance is divided amongst their creditors.

The Minister for Mines: People engaged in other classes of business have to meet their liabilities.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: But these people are engaged in what the Minister has not the pluck to do, namely, to go out back and carve out a home for himself.

The Minister for Mines: I had the pluck to go into country which you could not look at. I have been in parts of this State which you would not dare to look into.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: It is not a matter of parts of this State which I would not dare to look into, but of the position of these people. When the Minister says they have to pay their liabilities like other men he forgets the privations these settlers have to undergo. I have seen some privations myself. However, I am not here to blow my own trumpet, but merely to urge the claims of these people out in the drier regions.

Mr. Dwyer: Who sent them into the drier regions?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Not the member for Perth. Judging from his remarks at a deputation the other day, they would be very foolish to take the advice of the member for Perth on any subject. These men are certainly entitled to more consideration than they are receiving. They are converting into a valuable asset what was formerly considered worthless.

Mr. Green: Would you advocate getting the middle man off their back.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The hon. member always has a bogey or two which he hawks about with him, something after

the manner of his friend the Minister for Lands. They resemble each other in their efforts to destroy bogies, like the man who set fire to a hay stack to drive out the mice.

Mr. Dwyer: There are lots of mice still left.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Yes there are a few about Perth. Like the member for Kalgoorlie, the Minister for Mines sought to destroy what was a small trouble, and inflicted grievous wrong on the whole State in his definition of the lands regulations. He not only destroyed the security of conditional purchase leases but he ruined many men, and I venture to say that the gentleman whom we have spared severe criticism because of our high respect for him, I venture to say that—

Hon. J. Mitchell drew attention to the state of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am satisfied there is a quorum within the precincts of the House.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The instructions issued by the Minister for Lands in regard to the land regulations were nothing short of a calamity. These are not empty words. Prior to that definition the banks would receive these conditional purchase leases as a security. But once it had been given out that no transfers would be effected until 10 years improvements had been made on the leases, naturally the banks had not the pluck to continue, and I defy the Minister for Mines to say otherwise. Then the Government, in their generous manner, tried to shoulder the responsibility on to the associated banks. They said the banks turned down these people because a Labour Government was in power. Nothing of the sort. Since the Government came into power the banks have lent out more than they did previously.

The Minister for Mines: Was the member for Beverley correct when he said to-night that the Government had given generous assistance to the farmers?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I have myself said that in regard to my own electorate, in respect to water supply and seed and fertilisers. What I have now been saying is that it is the duty of the Government to

assist these people in regard to their liabilities. These people are heavily involved and if the Government would place them on a sound basis their positions would be much easier, and the merchants would be prepared to give them credit. If, for instance, their instalments due for seed and fertiliser and agricultural bank liabilities were extended over two years, we would find the merchants ready to carry them on.

The Minister for Mines: That has been done. The payments have been extended over two years.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: What we want is absolute freedom from such liability for two years. The property is sufficient security, and to extend it over six instalments is unnecessary.

Mr. Dwyer: And yet we have a deficit.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: What else can we expect from the people in power but a deficit? It is only natural. How can we imagine that a surplus will result from people who are so inconsistent?

The Minister for Mines: What was the deficit of your leader?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: When the Scaddan Government took office they took over a practically balanced ledger.

The Minister for Mines: You had a surplus of £13,000 once in six years.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: We wiped off the deficit, at any rate.

The Minister for Mines: So will we.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Reference has been made to the speeches having been personal, and, in the Premier's own words, "mud from the gutter." It is impossible to imagine a speech more characterised by mud from the gutter than that which the Premier made when replying to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Dwyer: He had to follow in the other's tracks.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Two wrongs do not make a right. If the leader of the Opposition did indulge in mud throwing that was no justification for the remarks of the Premier.

The Minister for Mines: But what have you to say about the cause of the trouble?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I have read the speech of the leader of the Opposition, which was a reasonable one, with the ex-

ception perhaps of the reference to Mr. Angwin, and I cannot see anything to take exception to in regard to his remarks concerning the Eucla land deal. Criticism, if fair, cannot be taken exception to. Reference has been made from time to time to our organisation as "the Liberal rabble," and "the old women of the Liberal League."

The Minister for Mines: What is a rabble, anyhow?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: We have not far to hunt for a rabble. Reference was made to the women of the Liberal League as old women. I would scorn to apply rude terms to the women of the Labour party, and the members who referred to the "old women" of the Liberal League have very little respect for the women of the country. There is no doubt that some of the women of the Liberal League would do greater service to the country than some of the members who ridicule them from time to time.

Mr. Green: Who said it?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I have heard members, particularly the member for Kalgoorlie, indulging in that unkind reference to the women supporters of our league.

Mr. Green: I deny that statement.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: If we want a specimen of inconsistency we have it from the Premier. When he was in London he said to his audiences, "Give us people and we will give them the land." Yet in the last two Governor's Speeches there has been no reference whatever to immigration. Does the Premier think those people in the Old Country are blind and that it is only a question of talking twaddle to them at Home, and turning it down immediately he returns and is under the whip of the Labour organisations? Reference has been made to the Eucla land grab. Certainly the Premier and his colleagues are justified in selecting land if they think fit, but in this particular case the public understood that the land was withheld from selection. Although the Premier said that the 40-mile belt only was reserved, the general impression was that the whole of the Eucla land was locked up.

The Minister for Mines: What nonsense!

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: That was the impression of the public at any rate and it was due to the fact that applications for land in that district were turned down by the James Government.

