

## Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 5th September, 1922.

Address-in-reply, Ninth day, conclusion ... .. Page 531

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

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

## Ninth Day—Conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous sitting.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS (North-East) [4.35]: I desire to be associated with the remarks of hon. members extending congratulations to yourself, Mr. President, and welcoming new members. To judge from the statistics and the general information already given to the House by the new member for the South-East Province (Mr. Burvill) it seems that that hon. gentleman will make up for the lost opportunities of his predecessor. I am interested in the legislation forecasted in the Governor's Speech, particularly that dealing with miners' phthisis and amendment of the Arbitration Act. Representing as I do an industrial centre and a mining district, I am specially concerned to know what steps are proposed by the Government for the relief of men affected with miners' phthisis and tuberculosis, if under the measure they are compelled to leave the mining industry. I am also specially interested in the Hospitals Bill. Again, the Speech makes mention of a proposed extension of the workers' homes scheme to the country districts, a step which I believe will be endorsed by the majority of hon. members and by the country. I shall be glad to learn whether the proposed extension will include the goldfields, where, I understand, no workers' homes have yet been approved. Undoubtedly the most important feature of the Speech is the immigration policy. Immigration is much needed. Obviously, if we are going to develop this vast State, we shall need millions of people and tens of millions of money. I congratulate the Government on having a scheme. But is it a practicable scheme, or is it impracticable? One essential is that the large amount of money referred to by the Premier as being obtained at a very low rate of interest should be used for reproductive purposes. Another essential for the success of the scheme is preparedness on the part of the Government. At present that preparedness seems painfully inadequate. The information which has been given in the Press regarding the scheme is scrappy; and I hope that the Leader of the House, when replying, will shed a ray of light on the proposals of the Government in this connection, will inform us of the details of the scheme, and let us know what is actually

peus nearly every day. It was only by complaining about those calls that I secured information which I doubt whether many members were possessed of. I doubt whether members knew that they are charged for these incomplete calls unless they can supply the number that has been wrongly obtained.

Mr. Corboy: Have you acquainted any of the Federal members with that position?

Mr. ANGELO: No one would give the number if asked for it.

Hon. P. Collier: It would cost you 2d. to write to a Federal member!

Mr. ANGELO: That is all very well. I know what anyone gets when he complains to the Federal departments. One gets very little satisfaction.

Hon. P. Collier: Or from Federal members?

Mr. ANGELO: The Federal members are in Melbourne and they give us very little of their time and very little attention. I am satisfied that this system is costing the citizens of Perth anything from £10,000 to £20,000 a year. That is nothing to sneer and laugh at.

Hon. P. Collier: No, but it is not our business.

Mr. ANGELO: Then why is it that if it is considered that the tariff is wrong, motions are carried in this House?

Hon. P. Collier: Fancy comparing the tariff with a penny ring on the telephone!

Mr. ANGELO: Many such motions have been brought forward in this Chamber. However, I wanted to ventilate this question.

Hon. P. Collier: You should fumigate it, not ventilate it.

Mr. ANGELO: I desire to ventilate this matter because I have been robbed by this cormorant-like department. The system means that we are taken down. If a complaint is made, the reply is received that one need not have a telephone. Business people must have telephones but that does not say we should be asked to pay for these incomplete calls. In my case, I was fraudulently robbed. The object I had in view has been attained. Probably some reference will appear in the Press to this matter and that may be sent to Federal members. If that be so, we may get some redress. It may be that the Deputy Postmaster General here—I have always found him to be a very fair-minded man—will, when he learns that this question has been brought up in Parliament, take some action to see what is wrong. In the circumstances, I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

## PAPER PRESENTED.

By The PREMIER: The original copy of the statutory declaration made by A. C. Kessell, referred to earlier in the day.

House adjourned at 10.22 p.m.

proposed. My personal feeling is that the Government, before asking for members' endorsement of their policy, should lay on the Table of the House the agreements entered into, or about to be entered into, with the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments. Speaking industrially, it is somewhat embarrassing to learn of the proposed large influx of labour to the State unless there is the assurance that the great majority of the immigrants will be settled on the land. If we are to judge of the agricultural qualifications of the proposed immigrants by the qualifications of that nature held by immigrants latterly arriving, they are not much to be pleased with. In conversation with many men settled on the land, including members of this Chamber, I have heard that large numbers of the men arriving here at present are practically without experience of agriculture. If future immigrants are to be of the same type, some very strong inducement will be needed to keep them on the land, provided they settle on it. I should like to see a complete scheme of land settlement prepared. If these people are to arrive here in six months' time, there should be a scheme in operation for their reception. Homesteads, or partly prepared homesteads, should be available for them on arrival, in such locations as will afford the immigrants opportunities of obtaining work on adjacent farms and thus securing local experience. With that experience they will be able to take on their own holdings with greater prospects of success. During the Parliamentary trip to the South-West I was greatly impressed with the fertility of the soil in the districts we inspected. Assuming the productivity of the soil there to be all that some hon. members residing in the South-West would have us believe, I should still like to be assured that if crops are grown by the new settlers the Government will be able to arrange for the disposal of those crops at prices profitable to the growers. On this very Address-in-reply members have said that potatoes and fruit can be grown but cannot find a market. One hon. member said that a quantity of fruit has been shipped away in a state of mush. If the Government put people on the land, they should ensure to them market facilities for the disposal of their products at a reasonable profit; otherwise the settlers will not remain on the land. Another matter of importance with regard to new orchardists is the provision of young fruit trees. What provision are the Government making to ensure that unsophisticated settlers will get fruit trees up to standard? Many settlers in this State have been fleeced by dealers in trees. If the new orchardist is not cared for by the Government in this respect, he may after many years of labour discover that much of his effort has been in vain. Unfortunately, there are indications that many of the soldiers who have gone on the land find the burden too great to bear. It seems that further assistance will have to be given in those cases. Profiting by this experience, the Government

should assist the new settlers to get on their feet. During this debate we have heard a great deal of the south-western and northern parts of the State. I now desire to say a few words regarding the north-east portion, being the province which I have the honour to represent. In that province we have a great gold mining industry, and one of the largest auriferous districts in the world. Whilst the Government from time to time boom the wheat areas, the South-West, and other parts of the State, they rarely make any reference to the great gold mining industry which has made the State what it is to-day. Western Australia is greatly indebted to that industry. Gold is one of the products for which the world is languishing, and there never was a time in the history of Western Australia when greater help was needed by the gold mining industry than is needed to-day. Many are optimistic about the future of the industry, but to sustain that confidence every help the Government can give is necessary. We have produced £140,000,000 worth of gold, and paid dividends aggregating 38 millions. Western Australia produces 63 per cent. of the gold won in Australia, and 72 per cent. of the gold output in Western Australia is produced in the province I represent. In that centre lie the larger mines. Although at present the industry is under a cloud, yet if the Government would but show the same enthusiasm for the mining districts as they show for the agricultural areas, the outlook would be greatly improved. Some time ago the Federal Government offered £50,000 for a find of payable oil. The State Government provide reward claims for the finders of payable gold mines. It has struck me that if we were to set aside, say, £25,000 to be used as cash rewards for successful prospectors, it would be a further inducement to all prospectors to speed up their efforts, knowing that, in addition to the reward claim, they would have also the cash bonus. Also the Government might reasonably provide that the cash reward should be free from income tax. In the past prospectors who have discovered payable mines and sold them have found themselves in debt after paying income tax on the result of the transaction. Last year provision was made that in this respect a prospector can be a prospector but once; that he can find a mine and sell it and claim the reward, but that the second attempt to do so constitutes him one making a business of it, and so renders him liable to taxation. For some time past we have been looking for relief in respect both of railway freights and water rates. Water rates have been very high. The 2½ million loan floated for the construction of the goldfields water scheme will mature in 1927. Recently the Leader of the House, when Acting Premier, stated that very satisfactory arrangements had been made by the Premier while in England; that we had paid in interest far more than was required.

The Minister for Education: In sinking fund, not in interest.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: At all events, I understand we are to get some relief from sinking fund payments, and that the relief will be reflected in the price of water not only to the companies engaged in mining, but to all consumers of water from the Coolgardie scheme. We should like to be assured that at an early date some variation will be made in the rates charged. While I would speak generally of railway freights, I wish to draw special attention to the increased rates imposed on the mining companies sending down gold ready for the mint. Wheat, I understand, is carried at an exceedingly low rate, in fact, at a loss to the department. But whereas in previous years the gold producers have paid 4s. 10½d. for every 100 ounces of gold carried on the railway, in December, 1921, the rates were increased 200 per cent., and the producer now has to pay 15s. per 100 ounces or any part thereof. The bullion coach specially used for the carriage of gold is taken to the goldfields when there is sufficient gold to be brought down. The whole of it is insured, and so there is no risk to the Government. The freights earned by that coach must have sufficed to pay for it over and over again, notwithstanding which the gold producers are now penalised 200 per cent. above previous rates. They have appealed in vain, and have suggested that, since there is a percentage of silver in the gold they should be called upon to pay the high rate only on the fine gold contents. However, up to the present we have been unable to get even that small measure of relief from the extortionate rate charged. It has been suggested that some of the railway lines on the goldfields should be lifted. I would impress on the Government the advisability of retaining every railway in the auriferous areas. What is to be gained by pulling up the Kanowna line, a length of 11 miles only? Of how much use would it be when transferred to the agricultural areas? Moreover in a district like Kanowna, where there are large deposits of pure kaolin for the manufacture of porcelain and where there is also alunite in huge quantities, it would be a great mistake to lift the railway line. Many mining districts, both old and new, are showing encouraging developments, and one can never say when a new Golden Mile may be discovered. It behoves the Government to pause and seriously consider before deciding to lift any of the goldfields lines. Of course, if they were going to adopt generally the system of lifting all non-paying lines, it would be different; but if that were done there would be no lines left in Western Australia, save perhaps that from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie. When, two years ago, I first came into the House, I was strongly attacked for exposing an audacious scheme of roll stuffing. It was one of the scandals of the North-East Province. Being new to the Standing Orders, I made it my business to inquire how such a matter could be introduced into the Address-in-reply debate. I was referred to a ruling by the late Sir

Henry Briggse, in which it was laid down that in that debate hon. members could discuss anything in His Excellency's Speech and, in addition what, in their opinion, should have been included in that document.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Any grievance.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is so. Last week Mr. Moore, who I regret is not in his place to-day, referred to a circular issued during the recent election campaign in the North-East Province, as constituting dirty, low-down tactics. He said that in the interests of clean politics it ought to have been suppressed. Furthermore, he wanted to legislate to get at the perpetrators of such an outrage, and he finished up by declaring that in the recent campaign the National Labour Party had appealed to prejudice and not to reason. It is with great reluctance I approach this subject because, so far as I can gather, it was the first time in the history of the Chamber that sectarianism had been introduced. Primarily the charge was made against Mr. Seddon; but as he has already spoken, and as the charges were directed generally against the party to which I belong, and referred specifically to the province I represent, I think I am justified in replying. I will endeavour to show that the charge made by the hon. member was entirely unwarranted on the facts. Since the debacle of the Labour Party in 1917, since that party left Moscow, the rainbow of victory has frequently appeared on the sky line, but when exposed to the ray of the searchlight it has disappeared. As a party, we have been subjected to many attacks. I listened in silence to the hon. member's attack last week, although I admit it required some restraint to refrain from making exclamations. I am taking this opportunity of offering a reply to the attack made by Mr. Moore, an attack unparalleled in the history of this Chamber so far as I know. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is the humble instrument of a sect or whether—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would ask the hon. member to refer to Mr. Moore as the hon. member and not the hon. gentleman. That has always been the rule of this House.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I should like to know if the hon. member moved in the direction he did in the interests of clean politics. He referred to the gentleman who was defeated for the North-East Province, Mr. Cunningham. I have the highest esteem for Mr. Cunningham, although we differ politically. Mr. Cunningham would be the last member of the party to which he belongs to represent the extremists that are within, or to take the all-red route to gain the objective of that organisation. I believe his soul is nearer the National Labour Party than the Official Labour Party. I do not say he does not possess courage, but he had not sufficient courage to act as his conscience dictated, and leave the organisation. He required the courage displayed by Mr. Sanderson when leaving the Liberal Party. Had it not been for the vituperation which he knew would be

east upon him, Mr. Cunningham I believe would have retired from the organisation. Mr. Moore said some people evidently knew the roll, and knowing it they had circularised the electors with a view to appealing to prejudice instead of to reason, because Mr. Cunningham was a Roman Catholic. We had a candidate in the National Labour Party who was also a Roman Catholic.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: And who also denounced the circular.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: He may have done so. The inference was that someone who knew the roll well and had looked it over, had issued a circular in order to defeat the Roman Catholic candidate. That is not substantiated by facts. When we were about to fight the campaign the question arose as to the grounds on which we should fight Mr. Cunningham. He had proved himself a good citizen and we had nothing against him. His only sin was that he represented a party that held up the red flag as a symbol of trades unionism and politics. We thought, therefore, the best way was to fight him on that point. It may be argued that these people do not stand for that. I am going to quote from a circular issued by Mr. P. J. Trainer, of the Trades Hall, Perth, dealing with revolution. Mr. Trainer says:—

Whatever your position in the community, it has been forced on you during the last few years that the industrial life of this community, in common with the rest of the world, has become an unending series of strikes, lockouts, unemployment and industrial unrest. These are symptoms of the approaching end of the wage system. You know this, though you do not always admit it to others. You can see now, what students have tried to teach you for fifty years, that the capitalist system of production for profit is unworkable as a permanent institution. The only question of importance now is this: Are we to continue the drift towards chaos, with its attendant bloodshed and the eventual ruin of industry, or shall the industries be taken over by the workers to be operated on the basis of community ownership, producing for use only, not for profit? We can easily produce abundance of everything necessary for the material needs of the people, but only if we cut out the triple cancer of rent, interest and profit, which is feeding on the life-blood of industry. There is no middle course. Either an organised revolution by the workers of Western Australia, or an intensified form of industrial strife, leading to eventual bankruptcy, unemployment, riots, civil war and chaos. Which do you prefer? Think it out for yourself. Hand this leaflet to a fellow citizen and get his ideas. Talk about it to your wife. She knows perhaps better than you that there must be a crash soon unless the workers take the necessary steps to prevent it. Literature dealing with this important development of society can be

obtained from P. J. Trainer, Trades Hall, Perth.

I read this to show the revolutionary kind of propaganda issued by these people, and to connect it up with the circular referred to and to which Mr. Moore took exception. The circular was put out in the form of an acrostic. It was perhaps unfortunate that Mr. Cunningham's first name was James. "Jesuitical" is the word to which Mr. Moore took exception. He evidently did not know the meaning of the word. According to Webster's dictionary it means "deceitful designing cunning or crafty." The word "Jesuitical" was therefore chosen to embrace these four words. If Mr. Cunningham's name had been Charlie the word "crafty" could have stood for that. If it had been Daniel, the words "designing or deceitful" could have been used. Mr. Moore definitely stated that the word "Jesuitical" meant "Roman Catholic." Anyone who would give that meaning to the word must be either hyper-sensitive, have a warped mind, or a fertile imagination. The circular is directed solely at the party. "Jesuitical" is a reference to the revolutionary propaganda as put forward at the Brisbane conference, the cunning, crafty, and designing propaganda put up to the unsophisticated workers at that conference by people who knew better. Our only objection to Mr. Cunningham was that he was associated with that party. Mr. Moore made a big effort to construe that perfectly clear statement into showing that we were appealing to prejudice and not to reason. He forgets apparently that the Labour Party are the sick men of politics. They are worse off than they were in 1916, because of the propaganda they have put forward. They have made many blunders. At the Brisbane conference, even Mr. Theodore, who cannot be accused of being anything but a labourite, said as they had changed their objective they might as well change the name of the party and call it the communist party. Mr. Gardner and other members of the party expressed views along similar lines. At the conference they decided to socialise industry and abolish capitalism, and a few other things. The Labour Party will find plenty of scope for work if they are going to induce people to adopt the new objective which the party approved in Brisbane. I might also quote another of the blunders which have been made. I have here a copy of a letter signed by Mr. Alex. McCallum, General Secretary of the Trades Hall. It is addressed to Messrs. Hudson, Dodd, Mullany, Thomas, Carpenter, Ardagh, Cornell, and Taylor, and is as follows:—

Under direction from the State Executive of this Federation, I have to forward you the following resolution which was carried at the last meeting:—"That in view of Messrs. Hudson, Dodd, Mullany, Thomas, Carpenter, Ardagh, Cornell and Taylor having failed to accept the decisions of the congress, the above mentioned be considered outside the pale of the Labour Party."

These men would not do as they were commanded, and therefore were ordered out of the party.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the hon. member to be as brief as he can. It is unfortunate that the subject should have been introduced the other day by Mr. Moore. The hon. member has had ample opportunity of replying. It is most unpleasant that the question of religion should have been brought into this discussion. As Mr. Moore made a brief statement, I think we have now given Mr. Harris every latitude on the same topic. If he has not quite finished I ask him to be as brief as possible and close the subject.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: I appreciate your remarks, Sir. I want to get to the figures relating to the election, and then I will close. The gentlemen I have referred to decided they would not be dominated by the secret junta or the brass hats of the labour movement and therefore got out, and have been out ever since. In connection with the North-East Province election, 2,111 votes were recorded. Notwithstanding that Mr. Cunningham placed 499 people on the roll, he got 904 first preference votes. He had a co-religionist also in his ballot and that candidate got 444 votes. I put this forward to disprove the statement made by Mr. Moore, and to show that these two Roman Catholic candidates obtained 1,348 first preference votes, whilst the other two candidates secured only 763. The two co-religionists obtained nearly twice as many first preference votes as the others, notwithstanding the circular. When Mr. Leslie, the National Roman Catholic candidate retired from the ballot, out of the 480 votes he received, 400, or 83.33 per cent., went to Mr. Seddon, the other candidate, who is accused of putting up the circular in order to defeat Mr. Cunningham. That in itself is proof that there is nothing to substantiate the remarks made, namely, that it was put up with the object the hon. member would have the House believe. The evidence is overwhelming that the circular was not used for the purposes for which we were accused of having used it. The facts of the case show that, irrespective of any question of religion, in every party in politics to-day we will find members of the several denominations each adhering to their respective policies and parties, and there is not so much truth in what the hon. member has said as he would have members of the House believe. The suggestion of prejudice cannot be supported, and while Mr. Moore said it was no credit to Mr. Seddon to have won the recent election, we hold our own opinion on that point. Nothing transpired during the campaign of which that hon. member or any other member of his party need be ashamed. I regret that it is necessary to make these observations. I understand it is the first time this subject has been introduced in the Chamber.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: You have not been here before.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: That is so, but I have made inquiries. I believe it was not raised before this occasion.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: Perhaps that was the reason.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS: However, I will not see the party with which I am associated traduced in the way I have indicated when the facts are all to the contrary. I will leave the matter to Mr. Moore's own conscience and the more discerning brains of others, the motive that prompted that hon. gentleman. I support the Address-in-reply and trust the Leader of the House will be able to give us some information regarding the matters I have raised affecting the North-East Province.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [5.18]: Were I asked for a reason for addressing a few remarks on the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply, I probably would retort that it was customary to do so. On this occasion, most hon. members have observed that custom. It is characteristic that in sessions such as these, and on a motion such as that before the Chamber, it is usual to express regret for those who have fallen by the wayside and to give our congratulations to the victors. This procedure has again been followed during this session. Particularly during sessions such as the present, which follows closely upon a general election, I am reminded somewhat of the burial service and a few lines spoken as a rule at the graveside. I am reminded of the sentence, "Man that is born of woman hath but a short time to live."