The Minister for Mines. Ten years ago.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Yes, and it was followed out by succeeding Governments. No intimation was given that the land was open for selection.

Mr. Dwyer: You had knowledge that the land was open for selection.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I had not.

Mr. Green: Would you have gone there if you had known?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I do not think I would, because it requires considerable capital to develop that country. At any rate, the public should have been made fully aware that the land was available for selection. This transaction raises the question of whether the Government are doing right in view of their official position, and I think they have been a little bit hypocritical in decrying the holders of large areas. It has been a general complaint of the Labour organisation that large holders of land are not putting their holdings to their best use and, therefore, they are against the country's best interests. We will see what the Cabinet syndicate do with their holding. It is not the first time that the Premier and his colleagues have indulged in land transactions. There is the matter of the home-
stead lease, which was much before the people during the Legislative Council election some time back. Here again the hypocritical phase of the Government's attitude comes in. Was it not through the fact that dummying was carried on and that the holders of land were selling and transferring to other people at a profit, that brought out the famous regulation by the Minister for Lands, which has done so much harm to the agricultural industry of this State? And yet we hear of a conditional purchase lease transferred to the Minister himself. With the member for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) I see no harm in the transaction, but the hon. member put the position clearly when he said that

the Government preached one thing and practised something different.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Do you not know that the reason for that regulation was that publicans in Perth were taking up land, and then a week after its approval it was for sale in an auction room in Perth?

Mr. Monger: It was not the reason at all.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: It is a fact that those who were so anxious to destroy this unlawful trade in land were not so clean in the matter of transactions themselves. I would like to refer to the financial aid and assistance given to the goldfields. The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Green) said that something like £140,000—I take it his figures are correct—had been given to the goldfields people for the advancement and assistance of mining generally. Contrast that with the action of the Government in the matter of water rates demanded from the farmers along the goldfields line, and other branch water service pipes. There we have an unjust tax imposed upon these people, people who are struggling hard to make a living on the land and the goldfields are spoonfed to the tune of £140,000 and probably the figures would total £200,000 if we had all the amounts before us.

The Minister for Mines: Are you aware that the goldfields people are paying a higher rate for water than the others—1s. 6d. per thousand?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: It is not a matter of whether the goldfields people are paying 1s. 6d. a thousand.

The Minister for Mines: Granted by your Government, too.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: And a just and proper arrangement it was. Just extend it to agriculturists, and see what the result will be. We are being squeezed, absolutely squeezed, and the other people are being spoonfed. That is not the only complaint we have against the present Administration on the point of assistance. In regard to the railways which have been authorised for some months, if the Government had had the wisdom and foresight to abstain from socialistic ventures the whole of them would have been in

course of construction, and some of them would have been completed to-day. But the country must be held up by this miserable system of departmental construction, which is questionable as to its saving from a monetary point of view, though there is no question that the country is losing enormous sums through the delay experienced owing to the lack of these conveniences. In my own district—I hope it will be served by a railway some day, as one has already been passed by Parliament, and in regard to which I have received replies from the Minister for Works that the construction would be put in hand—where people were put on the land by the assistance, not of the Government but of the merchants, if they put in every acre possible we would have something like 25,000 acres under crop which would yield about 100,000 bags of wheat to be carried over the railway. It seems that we must wait if the present wretched system of departmental construction is to be continued, and it looks as if we shall not get the railway for another two years. The member for Williams-Narrogin (Mr. E. B. Johnston) complained most bitterly of promises that had been made to him and had not been kept, and I think he complained with every justification. Similar promises have been given to other members. I do not say that the Minister for Works deliberately breaks these promises, but he has over-estimated the powers of his department from a constructional point of view. If we save £2,000 or £3,000 on the construction, I venture to say that we are losing more than ten times that amount owing to the loss of time experienced by the man on the land. The Premier, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, referred to the civil servants; in fact he bitterly resented the remarks of the leader of the Opposition in regard to the civil service. It is only reasonable and right that these men should feel aggrieved. They see fast slipping from them their means of livelihood. With the deficit at the present time, it is the fear of these men that something like a Black Thursday will be brought about in order to balance the ledger. They have seen the error of their ways in the matter of elections, and

their confidence in the Government is fast waning. No doubt at the next general elections we shall find the civil servant thinking deeply and mending his ways.

Mr. Gill: You will make some promises now to prepare them for it, I suppose.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: The civil servants realise that the future is very serious. What is happening to the surveyors? According to the Governor's Speech last session, something like 60 men were employed. This session I question whether six are employed. Surveyors to the number of about 50 must have left the State by this time; in fact, judging by a deputation to the Premier the other day, they are in a state of despair, and the fact that these men are out of work proves that the country, so far as land settlement is concerned, is practically at a standstill.

The Minister for Mines: They might have to work for farmers for 15s. a week.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I would be sorry to give the Minister 15s. a week. I would not give him his tucker. He would starve in the country; he can only live in the city. There is another matter I would like to bring under the notice of the House, and it is that of the railway service throughout the State, and in the far distant districts the careless manner in which goods are handled. From many of these outstations we have complaints from time to time as to the loss of goods or of goods being stolen, and at the way they are handled.

The Minister for Mines: It speaks badly for your constituents that many goods are stolen in your district.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I knew of one case where drapery worth £9 was stolen.

The Minister for Mines: It speaks badly for your constituents.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I take it that there are good and bad to be found in all constituencies, but it does not speak well for the Minister controlling that department.