Hon. C. F. Baxter: And feel miserable!

Hon. J. CORNELL: That applies very often to hon. members of this Chamber. One serves to remind us of Nature's immutable law and the other reminds us of the mutability of our electors. There is another fact that serves a useful purpose, if it does nothing else, and it is that those who fall remind us that such may be the fate common to us all. Be that as it may, I extend my congratulations to the victors. I extend my personal regret to the vanquished. I go further and say: May Fortune smile upon them in their new walks of life, and if they ever again endeavour to enter political life, I hope that what was said of Lucifer, when he fell, will not be said of them. I leave, without any further reference, the new members to you, Mr. President, and to the House. They are in safe keeping. I am perfectly satisfied they will be kept in order. It is not amiss that I should extend my congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your elevation to the high position of President of this Chamber. Your two predecessors, under whom it was my privilege to serve, set a very high standard. I am satisfied that with your long knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, your genial manner, and your forgiving nature, those high standards will be in safe keeping in your hands. It would not be amiss either for me to extend my felicitations

to the Leader of the House on seeing him again in his seat leading this Chamber. In extending those felicitations, however, I hope they will not be construed as meaning that I will be a docile follower on this occasion. There is another question to which I desire to refer with mingled feelings. I allude to the conversion of Mr. Sanderson. It must have come as a great shock to Mr. Miles. It certainly did to me when I returned to this Chamber, after a month's absence. As Mr. Sanderson long ago reached the age of consent, if not of discretion, it would ill befall me to find any serious fault with his most recent action. I venture to say that this stalwart—one of the last ramparts of Liberalism—has gone over to that hussy, the Country Party, horse, foot and artillery, without firing a shot! I would have given something to have been here when he made that hurried and long-suffering announcement.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Was that after the amendment was carried?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have been so disconcerted that I have not been able to ferret out the reason that prompted the hon. gentleman in adopting that course. If there was any hon. member in this Chamber who must have been disconcerted by the conversion of Mr. Sanderson, it must have been the Leader of the House, because, right down his political history, he, like Mr. Sanderson, can be considered one of the ramparts and bulwarks of Liberalism.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: He too will be with us before long.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I can, by drawing on my imagination, really believe that, when the Leader of the House heard the declaration by Mr. Sanderson, his thoughts flew to that immortal bard who depicted the assassination of that noblest Roman of all. As Caesar said, when he was being assassinated, "Thou too, Brutus," I believe the Leader of the House must have thought, "Thou too, Sanderson." If Caesar did not suspect Brutus, I do not think that even at that eleventh hour, the Leader of the House suspected Mr. Sanderson. Be that as it may, I would not say that that hon. member has committed a foolish act; but if anyone else were to say so, I would be the first to believe it. So much, however, by way of introduction. Let me get down to the Governor's Speech, which, I take it, is the book or directory upon which we are supposed to work during the course of this session. What strikes me most as of paramount importance in the Speech is contained in the two magic words "the deficit." It may be said that it is no business of the Legislative Council, but that it is really the business of another place. I consider it is the business of this Chamber to point to it as something that, if allowed to continue, will ultimately prove to be our undoing. Speaking subject to correction, I think hon. members will agree with me that it has been repeatedly said, both inside and outside the Chamber, that our annual direct contribution from revenue to sinking fund

about equalises the annual deficit. I have been gulled, so to speak, with that explanation for a long time.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is, with accrued interest.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I accepted that until recently, I turned to that excellent table appearing on page 966 of "Hansard" of last session, when I found that it does not do so. That table covers the period 1911-12 to 1913-1914. We find that the direct contribution from revenue to the sinking fund amounted to £739,929. The deficit was £460,224. Therefore, during that period, although the deficit approached to about half a million, there was a credit balance in favour of the direct contribution from revenue to the sinking fund of £279,705. Now we enter upon the mournful stage of our history. From 1914-15 to 1920-21 inclusive the direct contributions from revenue to sinking fund were £2,092,984, and the accumulated deficit for that period was £4,326,504. If we deduct the credit balance for the first period I quoted, we find that the deficit was £1,953,815 greater than the amount contributed from revenue to sinking fund.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You have not allowed for the accrued interest on the sinking fund.

Hon. J. CORNELL: This is a state of affairs which should not and must not continue. The sinking fund was established for one purpose namely, the redemption of the public debt, and the interest earned by the sinking fund should be devoted to the same purpose. The return shows that from 1915-16 to 1918-19 inclusive, even allowing all the increments by way of interest, etc., the deficit greatly exceeded direct contributions from revenue to sinking fund. The position to-day is that instead of having £8,370,160 to redeem our public debt, taking into consideration our present deficit of £5,505,563, we have only £2,864,595 in our sinking fund.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is tantamount to saying that, during the regime of the Seaddan, Wilson, Lefroy, Colebatch, and Mitchell Governments extending from 1911-12 to 1921-22, some of the sinking fund, which was available at the beginning of that period has been eaten up.

Hon. G. W. Miles: And when you add the loss on the trading concerns, it is another half million.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If the present state of affairs continues, there can be only one end. If a group of individuals continued business in this way, they would soon find themselves in the bankruptcy court or in gaol or both. The question now arises whether this is likely to continue. If the past be any guide to the future, it is going to continue. The old maxim says that familiarity breeds contempt. The familiarity of Ministers with the deficit has led to a spirit of contempt for the deficit. Governments come and Governments go but Parliament has an obligation to fulfil, and that obligation is to administer the law which provides for a sinking fund for a definite purpose. Though

contributions have to be paid to the sinking fund, if the State were wound up in the insolvency court to-morrow, it would be found that the fund was not available for the purpose stipulated by statute. If the advice of the world's greatest financial experts is of any value, it should be followed. Their advice is that every Government should in the shortest possible time and by the shortest possible cut, budget so that the expenditure will square with the revenue; otherwise there can be only one end, namely bankruptcy and financial chaos. I would commend to the Premier and the Leader of the House the excellent speech made by the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Bruce. He laid down these lines as the lines on which the Federal Government should proceed. I realise that it is hard to do this. Would any individual leading an expensive life and able to borrow readily, cease doing so unless he was brought up with a round turn? He would not, and what is characteristic of an individual is characteristic of groups of individuals and a State administered by one such group. This is our position to-day. The Speech blames the railways for the deficit. It says that the railways show a deficit of £414,056 on the year's operations. Even if this be added to the amount stated in the Governor's Speech as the direct contribution from revenue to sinking fund, the total will not square with last year's deficit. A shortage of £32,469 still remains. In the days when you, Mr. President, held Ministerial office, I venture to say that if the Government had finished the year with a deficit of only £32,000, it would have been regarded as a very serious state of affairs. To-day, however, the Government could end with a deficit of £1,000,000 without causing very great concern to the Government. If an individual were concerned, he would probably finish his career at the end of a rope, but the worst that can happen to a Government is to be turned out of office. One would have thought that during this period, when we have been emulating the donkey by being behind all the time, our public debt would not have assumed such serious proportions. Not only have we accumulated a deficit of nearly £6,000,000 in the last eleven years by way of excess expenditure over revenue, but we have increased our public debt per head of population from £73 7s. 10d. on the 30th June, 1911, to £124 15s. 11d. on the 30th June, 1921. I did not look up the figures as at the 30th June, 1922; I was afraid of receiving too great a shock. Side by side with saddling posterity with a deficit of £6,000,000 in eleven years, the Government have saddled the present residents of the State with an additional debt of £50 per head. If this is not the highest amount of indebtedness per head for any country in the world, it undoubtedly is the highest in the British Empire. Passing in brief retrospect the accomplishments of Governments from the time of responsible Government till 1911, and contrasting them with the accomplishments of Governments who have

come and gone since, it will be found that the institutions and concerns established for the people for the extra £50 per head during the last eleven years are infinitesimal when compared with those provided by previous Governments on the basis of £73 per head. We have only to look at the mileage of railway constructed prior to 1911 as compared with the mileage constructed since. The latter pales into insignificance by comparison. What is the remedy now suggested by the Government to stay the financial drift and wipe off the deficit? Immigration. Any member who has calmly considered this suggestion must admit that all that is being said to-day regarding the immigration policy bringing immediate relief to the State financially is absolute moonshine. It will not and cannot bring immediate relief. Just as the goldfields gave this country a fillip in the early nineties, so is the decline of the mining industry administering a knock-out blow at the present time. We find to-day on the Golden Mile that there are about 1,700 men employed above and below ground, whereas a few years ago the number ran into many thousands. Twelve years ago there were no fewer than between 15,000 and 16,000 men working in the industry, while to-day the total number is something like 5,000. We have the gold mining districts honeycombed with railways, and where at one time those railways carried all the other railways of the State on their back, to-day the position is reversed. There we have the secret of our present knock-out. We are rendering services to-day that are not commensurate with our true position, and it behoves thinking men to so circumscribe themselves as to be able to screw up courage and realise the true position, and assume that, unless we have a revival in mining, particularly in alluvial mining, we shall be hard up against it. A somewhat similar position arose in Victoria in 1890, and it was recognised by Sir George Turner. I venture to say it will be recognised here before long, and it is not for Parliamentarians to stay off the evil day; it is for all to analyse the position and act accordingly. We are told that immigration is to be the panacea. The Speech sets out 75,000 men, women and children are to be brought from Great Britain to this country in from three to five years, and for that purpose six millions sterling is to be made available at the small rate of interest of 2 per cent. I think the Scaddan Government spent more than six millions in one year alone, and the expenditure did not go very far towards absorbing all the unemployed. If we are to bring 75,000 people to this country in five years, we shall require a great deal more than six million pounds. But can we absorb 25,000 people annually in this State?

Hon. G. W. Miles: Easily.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Where? It is pointed out in the Speech that the money will be employed in the direction of strengthening the funds of the Agricultural Bank, in order that

improvements may be put in hand by existing holders to enable them to further their operations, and also to provide for the housing of people in country towns and districts, and to settle 6,000 additional people on the land, chiefly in the South-West, to bring their holdings to a productive stage by clearing, etc., and to provide railways and other facilities to enable them to market their products. That is the part of the State which Mr. Ewing told us was flowing with milk and honey.

Hon. J. Ewing: So it is.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am afraid that many of them will find that the milk is mare's milk and that the honey is bush honey. What is going to become of the other 70,000? Will the fact that 6,000 will be settled in the South-West strengthen the position so as to enable the remainder to be absorbed? I say it will not.

Hon. J. A. Greig: The man on the land always carries about 12 people on his back.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I suppose he does. The man on the land and the miner carry a lot of people on their backs as well as behind them. I do not intend to indulge in sophistries; and I do not desire to be a party to a project like this, as it now stands, a project which will eventually lead to confusion worse confounded. Assume that we can settle 6,000 people in the South-West. Bear in mind that I am not saying anything disparaging of the land in this country, but unless the greater part of it is reproductive land this country is damned internally, externally and eternally. The South-West has been compared with the land of Gippsland. Mr. Burvill drew attention to the happy condition of the settlers in Gippsland, but he forgot to refer to the salient points connected with the settlement in that part of Australia, the principal of which is that it has taken the settlers there from the earliest days to almost the present time to become prosperous.

Hon. A. Burvill: There will be a better chance here.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The land in the South-West, taken by and large, is hardly to be compared with that of Gippsland. Before you bring the land of the South-West to a state of productivity, you have the task almost equal to the removal of the tree, and that is the removal of the undergrowth. There are blackboys, zamia palms and the Lord knows what, which are not to be found in Gippsland, and it is also well known that in parts of Gippsland, when a fire is put through the forest, English grasses can be sown. I have yet to find many places of burnt country in the South-West where that can be done. Mr. Nicholson dealt with the question of what was to be done with the products of the people whom we propose to put on the land. I think it was the Premier who told us the other day that South Africa was endeavouring to induce Indian ex-service men to migrate to that country. South Africa is also bidding for immigrants from the British Isles so that they may push ahead

with their fruit-growing industry, and they are beating us in that respect. We must not forget that whilst we are 28 days from the British market, South Africa is only 16. Mr. Burvill has referred to fruit, milk and butter. There will need to be a few years of cultivation in the South-West before a state of production is reached. We must remember that it is virgin country that is being tackled, and before we can get that land into such a condition—

Hon. J. Ewing: What about the good swamp land?

Hon. J. CORNELL: For a purpose such as this I think we may liken the swamp lands to the soil contained in flower pots on our windows. I admit that on a good deal of the swamp land there can be grown vegetables or lucerne, but if it is desired to successfully raise herds, there must be pastures as well as artificial feed. What is the position to-day? My friend, Mr. Potter, will bear me out when I say there is merit, value and purpose in well thought out organisation. That is what is needed at present. Have we any organisation here? I have failed to discover any form of organisation, or that which one could construe into organisation, even sufficient to run a football team.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is the point, organisation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I said last session of my friend the Premier that he lacked imagination. I will withdraw that and say that he possesses imagination but that he has not the faculty of coming down from the clouds to put that imagination into tangible shape. If I want information concerning a matter connected with the Agricultural Bank, or the I.A.B., or the soldier settlement scheme, or the group settlement scheme, or several other schemes, where do I go to get it? I go to Mr. McLarty. Where did the Premier go when he had a deputation of unemployed soldiers on his return? To Mr. McLarty. The way in which responsibilities are thrust upon Mr. McLarty, good and all as he is, must eventually get him down. The Premier cannot possibly hope to succeed with all these enterprises in one man's hands. All the things which are to-day in Mr. McLarty's hands should be taken away from him. In all these years there has surely been enough of wisdom gathered in the departments to carry on without Mr. McLarty. Let Mr. McLarty be appointed to direct the immigration scheme. Let him formulate a policy, with the advice of a board if necessary. I believe that he would put up a definite and workable scheme in which order would reign, instead of, as to-day, chaos. As a soldiers' representative, I know the value of all the good work Mr. McLarty did on the soldier settlement scheme. If his undivided attention were given to the perfecting of an organisation for the immigration scheme, that scheme would be successful. But if the present position continues, I can only see failure of the scheme, and chaos, loss of money and dissatisfaction not only to people here but also to the people abroad. We have the New



Settlers' League, a body which is subsidised by the Federal Government to the extent of £1,500 a year. That league is doing good work, I know. But in that work there is nothing fundamental. The league may be regarded as only skirmishing on the fringe of the whole concern. The endeavour of the league is to place men in employment on arrival in this country. But where does land settlement come in? A new arrival has to put in a year as an employee. Now, we have still 1,200 A.I.F. men waiting to be placed on the land, and there is also a fair sprinkling of our own people desirous of settling on the land, but unable to do so. Very shortly some of these immigrants will have qualified to go on the land, and where is the organisation to place them there? I can find none. Shortly after the Premier's return a deputation, headed by General Hobbs, waited on him to point out that 400 soldiers were out of work. The Premier, after analysing the position, said there were only 250 A.I.F. men out of work. But there were also 150 Imperial Service men out of work, and the majority of these were assisted immigrants. To-day on the books of the Soldiers' Institute there are 300 men registered for employment and unable to obtain it. In Kalgoorlie there are another 300. If we cannot by some form of organisation so circumscribe ourselves as to find employment for our own Australian people, what is going to be the position when we bring out thousands of people under the immigration scheme? There is another point of danger, and that is the further migration of our immigrants to the Eastern States. A man with a passport cannot go out of his country for a period of 12 months, but there is nothing to prevent an oversea arrival here from going on to the Eastern States the day he lands in Western Australia. "Smith's Weekly" of about a fortnight ago contains a most scurrilous and misleading report concerning Western Australian conditions made by an immigrant to this State. The only redeeming feature of the article was that the man said he had been employed for a little while at Balingup and would have been there yet but for his employer falling sick and therefore being unable to keep him. Such stories are published by sensational journals in the East. As regards assisted immigration, I contend that the total cost of the assistance should be borne by the Federal Government, who are the first to benefit by the landing of immigrants in the Commonwealth. If an immigrant lands here to-day and goes on to the Eastern States to-morrow, that matters to us, but not to the Commonwealth. Wherever a man may be domiciled in the Commonwealth, he is a Commonwealth taxpayer. Therefore an endeavour should be made to induce the Commonwealth to pay the whole cost of assistance to immigration. There is another angle from which I desire to view the important question of immigration, and that is the question of which is the wiser policy—to bring men here and assist

them financially, or to endeavour so to circumscribe the State and ourselves that immigrants will be induced to come here of their own free will. I am one of those who favour the latter alternative. Our object should be to make Australia such a country that people overseas will say, "There is a country where we will find work immediately upon entering it." Then people would migrate here very quickly. The Governor's Speech says that authorised railways will be constructed as soon as possible. If I may refer to a hardy annual, I will mention the Esperance railway. If the construction of that line has been pushed on as speedily as possible, there is something slower on this earth than snails. I honestly believe that Esperance country is country which could be made reproductive with very little preparation and at a very early date.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It should have been done years ago.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Yes. With reasonable transport facilities, a great deal of the Esperance land could be made reproductive very soon.