Mr. Dwyer: Do you think the railway servants are guilty of peculation?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. Dwyer: Would it be the settlers?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I know the hon. member is looking for a brief or two. As

regards the servants of the Railway Department, we have no complaints against them. It is the poor provision in the matter of the care or storage of these goods of which we complain. We have from time to time asked for goods sheds at outstations, and I venture to say their provision is justified, but when it is a matter of Government impecuniousness that these sheds are not built, it follows that goods of a damagable nature, which have to be left at the sidings, do suffer from the effects of exposure to the weather.

Mr. Gill: Why did you not put up sheds at the time the railways were built?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Unfortunately the Government were not given sufficient time to do that.

Mr. Dwyer: The people rejected them.

Hon. Frank Wilson: It is necessary to get the railways first.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: They had to step out and let our friends opposite step in, which was most unfortunate.

The Minister for Railways: They did not step out; they were pushed out.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: We find our friends stepping out. Directly we will find those on this side of the House stepping back and then we will complete these sheds. The hour is getting late, and it is only out of consideration for the staff that I do not continue this speech until morning. It is always a matter of broken promises that these debates are carried on so late in the night. Our friends opposite have the early part of the evening and ventilate their views freely, but in our case we have to take what is offered to us.

Mr. Dwyer: That is your fault. Why did you not come along earlier?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: There is one matter I have forgotten, and that is the reclassification of lands. Too much money has been charged settlers for their land in the drier areas. That is a sin we can lay at the door of the previous Minister for Lands; but it is in the power of the present Administration to reclassify that land. Our friends opposite are in power in consequence of promises they made to the people and the representations they

made to the people, which were more often false—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must withdraw that remark.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I withdraw, but I thought I was justified in—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw unreservedly.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I do so, Mr. Speaker, but say it was due to their representations that they are there, and those representations will be long remembered by the people.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: They have been faithfully carried out.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: And they will find that it will be due to the practice and policy adopted by them that they will suffer. The price of land is much too high, and it should be reduced to the old standard of 10s. per acre on a 20 years' term, or a longer term as force of circumstances demands.

The Minister for Railways: Who is responsible?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I admit that the late Administration was responsible for the price. It was done like some of the work our friends opposite do, with the best of intention.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why do you fix 10s. an acre for it?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Ten shillings is ample.

Hon. Frank Wilson: Why not fix 7s. 6d.?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: If I had my way I would make it less so long as the people live and work on the land.

Mr. Dwyer: You are a philanthropist.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: If the hon. member for East Perth went out on those terms he would starve, but there are plenty of men who would prove of value to the country even on those terms.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Do you expect the financial institutions to advance money to the same value?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I am sure that members opposite who twit and interject while I am speaking with regard to these holdings, have no conception of the uphill fight these people have.

Mr. Price: Have they not always had an uphill fight?

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: Not within the better rainfall districts. Outside it has been and is still a big struggle. Many of the women in the dry areas do more and put up with more privation than some of our friends opposite could endure for a week. I hope the Government will see the necessity of ensuring to these people the reward of their labours. Unless some special consideration is extended to them, unless their position is reviewed and relief is granted, the majority of them must leave their homes. Even given a big harvest this year they cannot carry on. They are heavily involved to merchants in the matter of supplies and machinery, and so far as the liabilities due to the State are concerned, these could be extended for a very long period without any great loss to the State. If this is done we shall retain on the land good honest settlers with an abundance of grit.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: The hon. member wants these things done and then croaks about a deficit.

Mr. A. N. PIESSE: I said it was no more than we could expect from the people in power. The revenue from that source is not a very big sum, and ultimately must come to the State. It is not lost money; we are merely losing the interest on the amount due for the time it is not paid. I take it that there are others who propose to continue this debate, and in consequence I would like to express regret that force of circumstances has compelled me to inflict myself upon the House at this hour of the day or night.

Mr. ALLEN (West Perth): I regret exceedingly that I should have to take this opportunity to speak, but I believe it is the only one which will be afforded any members desiring to address the House on the Address-in-reply. I regret that I should be compelled to take the only opportunity available to me in the early hour of the morning to utter the few remarks I propose to make on this particular occasion. I have already been talking some five or six hours in my ordinary vocation, and, therefore, I am not feeling to-night perhaps as ready and able as I would like to be to address the House on this important subject. Members on the Government side have spoken long and

loudly on the Address-in-reply, and I think the Government might reasonably agree to adjourn the debate until Tuesday, as I am given to understand that nearly all the members on their side who desire to speak have done so. You, Mr. Speaker, referred a little while ago to the remarks or conduct of one of the members on this side of the House as being farcical. Is it any wonder at this hour of the morning that the remarks of hon. members should become somewhat disjointed, or the proceedings farcical? I wish to congratulate the Government on the absence from the Speech of a lot of fresh legislation. What is proposed will give us more time to consider important amendments and these will not be rushed through. I think right throughout Australia to-day, if anything, we are over-legislated, and the fact that there is not a long list of new legislation predicted is rather an advantage than otherwise. I congratulate the Premier on his return to the State after his experience in the Old Country, looking better in health, and I congratulate him on what he, with the assistance of the Agent General, was able to accomplish in regard to the raising of a loan. I would like briefly to refer also to the nature of the debates which have taken place in this House on different occasions. Some remarks have been made by members on the other side of the House which have been detrimental and which have reflected on the leader of the Opposition and other speakers. I refer to the allusions to mud slinging. I have no sympathy with anything of that kind. I think personalities and anything descending to mud slinging is to be deprecated, and the less of that kind of thing we have the better it will be. Had the Premier, holding the high position he does, refrained from retaliating, and not started slinging mud back, as he called it—had he refrained from doing this, he would have set an example which hon. members would have followed, and he would have upheld with greater dignity the position he occupies.