Hon. J. A. Greig: Do you honestly believe it would grow wheat profitably?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do, as regards the larger portion of it. That was stated by a Royal Commission which inquired into the matter. The same opinion is held by mallee farmers who have seen the Esperance country. Many of us remember the hostility which was shown towards the chairman of that Royal Commission. When the Esperance Northwards railway has reached Grass Patch, the Lake Grace-Newdegate line should be run right through, so that the whole stretch of that country could be opened up as speedily as possible. Now I desire to refer to existing railways. I have already alluded to the deficit of £400,000 odd incurred by the Railway Department last year. I do not know whether that deficit is going to continue. Our production this year is not going to be greater than it was last year, and the working costs of the Railway Department will be very little less. Therefore, if the present state of affairs continues, there will be a corresponding deficit for the current year. With regard to Mr. Stead's report, I may point out the present Commissioner of Railways was appointed some three years ago. About two years after his appointment, an outside railway man of high reputation was appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of the Railway Department. At a casual glance, Mr. Stead's report seems about as damaging a document as could be framed against a railway administrator. Are the Government going to procrastinate, and allow the Commissioner of Railways to engage in verbal warfare with Mr. Stead, or are they going to put the recommendations of the Royal Commissioner into effect? Long before Mr. Stead reported, it was common property in the railway service that he would report in favour of a severe reduction of the staff. I look to the Govern-

ment to say either that Mr. Stead is right or that he is wrong.

*Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.*

Hon. J. CORNELL: It was my privilege recently to attend a conference of representatives of all the State branches of the Returned Soldiers' League of Australia. It was possible there to get some comparison of what had been done in regard to soldier settlement in the several States. As a Western Australian representative I was very pleased to learn that, generally, this State had done as well as any other. Western Australia, South Australia, and Victoria had each done well, and Western Australia had done as well as either of the other two. The best that can be said of soldier settlement is that it is still in its experimental stage. What has been done has been done more or less hurriedly, and in the near future the whole position will have to be reviewed. The controller of soldier settlement in this State knows that many soldiers have been settled on holdings where they have no chance of succeeding, either because the district is not suitable, or because of the over-capitalisation of the land. The conference was unanimous in its approval of the capitalisation of the first five years' interest. At the forthcoming soldiers' conference that will be a burning question. I am convinced that it must be tackled. The recent conference thought the Federal Government had not extended to the several States handling soldier land settlement the consideration which should have been given them. It was unanimously resolved that the £620 advance by the Federal Government should be increased to £1,000. If there is one man in this country to whom a tribute can be paid for his work, it is the controller of the soldiers' land settlement scheme, Mr. McLarty. The Minister in charge of the scheme should seriously consider reviewing the whole position. If there is to be any decapitalisation, the sooner it is done the better. The answer to a question asked by Mr. Stewart the other day informed us that there are at least 1,400 A.I.F. men still waiting to go on the land. Very properly, the Premier has declared that our discharged soldiers are to have preference in land settlement. In view of the fact that, after all, we have settled only 4,000 soldiers on their holdings, the problem of settling another 1,400 is not easy of solution. If no immigrant is to be fixed up with land until all those 1,400 men are settled, it is clear that presently we shall have confusion worse confounded. Many of those returned soldiers are really anxious for their land. They are out of work, and would be only too willing to go to their holdings without further delay. I trust something definite will be done to absorb them. According to the Speech, the sinking fund on the Coolgardie water scheme is far in excess of requirements, and in future payments to the extent of £100,000 per annum may be suspended. To me, a goldfields member, this is a most happy position, especially in view of the utterances of the croakers in the days of Lord Forrest, men who, despite that statesman's vision, declared it would be impossible to carry water into the desert at a practicable price to the consumer. It is fortunate that during the last 11 years successive Governments have not been able to

out into that sinking fund to help square their deficits. Since that water scheme would never have been brought into being but for the goldfields I, as a representative of the fields, sincerely ask that, if possible, relief be afforded the goldfields' users of that scheme. We have had many deputations to the Minister for Mines and the Minister for Works, asking for cheaper water for the goldfields.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The scheme has never paid.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I sincerely hope some relief will be afforded to the consumers of water on the goldfields. There are still millions of tons of mineral ore which could be profitably worked if only cheap water were available. It must be remembered that one miner in work is responsible for the maintenance of about seven other persons living on him on the spot, to say nothing of all the rest more or less dependent on him from a distance. So, to further the mining industry by the cheapening of the water supply, is to do something much more beneficial for the State than flooding the country with immigrants before knowing where we are to put them. I have referred to the decline of the mining industry. We have to view the position as it is. It was the gold mining industry which gave this country its first boost, not so much the base metal industry. A Commission should be appointed on the lines of the low grade Mining Commission of South Africa to go thoroughly into the question of seeing whether some relief from the heavy burden now imposed upon the industry could not be afforded. The South African Commission came to the conclusion that if the low-grade mines could be placed on a payable basis it would do much good to the community. We should have an inquiry to see if the working costs could not be reduced here so that the life of our mining industry might be prolonged. I do not believe in reducing wages, or in that being a panacea. However, it may be bruited about this country that wages must come down, I cannot see how they can be reduced for several years to come. It is not advisable that we should reduce wages, and in that way lower the standard of living. If we measure the bearing which wages have upon an industry as against the other contingent costs, we find that the ratio is about 40 to 60 per cent. It would be logical to argue a reduction of wages if the cost of the other requisites also come down; but until that time comes it is unfair to ask those engaged in this important industry to accept a reduction in wages. I am anxious to see a revival in this industry. If we can bring it about we shall attract the men who are most ambitious and most enterprising from other parts of the British Empire. Some effort has been made to discover new goldfields. I am not going to pelt stones at the Minister for Mines or the Government in regard to prospecting. I represented the Returned Soldiers' League for nearly three years on the State Prospecting Board. That board has never been hampered or hamstrung in the matter of finances in equipping the prospector. The board was not satisfied with the results achieved by the old methods, and the lay members of it said if a new system was not adopted they would retire from the board. The result was

that we were successful in getting a sum of between £2,500 and £3,000 to equip the State Prospecting party. Whether the operations of that party are a success or not is in the lap of the gods. Capt. Jones and all the members of the party may be relied upon to do their utmost to ensure success. No party has ever gone out in this State better equipped in personnel or in any other way. I am sure if it is possible it will do full justice to the confidence that has been reposed in it. The members of the party are making a big financial sacrifice in the interests of the State. It is the wish of all that a new Kalgoorlie should be found. If that happens we shall soon be lifted out of the slough of despond in which we find ourselves. Encomiums have been passed upon me for the inquiries I made in South Africa in connection with miners' phthisis, and for the joint report put in by the State Mining Engineer and myself upon the question. I made these inquiries in an honorary capacity. I fully recognised the danger of the fell disease which creeps upon our miners. I thought I might be able to discover in South Africa some measure by which a lasting benefit could be afforded to those who work underground. The proposals that are now promulgated for dealing with this matter are, however, very far from all that are required. Later on I hope to have something further to say on this question. It is my belief that every member, irrespective of the party to which he belongs, will support any proposal that will improve the conditions of the men who work in our mining industry. The unification of the Commonwealth railways is a question that has not yet been touched upon. It is one of the most important questions confronting the people of Australia to-day. The sooner it is tackled the greater will be the benefit to the Commonwealth. Owing to our Federal system it seems to me the present difficulties are insurmountable. Were we happily circumstanced as they are in South Africa, where the union railways belong to the union and not to the provisional council, a commencement in this direction would have been made long ago. The States of Australia may be likened to six lady suitors for a new Apollo. They all want to secure him, but none has been able to do so. We must all recognise the advantage of, at all events, a unified trunk line throughout Australia. One can travel all over Europe, the United States, Canada, and the union of South Africa as far north as the Belgian Congo, on railways of the one gauge. This brings to mind the criminal waste and neglect permeating Australia owing to the many gauges that make up our main trunk line system. With this subject is bound the great question of immigration. The early commencement of this work would mean the employment of thousands of men. It has been said that every year the work is delayed adds £1,000,000 to the capital cost of the undertaking.

Hon. G. W. Miles : That is so.

Hon. J. CORNELL : If the State Parliaments of Australia do not urge the early commencement of this work, they deserve to be indicted and put in durance vile for the rest of their lives. Transport is the main arm of defence. If the little brown men were to land in Perth,

as they could easily do, owing to our tin-pot navy, we can well imagine what a task it would be to move a division from Melbourne to Perth. It would take fully six months to transport 20,000 men with all arms, if indeed it would be possible to do it in that time. Western Australia, at all events, should take a serious view of this matter. It is one which the Federal conference of soldiers discussed, and it unanimously resolved that the work should be commenced immediately. If anyone is competent to speak on this question, not only from the martial but the utility aspect, it is a body representative of the Soldiers' League of Australia. We members of Parliament must realise what benefit would accrue from the electrification of our metropolitan railways. One has only to see the suburban electric service in Melbourne to realise how far ahead of ours, that system is. The Victorian suburban service is much the same as ours in that it runs through a central station, namely Flinders-street. The train may come in about eight o'clock in the evening or some other busy time, and discharge its freight at Flinders-street. The full train does not then go on either to Essendon or Sandringham, or some other destination, but so mobile is it that half the train can be detached and run into a shed and the other half sent on to one terminal point or the other, the reduced number of coaches being sufficient to cope with the then reduced traffic. In this State a train is run from Midland Junction to Perth, and after discharging a heavy passenger load is sent on to Fremantle practically empty. Until our railways are electrified we cannot handle our rolling stock economically as they do in Melbourne. The backbone of the system in Melbourne is Morwell. The system has proved beneficial, economical and a great saving. Collie is not very much further from Perth than Morwell is from Melbourne. If it is possible to secure the services of the responsible engineer connected with that scheme they should be obtained at once, and he should be brought here to report on the present situation. I refer to the greatest man in the A.I.F. and to-day the greatest man in the engineering world of this country, and probably in the Southern Hemisphere—Sir John Monash.