Mr. Price: You admit that your own leader started it.

Mr. ALLEN: Perhaps by way of interjection some remarks were brought out which members opposite designated mud

slinging. We have heard something from the Premier in regard to newspaper publications. We have been criticising certain remarks made by the Premier which appeared in the daily Press, but if, as the Premier states, the reports are incorrect, we are not to blame for assuming that they were correct and quoting them in the House. If the Premier is misreported he can always take the opportunity of rectifying the report. Statements have been made regarding the powellising contract and the only information we have is that which appeared in the newspapers. The report, I understand, was given away by an officer of the Government, and I might say here that with such tactics I have no sympathy. We have had no denial of the accuracy or otherwise of that report, therefore I take it we are right in assuming it to be correct.

The Minister for Mines: It has been admitted that it is correct.

Mr. ALLEN: We had a speech delivered by the Premier at a social to Mr. McCallum some nights ago. In the course of that speech the Premier was reported to have made certain references to the action of civil servants at the recent Federal elections. Then the Premier declared that he had been misreported. I accept his assurance that that report was incorrect, but I want to tell the House that it has come to my knowledge that since the Federal election, one gentleman at least has been to me and told me that he received his walking orders from the service. I asked him why he had been dismissed, and he said that certain reasons had been assigned which had no foundation in fact, and that the bottom of it all was that he had been working for a Liberal candidate.

Mr. Price: Did he apply to the appeal board?

Mr. ALLEN: This man was a temporary civil servant. He had been in the service for seven years.

Mr. Price: The period of temporary service is only two years.

The Minister for Mines: Are you making this charge yourself?

Mr. ALLEN: I am repeating what he told me.

The Minister for Mines: You are repeating tittle tattle.

Mr. ALLEN: It is not tittle tattle.

The Minister for Mines: Do you believe it?

Mr. ALLEN: I have no reason to disbelieve it. The man gave me his word that what he told me was true.

Mr. Dwyer: Have you made inquiries from the Public Service Commissioner?

Mr. ALLEN: I am simply informing the House what the man told me.

The Minister for Mines: And you believe it to be true without having made any inquiry?

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Will you give us the man's name?

Mr. ALLEN: I will do so with the man's permission, and, as a matter of fact, I have been endeavouring to get hold of him again with the object of disclosing his identity. I am simply stating now what he told me, and I have no reason to doubt the man's word. It certainly looks very much as if there was something behind the scenes in this particular case, but with regard to the utterances of the Premier to which I have referred, the Premier denies the accuracy of the report, and I take it that the Press will tell me that they accurately reported the Premier.

The Minister for Mines: But in regard to that man, did you make inquiries in the department where he was working?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, and I believe the head of the department was anxious to retain his services.

The Minister for Mines: Who was responsible for his dismissal?

Mr. ALLEN: The Minister for Works.

The Minister for Mines: I think I know to whom you are referring.

Mr. ALLEN: Evidently there is something in the atmosphere as far as this man's case is concerned. In regard to the question of the unemployed, I regret that there should be any unemployed in this State. Western Australia should be able to absorb all the labour which can come into its borders. I would impress on hon. members that we do not hear of the whole of the unemployed. As a business man, in a settled part of the City, receive numerous applications for em-

ployment from a class of man who is not the ordinary labouring man, and who does not parade his unemployment by marching through the streets, meeting morning after morning, and waiting on the Premier to ask for work. I regret to say that there is a good deal of what is known as genteel poverty in the city at the present time. A good deal has been said about what is known as the Eucla land transaction, and it was during that part of the debate on the Address-in-reply that the leader of the Opposition was accused of throwing mud. I have read the hon. gentleman's speech through, and I must confess that I saw no remark which could be directly construed into mud slinging. The hon. member for Moore (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) did say to the Attorney General, by way of interjection, that if he dealt in mud he must expect some of it to stick. In regard to the Eucla land transactions, the member for Moore put the question nicely and plainly last night. He said that it was never intended to attribute to the Government anything in the nature of corruption, or anything that was illegal, and he said it would be better if the gentlemen who preached certain principles were to practice them. Now I have heard from the other side scathing criticisms levelled at certain gentlemen holding large areas of country in the North-West on leasehold. They have been adversely criticised in this House.

1 o'clock a.m.

The Minister for Mines: By whom?

Mr. ALLEN: I cannot say now, but there is plenty of it in evidence in *Hansard*. Remarks have been made referring to the holding of these large tracts as something detrimental to the interests of the country. Reference has been made to Copley Brothers, and to Forrest, and others. I have no fault to find with the gentlemen opposite holding land, but I really do think they should be consistent.

Mr. Price: Why, you are making charges of corruption now.

Mr. ALLEN: Nothing of the sort.

Mr. Price: Well, you were five minutes ago.

Mr. ALLEN: No; I say if it is wrong for Copley and Forrest and others to hold large tracts of country surely it is equally wrong in our friends opposite. But we want people to take up large tracts of country. Possibly the time will come when a substantial offer will be made for those large tracts of land, and the offer will be accepted. If the member for East Perth (Mr. Lander) were here now he would say that the proper thing to do with the holders of large tracts of land is to put the boot into them. The member for Bunbury (Mr. Thomas) made a speech the other night which I shall long remember as being the most egotistical utterance I have ever listened to, whether in the House or outside of it. It brought to my mind the old saying that if only one could buy such a man at one's own estimate of his worth and sell him at his own, what a fortune one would make. The one object of the hon. member was apparently to belittle members of the Opposition. On a previous occasion I heard the member for Bunbury deprecating the personalities which were sometimes indulged in in the House, but when I heard his speech the other night I almost blushed for his lack of any feeling of decency. The member for Bunbury made reference to the proposed site of the agricultural machinery works, and he emphasised the fact that Bunbury was the place where these works should be.

Mr. Dwyer: We ought to get them in Perth.

Mr. ALLEN: No, I do not think so. I think the agricultural machinery works should be placed where the works will best serve those who require the machinery. The member for Bunbury made a great many points, but the one that struck me most was this: that if these works were established in Bunbury they would provide work and homes for 500 men. Presumably the great outstanding advantage of this would be that these 500 men might be induced to vote for the hon. member at the next election. We hear a great deal about monopolies. When first I came into the House I was prepared, and still am prepared, to sup-

port any Government in a legitimate desire to do anything in the nature of breaking up a ring proved, or even suspected, to be detrimental to the food supplies of the people. I must confess, however, that the butcher shop enterprise of the Government must inevitably tend to build up a monopoly. What is going to happen if the system is extended, as we are told it will be? Will it not close up the different private traders in Subiaco and elsewhere? Because they will not be able to compete against the Government. Their customers, being human, will transfer their custom to the place where they can get the cheapest meat, which any faithful supporter of the Government will tell us is in the State butcher shop. Therefore, the result is clear to anybody: the private shops will in course of time be closed down one by one, leaving the Government with a huge monopoly. Then there will be nothing in the world to prevent the Government from charging anything they like for meat.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: The Government cannot.

Mr. ALLEN: Why not.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Because they have to treat the people reasonably.

Mr. ALLEN: Well if that is your best reason it is a very feeble one indeed.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: Have the Government raised the freights on the railways because they have there a monopoly?

Mr. ALLEN: Supply and demand must always regulate the price, and if the meat supply ran short the price would go up accordingly. The member for Bunbury made some scathing remarks with regard to some of the ladies in the Government service? He said he had gone into a Government office and found two young ladies reading the *Western Mail* in office hours. Thereupon he levelled an indictment against civil servants generally, the chief burden of his song being that they have not enough to do. I do not believe anything of the sort against the civil servants. I believe they are ready to give just as good a service for the money received as are others in private employ. Of course if the ar-

rangement of the building in which they are housed is such that a certain amount of loafing is not only possible but is almost invited by the endless passages and turnings, it is only what would happen in any other institution where the employees could not be brought right under the eye of the supervisor. Here is another little matter I wish to refer to: A certain gentleman was promised a position in the State implement works which have recently been established. He was a little bit dubious about entering on his duties, because he had at one time come into collision with members now sitting on the Government benches. In order to assure himself he called on the Premier to discuss the matter with him. The Premier was busy, as he always is, and the caller was asked to communicate his business. He did so. His name and business were given to the Premier, and the Premier said that perhaps he had better not go there. The result was that this gentleman called the auctioneer in, sold up his goods and chattels, and left the State. Now I refer to this because this country is sadly in need of population, and on this occasion we lost a householder with his wife and family.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: What was his name?

Mr. ALLEN: That gentleman was Mr. Wilson, who used to be a member of this House at one time.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: A. J. Wilson?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes, I think those are his initials. He was commonly known as Woodaxe Wilson. I think that sort of thing is not desirable. The manager of the agricultural implement works had promised this gentleman the position, and I do not think the sequel reflects much credit on the Premier.

Mr. Gill: It is not true.

Mr. ALLEN: I do not want that denial from the hon. member, I want it from the Premier.

The Minister for Mines: What is the charge?

Mr. ALLEN: That this gentleman was promised a position, and on consulting the Premier as to whether he ought

to take the position he was told that he had better not.

Mr. Dwyer: They doubted his ability as a canvasser, I suppose.

Mr. ALLEN: Oh, there will be a lot of excuses.

The Minister for Mines: There will be a lot to speak of if you are going to listen to every disappointed applicant.

Mr. ALLEN: But this man was not a disappointed applicant, not at least in the first place, for he had been promised the position.

Mr. Gill: He was not promised that place.

Mr. ALLEN: I will not accept that denial. The gentleman in question did not wait on you.

Mr. Gill: Yes, he did.

Mr. ALLEN: We all regret to know that the finances of the State are in a rather unsatisfactory condition. I am not going to say that the Government are to blame entirely for the unfortunate financial state of affairs in Western Australia. That no doubt is due in a small measure to the dry season, which necessitated the Government spending money in directions in which they would otherwise not require to do, but surely that is compensated for by the bountiful harvest of last year, which must have yielded considerable revenue to the State through the railways. But the point I want to come to is that knowing the conditions of the finances, and knowing that the season was likely to be a bad one, and that they would require to find money to provide water for the settlers and to remit rents, the Government yet launched out on socialistic enterprises, which absorbed a large amount of money that should have been kept to provide for these extra contingencies. The farmers, we are told on all hands, are calling out for railway facilities, yet the Government had money to provide for these socialistic enterprises. The Government found it expedient to take over the Perth trams at a cost of, I suppose, half a million. I regret to find out that the tramway people did not take debentures as I thought they would, but insisted on getting cash, and by the time we have added to the actual

purchase price the cost of finding the money, the cost of the trams to the State will come out at close on half a million. I still contend that the Government should never have entered into this purchase. We had the trams running while many districts were languishing for railway facilities, yet the Government found half a million of money to acquire these trams from the company. I said then, and I say now, that if we had only forced the company to carry out the terms of their agreement we would have had a good service, and a much better one than we are likely to get from the Government during the next year or two.