Hon. J. Ewing : They will not consider it here for a moment.

Hon. J. CORNELL : Sir John Monash is nothing if not practical. He is a blunt man. He will not surround himself with red tape. He will go into the matter as it is. It is not worth while getting the man on the lower rung to report on this matter; we should get the man with a master mind such as Sir John Monash. He proved himself a brilliant man in his achievements when in command of the A.I.F., and when he returned to this country, after relinquishing his command, there were no banners, no flags, no bands. He started work at his office next day. He has not only proved himself brilliant as a soldier in the field but he is to-day the master mind in the engineering world of Australia. His services should be secured as soon as possible. Another matter I wish to refer to is in connection with workers' homes. I understand

it is the intention of the Government—and they are doing so to-day—to build workers' homes in the agricultural districts in accordance with the amending Act passed last session. I further understand that since the defeat of the Scaddan Government few, if any, homes have been built on the leasehold principle. I have it direct from the Premier that he is opposed to the leasehold system. I have a home under the leasehold system and I am prepared to go on with it, as others are prepared to do, if the leasehold system is to be perpetuated. If it is the policy of the Government, as it was of those that preceded the Scaddan Government, not to construct houses on the leasehold system, it is time the whole position was reviewed and those who obtained homes on the leasehold principle, on the understanding that it was the policy of the Government to continue them, should be given an opportunity to reconsider their position and take advantage of a move to transfer from the leasehold to the freehold system. The Minister promised something in that direction last session. I would not object to the two policies continuing, as obtained during the regime of the Scaddan Government. In those days one could take his choice between the two systems. I understand that to-day one can only secure a home under the freehold system, unless a leasehold house should become vacant. I hope the Minister will give the House some indication as to the intentions of the Government regarding this matter. It is usual for Governors' Speeches to contain a mass of verbiage regarding new legislation. There has been a departure on this occasion in that there is very little in the Governor's Speech indicating new legislation that is to be introduced. However, it is proposed to bring forward a Bill to amend the Industrial Arbitration Act. I understand that Bill is to be introduced to make provision for the appointment of a permanent president of the Arbitration Court. At this juncture, I will not enter upon the vexed question of arbitration; I will reserve my remarks on that matter until the Bill is before us. I understand, however, that the measure is the outcome of a conference attended by the Leader of the House as Deputy Premier and certain representatives of the Trades Hall. Though I am beyond the pale regarding the Trades Hall to-day, Mr. Dodd, another old and valued Labourite, Mr. Harris and other hon. members—I say this advisedly—are just as competent and qualified to offer suggestions as to how the Arbitration Act can be amended as those who met the Deputy Premier. It must not be considered that when the Bill comes forward those opinions which were not sought on that occasion, will not be advanced in this Chamber. There is another matter to which I desire to refer, although it was not mentioned in the Governor's Speech. It may have a very sorrowful influence on those of us who are to retire at the next election. It has been bruited abroad that during the life of this Parliament there will probably be a Redistribution of Seats

Bill introduced. It has been the practice in the past to leave such a measure to the eleventh hour.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think there is any reference to that matter in the Governor's Speech.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No, it should have been referred to.

The PRESIDENT: If the hon. member intends to speak on everything that ought to have been included in the Governor's Speech, I am afraid he will take up considerable time.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am noted for that.

The PRESIDENT: If you have something important to say, you can go on.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say it advisedly that the advent of another year can make very little appreciable difference in the present numerical representation in Parliament of the various electorates throughout the State. In the interests of those who may go before their electors at about the same time as the members of the Legislative Assembly, I claim that the proper time to bring forward any such measure is not on the eve of a general election but during the middle of a session, when the whole matter can be discussed thoroughly and the electoral machinery made ready for the election. I trust that if the Government propose to introduce such a measure—the Government look as though they will stay out the rest of the period of three years, and I do not wish them otherwise—they will bring forward the measure this session and not leave it till the next session just prior to the election. To sum up the position, in my opinion there are two points which tower paramount above all others I have referred to. One is the question of finance and the other is the question of our immigration policy. I can see no tangible way out of our financial difficulties unless and until we recognise our true position.

Hon. A. Sanderson: Hear, hear!

Hon. J. CORNELL: We must realise that we are not the solvent and rich community that we imagine we are. We can no more go on living in a fool's paradise than any other fool can, and to tighten up our position would probably mean a reduction in the services rendered and a reduction in the civil service and other administrative staffs. I will be consistent. I cannot stand here and advocate the retention of our public services doing work that is not necessary, doing work that could be done without, or not doing work we should be doing, saying at the same time that the constituents I represent here should be content to live on day to day engagements and very often with no engagements at all. After all, it is the general taxpayer who keeps these institutions going. In view of the activity in many directions and our decline in other directions, the numerical strength of our administrative staff is greater to-day than ever before. For what reason that should be so, I do not know. I would not be one to advocate the reduction of wages, but I think if we were to reduce our

present administrative staff by 25 per cent. and pay the balance a better wage, we would have more up-to-date and efficient service than we are receiving to-day. If there is one department with which I sympathise, it is the Education Department. Most people will not realise why there is such a large vote for education. It is because throughout the gold-fields districts, palatial schools were erected in days gone by. In those days the accommodation was over-taxed; to-day it is not half filled. Settlement has extended in the metropolitan and agricultural districts, where there are not the necessary facilities in order that the children may be properly housed and educated. If there is one vote the curtailment of which I will fight against, it is that affecting the Education Department. If we cannot give our children proper education, we should shut up shop. I desire to sum up my idea as to what should be done regarding the immigration policy. I think there are not enough Ministers. That is my candid opinion. I am positive that, great superman and all that he is, the Premier cannot be expected to carry out all the duties that devolve upon him now. He is Premier, Minister for Lands and Colonial Treasurer, as well as bearing the responsibility for other departments as well. He cannot, with justice to himself and the country, carry on those functions of office as they should be conducted. I consider a Minister, even if he be an honorary one, should be appointed. I would even go to the extent of being a party to amending the Constitution to appoint another Minister whose sole mission should be to control immigration and soldier settlement. That would relieve the Premier from the heavy obligations that he shoulders at the present time, and would put him in the place in which he should be. I think the Premier should be the loose man in Cabinet, and not the man with the most work to do and the greatest number of departments to administer. If the Premier were the loose man in Cabinet he would have time to nose round and see what Ministers were "going slow" on him. As the position is to-day, the Premier has not time enough to go round to see who is, and who is not, going slow. With these few remarks, with a big emphasis on the "few," I support the motion before the House.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [8.15]: I have already availed myself of an opportunity of congratulating you, Sir, on your election to the office of President. I want now to associate myself with those members who have expressed their deep regret at the loss this House has sustained by the defeat of the former President, Mr. Kingsmill, and at the defeat at the last elections of Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Pantou. I join in welcoming the new members and congratulate them on the contributions they have made to this debate. There are one or two matters mentioned by Mr. Cornell that I should like

to refer to now while they are fresh in mind, because I have had no opportunity to make notes regarding them. He referred to the question of the deficit and the sinking fund. The statement I have made over and over again is that the contributions from revenue to the sinking fund and the appreciation of the sinking fund by the interest it itself has earned, have exceeded during the past 11 years the deficit that has been accumulated during that period. I have used that argument in this connection and in this connection only. I think I used it first on the occasion when you, Sir, from your then place in the House, made reference to the position of the other States of the Commonwealth, and to the fact that we alone amongst the States of the Commonwealth, were accumulating a huge deficit. I said then and I say now, that when we enter into a comparison with the other States of the Commonwealth it is only right and fair that we should get the whole of the picture and remember that not one of the other States has made any substantial contribution to sinking fund, and not one of them has a sinking fund capable of earning anything great in the way of interest. I have said over and over again that if the other States made the provision for meeting their debts when they become due, such as we have made, they like us, would be burdened with a heavy deficit. We have a deficit and we cannot set off the sinking fund against the deficit, but when members make a comparison with the other States which are contributing nothing to sinking funds, they are doing something unfair to Western Australia, and it is only right and just to put the whole position. When I have put the position to people in the other States, as I have done on various occasions, they have recognised at once that it was a fair and reasonable line of argument to take. If they had done as we have done they like us, would have been labouring under considerable deficits. The hon. member also referred to the remarks of the Federal Treasurer and the necessity for making the revenue balance the expenditure. If the Federal Treasurer, observing not merely the spirit, but the exact wording of the Constitution and of the Surplus Revenue Act, would give to the States the surplus that he has improperly and in defiance of the Constitution and of the Surplus Revenue Act accumulated, our position would be considerably relieved. The reference made to soldier settlement I do not propose to allude to at this moment, further than to say that a few weeks ago I attended a conference of Treasurers of the different States, when the whole matter of the financial aspect of soldier settlement as between the Commonwealth and the States was gone into exhaustively, and certain proposals were placed before the Federal Treasurer. The State Treasurers emphasised the contention which I think is unanswerable, that repatriation is primarily a duty of the Federal Government and while the States, because of the advantage they will ultimately obtain from settle-