Mr. Dwyer: Did it not rest with the city council to see that the company carried out the agreement?

Mr. ALLEN: It not only rested with the city council. The final arbitrator was the Minister for Railways, or the Minister for Works for the time being, and the Perth City council always felt—I, as a late member of the council speak with a certain amount of knowledge—that there was not that amount of sympathy between the local governing body and the Government that there should be. When we approached them we were never given that consideration or treatment that we thought we should get.

Mr. Dwyer: Was that the case with the previous Government?

Mr. ALLEN: It was the case with all Governments, but had any of those Governments assisted the City Council the company would have been compelled to give a better service, more adequate accommodation, and a better time-table, and the State would not have had to buy the trams.

The Minister for Mines: Did the city council ever approach the present Government?

Mr. ALLEN: Yes; they approached the Government in regard to permission to run motor buses in Perth, and the Government kept them on the string for months, while all the time they were negotiating with the tramway company for the purchase of the trams. They were making fools of the City Council for months.

The Minister for Mines: You complain that the City council did not get assistance from the Government in enforcing the terms of the contract.

Mr. ALLEN: I refer especially to the previous Government?

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: You are speaking against your own leader.

Mr. ALLEN: I have always been opposed to the nationalisation of the service. It is a mistake, and I am satisfied that we will not get a better service for the next two or three years than we could have had under the control of the company. Another point I wish to refer to is the fabulous price paid for the system.

The Minister for Mines: It is a profitable deal.

Mr. ALLEN: Of course it is a profitable deal, but too much money was paid for it. If the Government had sat tight and waited a while they could have bought the tramway company out for £100,000 less than they paid for the system.

Mr. Lewis: Why did not the City council move before?

Mr. ALLEN: The City council did move. We could have bought the trams long before the Government purchased them, and at a less price than the State paid. When Mr. Molloy was in England he cabled out telling us the trams could be bought and asking the City council to give him instructions. At a special meeting I moved that we should purchase the trams at £380,000.

The Minister for Mines: But what did Molloy offer for them?

Mr. ALLEN: I believe he offered £450,000. But if the Government had kept out of the way we would have purchased the system on much better terms than the Government obtained. As I said before, the Government fooled the City council. Whilst we were trying to get permission to run motor buses the Government kept the matter hung up for months, and all the time were negotiating with the directors in London to purchase the trams. Recently I received a copy of a paper from the Old Country which contained an article tending to show that the London trams

are gradually going down and down. The motor buses are going to displace them, and I believe that if the City council or a private company had power to put motor buses on the streets the trams would not be able to compete against them.

The Minister for Mines: The Tramways Act prevents that.

Mr. ALLEN: I know it does. It is another monopoly.

The Minister for Mines: A necessary monopoly.

Mr. Dwyer: That does not prevent the City council from running motor buses if they have the necessary authority.

Mr. ALLEN: The council cannot get the necessary authority. We tried to get authority for the running of motor buses, and could not get it. Another injustice in connection with the Government control of the trams is that they have been asked to give a free pass over the system to the members of the local governing bodies through whose districts the trams pass and that small privilege has been denied them. I did not think the Government, after taking away from the local bodies the trams which should have been theirs, would have been so grasping and niggardly as to refuse them a free ride over the system during the time they are in office. Seeing that we, as members of Parliament, provide ourselves with free passes over the railways, and, now that the trams are nationalised, with free passes over the trams, and receive at the same time a salary for our services to the country, the least we might have done was to give to the members of the local governing bodies a paltry pass over the trams.

The Minister for Mines: To whom do the trams belong?

Mr. ALLEN: To the people of the State, of course.

The Minister for Mines: Then why give a pass to the members of the local governing bodies?

Mr. ALLEN: As a little compensation for the services they render year in and year out, free, gratis, and for nothing.

The Minister for Mines: Their services are rendered to the people of the metro-

politan area and the trams are owned by the people of the State.

Mr. ALLEN: The Government do not recognise the amount of self-sacrifice on the part of these members of the local governing bodies. If they did not take up this work and carry it out what a tremendous amount of work would devolve on the Government! But the local governing bodies do this work in season and out of season, and yet when the Government have taken away from those bodies rights which should have been theirs, taken them away by what I can only term an act of confiscation—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must not refer to a Statute in that way.