ment of these men on the land, are prepared to take some share of the responsibility, the Federal Government must bear their share. I am very hopeful that the Federal Treasurer and the Federal Cabinet will see the matter in that light. The hon. member also made reference to the goldfields water supply. He was quite right in saying that the scheme has entirely justified itself. In common with many other great undertakings, it stands a monument to the State-craft, vision and foresight of the two men whose names are chiefly associated with it, Lord Forrest and Mr. C. Y. O'Connor. It must be borne in mind that while that scheme since its inception has paid the whole of its working expenses, and almost the whole of its interest—not quite all—the sinking fund throughout has been contributed from Consolidated Revenue, and has been contributed by the general taxpayers of the State, so that when the loan is finally liquidated, the work will not properly speaking, be the property of those who have used it, because they have not contributed anything towards its capital cost. It will be the property of the general community. I am fully in accord with the hon. member, that in the course of two or three years we no longer shall have to pay interest or sinking fund in connection with that great undertaking and that it should be possible then, even if it is not possible at an earlier date, to give some measure of consideration to the users of the water. On the question of the unification of the railways, mentioned also by Mr. Cornell. I shall have something to say at a later stage. Quite a number of matters have been raised by members to which I shall not allude during my reply. To do so would be to detain the House unduly, but I ask those members to take my assurance that these matters will not be neglected. I have passed minutes along to the different departments concerned, and I am sure that consideration will be given to the views expressed on these matters which I may describe as being of minor importance, though I do not wish to belittle them. They are minor matters compared with the larger issues in the Speech. I shall confine myself chiefly to the great question of immigration and to the side issues arising out of it. First of all I should like to remove a misconception that seems to exist in the minds of a great many members in regard to the immigration scheme. It is illustrated by the remarks of several members. First of all, Mr. Lovekin said that during the last four years without any of this settlement scheme in progress, we had increased our indebtedness to the extent of £3,125,000. Then Mr. Greig said the Government should have prepared two or three years ago for new settlers. Mr. Hamersley made reference to our unpreparedness to receive settlers and the delay in connection with the inspection of conditional purchase land to be converted into freehold. Dr. Saw expressed doubts as to whether the details of the scheme had been given consideration by experts in land settlement and finance. Many other members

spoke in the same strain. Each of those members appeared to me to have approached the immigration question from the point of view of something entirely new. As a matter of fact, so far as the placing of people on the land is concerned, there is scarcely anything new about it at all. The £3,125,000 to which Mr. Lovekin referred as having been borrowed during the last four years, has been devoted very largely to a similar scheme of land settlement and the actual rate of settlement during that period has been practically equal to what is contemplated by the present scheme. In three years over 4,000 soldier settlers have been placed on their blocks, in addition to a large number of ordinary settlers. We do not need to go very much faster than this to cope with our obligations under the present scheme.

Hon. J. Cornell: Most of those settlers were put on improved holdings.

**THE MINISTER FOR EDUCATION:** Group settlement a year ago was an entirely new development, but it is in full swing at present. In a comparatively few months 30 groups, comprising 600 settlers, have been placed on the land. Twelve new groups of 240 settlers have been placed within the last ten weeks and at the present time we are averaging practically two groups a week. This represents a rate of 2,000 settlers per annum. Two thousand settlers per annum is what we propose to do under this scheme; so that instead of being a matter, as some members think, involving something entirely new in land settlement, what we propose to do is to carry on what we have been doing during the last three or four years, but perhaps a little more expeditiously. We have almost overtaken the work of settling our returned soldiers on the land, and we want to continue the work of settling people on the land as rapidly as we have been settling them during the past three or four years, or perhaps a little more rapidly. Even from the point of view of absorbing the immigrants, there is nothing very extraordinary about this scheme. There is nothing greater than we in Western Australia, with our enormous territory and sparse population, ought to aspire to. In the four years preceding the war we brought out nearly 30,000 assisted immigrants and increased our population by 50,000 souls. Proportionately to our present population and our resources, the contemplated immigration and increase of population spread over the next five years is not much greater than we actually achieved during that period immediately preceding the war. It is certainly no greater than we are justified in aiming at. We should fall short in our duty if we aimed at anything less. For the purpose of convenience I propose to divide my reply on the question of immigration into three parts, namely finance, placing the new arrival, and the marketing of his products. The financial aspect of the scheme has been very severely attacked by Mr. Lovekin. I acknowledge gratefully on the Premier's behalf, his tri-

bute to Sir James Mitchell. He made in the same connection, reference to the late Lord Forrest. If my recollection serves me aright, it was by no means unusual for the hon. member, in the very influential and powerful position he then occupied, to criticise the proposals of the then Sir John Forrest quite as vigorously and as hostilely as he has criticised the proposals of the present Premier. I venture to think that now as then, the hon. member acted very largely on the old saying, "If you want to be heard, sing out of tune." The hon. member at the outset made reference to what he said was a difference between the scheme now put forward and that originally submitted to the Prime Minister; the difference between the amounts of £750 and £1,000. There is really no difference of any moment at all so far as that aspect is concerned. When the Premier placed his scheme before the Prime Minister it was suggested between them that the average cost of settling the newcomers under group settlement conditions, would be £750.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is all I said.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That was the idea that both of them had. When the agreement came to be finalised, the Premier realised that if we were going to have an average cost of £750, we must not definitely pin ourselves down to £750 as a maximum. So, Schedule A which is referred to in the agreement reads—

The debt charged including charge for supervision shall not in any case exceed £1,000.

It is not a matter of the Commonwealth or of the State Government advancing £750 per settler or £1,000 per settler. Neither of those questions enter into consideration. It is a matter of the State undertaking to settle the 6,000 people on the land, and of setting out in the agreement how we propose to do it and what is to be charged against them. In no case will we raise a debit charge against any one of these settlers exceeding £1,000.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We have never seen that agreement.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not know whether the hon. member has seen it or not.

Hon. A. Sanderson: What agreement are you quoting?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The difference between £150 and £1,000 is not a matter of importance. It is not a question of advancing so much per settler, but a question of £750 having been decided between the Premier and the Prime Minister as the average cost, and, in the agreement, we stipulate that we will not place a debit against any one settler of more than £1,000. That is the maximum. Mr. Lovekin has said that the absurdity of the scheme is manifest, and then he set out to prove his statement. He started to prove it by telling us that the present wheat production had been reached by an expenditure of six millions sterling, and therefore it would cost another six million to

double it. I am sure the hon. member knows that the last thing I would think of was being personal, but if one wishes to force an argument, he must use an illustration which will appeal and which is entirely apt. If the hon. member prints 2,000 newspapers at a certain cost, it does not cost double the sum to print 4,000 newspapers, and very much the same argument applies in the production of wheat; because if a man is farming only 200 acres he is doing it uneconomically, and until you get him up to the maximum of what he can economically produce, the work cannot be done at a reasonable figure.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are quite wrong.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Does the hon. member take up the attitude that if it costs six millions to produce—

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You can farm 300 acres cheaper than 1,000 acres, that is, at so much per acre.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: And allow the remainder of the land to lie idle?

Hon. C. F. Baxter: No.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: In order to double our production of wheat it is not necessary to spend six millions, nor what has been spent to bring the production up to the present figures. I take it that the clearing of an extra million and a half acres will practically double our production.

Hon. H. Stewart: It will certainly increase it proportionately.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There will be some additional machinery required. It is set out in the Governor's Speech that for the first three years it is proposed to use one million pounds per annum to strengthen the funds of the Agricultural Bank so that money may be advanced to clear the additional million and a half acres and also to provide for fencing, dams, and other things necessary to increase the sheep carrying capacity of the land.

Hon. A. Lovekin: All out of a million.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: A million per annum will be ample for three years to do that work. During that time and for the remaining 8 years that will elapse before it is necessary to find the whole of the money to place new settlers on the land, the Agricultural Bank money will be constantly coming in so that even the three millions will be reduced to a considerable extent. The hon. member has said that during the next five years we shall have to raise 10 millions of money for ordinary loan expenditure, because we raised eight millions during the last four years. The hon. member overlooked the fact that the great bulk of the money we raised during the past four years was for a settlement scheme exactly similar to the one now proposed, but probably more costly. Therefore, it is entirely fallacious to suggest that we must borrow all that we borrowed during the last four years plus the £6,000,000. We certainly shall not borrow on anything like the scale the hon. member

suggests. He also said that we shall increase our ordinary expenditure by £300,000 a year, and the next statement he put up was that that £300,000 was to be spent in every year of the scheme, as though we were going to have 75,000 people here to-morrow. If his calculation that to provide for 75,000 people will cost £300,000 per annum in general services were correct, it would obviously be wrong to pile up that £300,000 every year for five years, because it would not be until the last year that we should have all of the 75,000 people with us. The hon. member's calculation, therefore, is hopelessly astray. On this basis, he builds up his extraordinary calculation and declares that there will be no extra revenue. Why does he assume that? If we double the wheat production, there must be extra revenue. In all directions, in fact, there is bound to be additional revenue from any policy which means activity. The whole trouble with all our public utilities is that we have to provide too much for our population. Give the railways for instance, their full loads, and our troubles will soon disappear. This year there will be a considerable increase in the business of the railways, and because of that increase there will be a smaller loss than that of last year. If we succeed in doubling our wheat production, the increased business which must follow will have the effect of wiping out the railway loss altogether. We have too much equipment just now and too little traffic. We have to cater too much for a population which is scattered over too wide an area. Remedy those defects and our troubles will disappear. The hon. member argued that this arrangement was good for the Imperial Government and that Great Britain would get all its advances back in three years. The hon. member spoke as if we were not getting anything from this trade, and that the whole of it was net profit for the Imperial Government. It will be admitted I think that it is a fallacy to suggest that because they have so much trade with us that that trade is all profit. The hon. member said that Great Britain would get it all back in three years.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I said five years.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Then there is also the question of the Federal Government taking too much. I have a good deal of sympathy with the hon. member's argument in that regard. There is the question of duties in particular. It does seem to me to be a scandalous abuse of the spirit of the Federal Constitution that any State which embarks on a vigorous developmental policy should have to pay Customs duties on the things it imports for its own use, such as rails. When the Prime Minister was here I made reference to the duties that the Federal Government compelled us to pay on tractors which could not be obtained in Australia, and which were used exclusively in connection with soldier settlement. In spite of the promises which have been made from time to time, we