Mr. ALLEN: I withdraw the remark. When they took away from the local governing bodies the rights that ought to belong to them, the least they could have done was to give a free pass over the system to the representatives of those bodies through whose districts the tramways run. We have heard a good deal about want of confidence in the country. I desire to emphasise the fact that so far as members on this side of the House are concerned, we have been charged with crying "stinking fish." That is the only reply given to our criticisms of the actions of the Government. I think trouble has arisen in this House largely owing to the policy of secrecy and the withholding of information by the Government when such information has been sought by members of the Opposition. For what reason this is done I know not, but when legitimate information is sought the members of the Government show a desire to withhold it, and to withhold it in a sort of schoolboy fashion just simply because we have asked for information. We do not ask for such information for ourselves, but we ask for it for the benefit of the country, and I think if the Government were more ready to give information to members sitting on this side of the House a great deal of unnecessary debate, and debate which is not at all times the most pleasant, but is rather of a vindictive nature, would be done

away with. The withholding of information creates a suspicion and an uneasiness which would be allayed if the Government were more open in giving to the House that information which we as representatives of the electors of the country are entitled to. There is another matter to which I wish to refer, because Western Australia is going ahead by leaps and bounds. No matter what party are in power we have in Western Australia the land, the facilities, and everything which conduces to prosperity. In fact Australia, to my mind is a wonderful country. With all the ins and outs of Government, all the changes of policy and all the vicissitudes to which the States are subject, it is to my mind wonderful how the progress of Australia is maintained. Fancy any private business experiencing such changes, having a board of directors, one pulling one way and another pulling another way; such a business would not stand for 12 months. And yet not alone in this State, but in Australia as a whole, there seems to be one pulling one way and another pulling another way, and yet Western Australia goes ahead and is bound to progress as is also Australia as a whole. We in this western State have geographically a great advantage over the other States, and we have opportunities which they might well envy us. Our products are increasing year by year and when we get the South-Western districts of the State under irrigation goodness knows what we will not produce. I wish to refer to a course which South Australia has adopted, and that is the appointment of a commercial agent in London. We have exhibits of our products sent Home. They are limited at present, it is true, but I am satisfied that in a short space of time they will be multiplied considerably. South Australia has appointed a commercial agent. He was appointed 10 or 12 years ago and he has done wonders in the way of opening up markets for South Australian products.

Mr. Dwyer: Is he attached to the Agent General's office?

Mr. ALLEN: I think so. I have before me a copy of the *British Australasian* of 5th July, 1913, which contains a very interesting article under the heading "Winning New Markets, How South Australia Sells her Food Products." Although the hour is rather late I would like to read this article for the information of hon. members:—

Far and away the most extensive, as well as the most imposing display at the National Health Exhibition held last week at the Holland Park Rink, was that of the food products of South Australia, arranged under the supervision of Major A. E. M. Norton, D.S.O., Trade Commissioner for that State in this country, who was ably assisted by Mr. Alan Champion. Major Norton received many hearty and well-deserved congratulations on the attractiveness of the display. He was warmly complimented, too, on his practical foresight in attaching cards to each exhibit, stating where the goods in question might be purchased, an item of information which was carefully noted by would-be buyers. This feature, though apparently trivial, is nevertheless, one of great importance. When Major Norton was first appointed Trade Commissioner some six or seven years ago, and, in the course of his duties, began to arrange and supervise exhibits of his State's produce in various parts of Great Britain, it did not take him long to realise that a mere display of food and other products at some local exhibition would not suffice to create a demand for these articles, or open a market for them. However attractive a display might be in itself, something more was needed to get the public to buy. There was no good, he reasoned, in baiting the hook unless you were prepared to land the fish, and many a good fish was lost simply because no landing net was at hand. In other words, the general public who attended the exhibitions saw and admired the displays, and wished to buy the goods, could, or rather, did not do so because they did not know where they could

be bought. Major Norton, with characteristic business-like thoroughness, promptly altered all this. Whenever an exhibition was arranged he made a point of calling upon the local retail grocers and inducing them to make a special window display of South Australian food products—apples, preserved and dried fruits, butter, honey, wine, eucalyptus oil, and so forth. This, in a great majority of cases, the retailers readily consented to do, especially as Major Norton promised to advertise the fact that these products might be purchased at their respective stores. The idea was a good one, and proved surprisingly successful from the start. By getting into touch with and winning the sympathy and support of the various grocers' associations throughout the country—several of which have a membership running into thousands and representing, in more than one instance, upwards of 30,000 shops—Major Norton obtained wide publicity for the State's products, and gradually built up an equally wide market. All of the grocers who undertook to stock the goods did not, it is true, continue to do so, but a very large majority still remain constant buyers whose orders show a steady, gratifying increase. This is largely owing to the fact that Major Norton keeps a keen eye upon them and conducts his important department on strict business lines. No mercantile firm is more assiduous in looking after its clients. In order to save the middleman's profit, Major Norton dispenses with brokers as far as possible. He is glad of course to avail himself of the facilities possessed by the wholesale houses for distributing the goods; but, after all, to secure the support of the retailer is his constant aim and endeavour. If the retailer wants the goods the wholesaler must stock them. Create the demand and the rest will follow. That is the position in a nutshell. Much has been said and written lately of the vital importance of exploiting the large provincial markets in the

interests of the Australian producer and the problem, we have been told with somewhat wearisome iteration, is a difficult one. From some points of view, and in regard to certain articles, this may be so; but Major Norton has succeeded in demonstrating, in a most practical manner, that, so far as many important food products are concerned, a solution has been found. He has furnished a very striking illustration of how a State department, run on business lines, can benefit producer and consumer alike, and at the same time advertise and promote the interests of the State itself. It is an object lesson which other Australian States might study with advantage.

I want to commend that article to members of the Government. It seems to me that it is a proposal worthy of any Government, no matter whether Liberal or Labour, to take into consideration the advisability of appointing a commercial agent in London to see that our products which are sent Home are not only exhibited, but are publicly advertised, and advertised as Major Norton points out, with the information where they can be purchased. I hope this matter will be received favourably by the Government. It is one apart altogether from party politics. It is well worthy of consideration and I hope it will not be overlooked. I wish to offer my congratulations to the Minister for Lands upon the speech which he delivered in this House on the Address-in-reply. I would like to say that it was the most interesting and the most lucid and fair-minded speech which I have listened to in this House for a long time. I greatly enjoyed listening to him. I was pleased to hear his remarks concerning the purchase by the Government of agricultural machinery in South Australia. There was an impression that the Government had made a bad deal because they had purchased a second-hand plant, but after the explanation of the Minister for Lands I feel that the anxiety of the country on this score will be relieved. The Minister has given us an assurance that a great deal of the machinery is, as a matter of

fact, not only equal to new machinery, but has actually never been used. The Minister explained that the Government had got rid of most of the second-hand stuff, and that though the other machinery did not come direct to Fremantle it was diverted from Port Adelaide and was still in the boxes in which it was originally placed by the manufacturers. This explanation should tend to allay the anxiety which had naturally been created by the reported purchase of second-hand machinery. The Honorary Minister last night dwelt upon the subject of the food and drugs regulations. For the life of me I cannot understand the objection of the proprietors and manufacturers of patent medicines to the requirements of the Government to lodge their formulæ when they have a guarantee from the Government that the secrets of these formulæ will not be divulged. Such a guarantee, of course, is necessary. The Honorary Minister informed us that in regard to explosives it is necessary for manufacturers to lodge the formulæ of the component parts and that these formulæ are kept secret. While I agree with the attitude of the Honorary Minister in this respect I cannot agree with him when he contends that certain medicines, the ingredients of which are perhaps actually worth only one half-penny or a penny, should not be allowed to be sold because the public are charged 2s. 6d., or 2s. 9d. a bottle or a box, as the case might be, for them. If we call in a medical man and he gives a prescription, we have to pay the doctor's fee of 7s. 6d., or half a guinea, and goodness knows what the doctors give us in their prescriptions; the greater part is aqua-pura, and the chances are that the ingredients do not cost more than 2d. or 3d., whereas we are charged half-a-crown or even more for the bottle of mixture. We hear no complaint about that. While I think it is desirous that every restriction should be provided that the people do get the best of drugs, at the same time I think a great deal of consideration should be given in favour of a lot of these proprietary medicines which people

in the backblocks are in the habit of availing themselves of. The Honorary Minister made reference to Doan's Backache Pills. I have heard friends of mine speak very highly of those pills, and with confidence of the good they have received from them. It is the standard proprietary medicines that people seek after. I know a person from Western Australia who, when in Rome, received a severe attack of kidney complaint, and after considerable trouble was supplied with some of these pills, and he bears testimony to the relief received. I do believe that a great deal of hardship will be caused if these proprietary medicines are struck right out, particularly to the backblocks people.

Mr. Foley: Not many of the backblocks members are advocating them anyhow.

Mr. ALLEN: I have heard one or two do so. Reverting to the subject of the Address-in-reply, I said at the outset that I congratulated the Government on the absence of a great deal of legislation being foreshadowed. I want to congratulate the Government upon having provided a more adequate supply of water for the metropolitan area. I am glad to see that, as the metropolitan-suburban area at certain seasons is very short of water, and with the extra accommodation provided for storage will be better off, and I hope there will be no delay in starting the scheme for the supply of the water, which is very badly needed. In connection with the liquor traffic I notice that a measure is to be submitted providing for the granting of complete local option, and the suppressing of sly-grog selling. I hope that the Government, in bringing forward this Bill, will give us a fair, equitable, and just measure. By that I mean, that there will be nothing in the nature of confiscation. There are many members on this side of the House, and a great many electors, although some of them may not be of the same political faith as members sitting opposite, who cordially agree with the desire to amend the liquor legislation, but they do not want to see anything in the shape of confiscation.

Mr. B. J. Stubbs: What do you call confiscation?

Mr. ALLEN: I call it confiscation when a man has been compelled to go before a bench, submit plans, and spend a certain sum of money to put up a building to comply with the Licensing Act, and shortly after a poll is taken he walks out without any compensation. It seems to me that those who have done that should receive some compensation. If it is to be time compensation, let us fix the time, but do not let it be too long. The time compensation in the 1910 Bill was too long. In this amending measure we want to be fair, equitable, and just.

Mr. Turvey: How long do you suggest should be given?

Mr. ALLEN: Somewhere about 1916 or 1917, but for goodness sake do not let us have anything in the nature of confiscation. The electors will support us if we are only fair, equitable, and just. I have told members of the Temperance Alliance that if they are prepared to be equitable and just and take progress slowly, and not want the whole loaf at once, they would accomplish more in the long run. I do not want to take up more time in the early hours of the morning, and in conclusion I express the hope that we will be able to carry some useful legislation during this session. I hope that the personal element which has characterised this, as well as other debates, will be lost sight of. I hope that the Premier, holding the high and exalted position he does, will set an example to other members of this House. I believe we are able to do useful work for the benefit of this vast State of Western Australia, but not if we are continually squabbling among ourselves. Western Australia possesses great possibilities, given equitable and just legislation, and not too much party legislation. The Premier when he came into power said he was going to legislate for all, and I would remind him of that promise. Let us be fair and equitable to all, and I think this State has possibilities second to none in Australia.

Question put and passed; the Address adopted.

House adjourned at 1.36 a.m. (Friday.)