have not yet received any rebate. I know that the hon. member is of opinion that we might set the Commonwealth Government at defiance and refuse to pay them, or that we might sue them. Unfortunately, under the Constitution there is no appeal from the Federal High Court in a matter of this kind.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The Privy Council can give leave.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am not going to argue the matter. The advice is that there is no appeal on matters of this kind, and the question has been twice tested. It was decided on the first occasion in connection with fencing wire. The New South Wales Government failed in that case, because this fencing wire was brought out to sell to other people and was not for the permanent use of the settlers in the State. The second case was on the subject of rails, and again the High Court held that the rails were liable to duty. Against these decisions there was no appeal.

Hon. A. Lovekin: And the court used nonsensical arguments.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: After that remark I would not be surprised to be told by the hon. member that Dr. Saw and I used nonsensical arguments. Perhaps we should be safer to err with the High Court judge than to shine with the hon. member. There is a good deal in what he said with regard to our treatment by the Federal Government. For instance, there is the treatment of the States arising out of transferred properties. Under the Constitution transferred properties had to be paid for. What do the Federal Government do? They take over the properties and credit the States with the value. Over a period of 11 years they pay no interest whatever. For the subsequent 11 years they pay the totally inadequate rate of 3½ per cent. The recent conference of Treasurers brought this matter under the notice of the Federal Treasurer and asked that he should either give us our money right out, write it off against what we owe him, or else pay us a reasonable rate of interest. I want to emphasise again that the money which we have been borrowing in the past three years has been chiefly for land settlement purposes, and therefore the borrowing of six millions for the same purpose does not suggest "a glorious drunk for five years," as Mr. Lovekin has termed it. Neither does it suggest an extra debt of 20 millions. To my mind it does not suggest any tidal wave of money by which this State is to be submerged. We have heard a good deal of the Victorian scheme, which was said to be so much better than ours. The Victorian scheme has not up to the present time materialised. There is no scheme so far as Victoria is concerned. I spent a good deal of time a few weeks ago with Mr. Lawson, the Premier of Victoria. Mr. Lawson told me exactly the scheme that he desired to bring to fulfilment. He told me confidentially because these things cannot be talked about until they are finalised, but he



did tell me this without reservation, that he had no desire, neither had he any hope of getting anything better than Western Australia had obtained. He made no secret whatever about that.

Hon. A. Sanderson: From the Federal Government or from the Imperial Government?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Either or both. I was told yesterday—in our present benighted condition we do not know what value to attach to the reports and rumours we hear—that the Premier of Victoria was about to proceed to England. As a matter of fact, I urged him to go to England, and if he intends to go his object will be to try to fix up an immigration scheme, and to use his own words, he will be quite content to get as good a deal as Western Australia obtained. The position is that the Imperial Government will not enter into any agreement with an individual State. They will treat only through the Commonwealth. The Prime Minister of the Commonwealth takes up this attitude: that in view of the condition of the labour market in the Eastern States he is not prepared to enter into an immigration partnership with any State unless the scheme goes hand in hand with the proposal to unify the railway gauges of Australia. The Prime Minister recognised that Western Australia could settle its people on the land, and that that would relieve the unemployment in this State to a considerable extent, whereas they are not in a position to do that in the Eastern States. I discussed the question at some length with the Prime Minister. Mr. Cornell has made reference to the question of the unification of the gauges, and I have no doubt the matter will come before the Federal Parliament at an early date. It will probably also come before our own Parliament, and I have no doubt it will be the great issue at the next Federal elections. For that reason, although it is very dangerous to prophesy close to the event, I think it not unlikely that we shall find the Prime Minister contesting a Sydney seat, a seat in a State that believes in the unification of the railway system and not a seat in a State that is opposed to it. I know that for Eastern Australia the Prime Minister's immigration policy is linked up entirely with the question of the unification of the railway gauges. An alternative was put up by Mr. Lovekin that the British and Commonwealth Governments should advance the money to the settlers and get it back from them. That was the alternative. We were to provide roads and railways and facilities of every kind, while the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments took the risk of failure of individual settlers. For a start, I do not see how anyone can take the risk except the people who are handling the concern. For that reason I do not see how the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments, at the distance they are away, could accept this particular risk. They said to us, "You take the risk, and we will give you £1,200,000 to do it." It has to be remembered that a great deal of this money

is going to be advanced to established settlers, and in that regard there will be practically no risk at all. The business of the Agricultural Bank in this respect is a business that any bank might undertake. The money will be returnable with interest. A considerable proportion of the loan will be spent on reproductive works. I quite admit that in establishing new settlers there will be some failures and some losses. To take that risk, we have from the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments what amounts to a present of £1,200,000. Whether that sum will be sufficient to meet the failures and losses, I will not stop to argue; but I do say that the difference between the Premier's scheme and Mr. Lovekin's scheme is merely a trifling difference, and certainly not such as would spell the difference between success on the one hand and failure and disaster on the other. Mr. Rose suggested that we should give the settlers some of the advantage of this interest concession. Mr. Rose probably knows more about land settlement than Mr. Lovekin does. Mr. Rose is aware that there will be losses and failures, but nevertheless he thinks that we can go so far as to give to the new settlers some of the money given to us by the Imperial and Commonwealth Governments to carry the risk. I do not know that we can afford to do it, but I do feel that the amount which those Governments have given us represents a reasonable concession to meet losses and failures.

Hon. E. Rose: My idea was that the interest should be suspended for five years, and then be added to the principal.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Quite so. Mr. Willmott, a South-Western representative, seemed to me to be extraordinarily pessimistic. He said Mr. Lovekin had understated the financial difficulties. Then, to my great satisfaction, though also, I must confess, to my amazement, Mr. Willmott wound up by saying that the State would gain greatly by the scheme. How the two statements are to be reconciled is a matter I leave to the hon. member himself. Next in importance to the financial effect is the question of the absorption of the immigrants. It is said that the people will come here and go over to the East. If some of them do that, we shall at all events have the consolation of knowing that they have not cost us anything to bring here. In the past the immigrants whom we brought here and who leaked away have cost us a good deal of money. The pre-war immigrants used to cost us about £8 each in passage alone. The people now being brought out will cost the Commonwealth about £12 each in passage money, and the Commonwealth also bears the whole cost of propaganda work. Those people will be landed here free of cost, and such as leak away will not have cost us anything. The Governor's Speech sets out figures, covering a long period of years, as to the number of assisted immigrants and the net excess of arrivals over departures. During 1920-21,

4,745 assisted nominated immigrants arrived in Western Australia, and for that period there was an actual excess of departures over arrivals of 1,320. The reason, I believe, was, as Mr. Cornell states, the decrease of gold-fields population. For the first six months of the current year, the assisted nominated immigrants numbered 2,288, and we have had an actual excess of arrivals over departures of 2,194. I take that as an indication that we have turned the corner, and that if the immigration policy is solidly followed up, we shall keep the people that we get. Why should people leave Western Australia to go to the Eastern States? What inducements have those States to offer that we cannot offer here? The other day I travelled from Melbourne with a young man who has for some time been settled in lower New South Wales, a prosperous successful farmer. He was bringing his mother and his sister over to spend a holiday with their brother-in-law in Kellerberrin, and he told me that for the past 11 years he and his brother-in-law had been comparing notes carefully, and that his brother-in-law at Kellerberrin had made more money on his £1 per acre land than he had been able to make on his £9 per acre land in New South Wales. He said he was going to spend five or six weeks' holiday here with the intention of going back afterwards on his own farm, but he added, "If I am satisfied with what I see here I shall not hesitate to sell my farm in New South Wales and come back here, because I am satisfied from the notes I have compared with my brother-in-law that the productive value of the land compared with what it can be bought for is much greater in Western Australia than in any other State." We need only to get that fact more generally known, when we shall find it less difficult to retain our population than at the present time. The first element in the absorption of the immigrants is to be the employment given by established farmers. We cannot double our production and increase our flocks and herds without permanently increasing the numbers engaged in the wheat industry. When we come to the land settlement of the new arrivals it is a different proposition. Mr. Ewing wanted to know exactly where these people are to be settled. The agreement—

Hon. A. Sanderson: Has this agreement been published?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I do not think anything has been published during the last fortnight. I took this agreement over to Melbourne to the Prime Minister, and the day after I got back here we had the newspaper strike. There is nothing secret about the agreement now.

Mr. Lovekin: Is not the "Worker" published?

Hon. J. Duffell: That is a scab paper.

Hon. A. Sanderson: On a point of order, is that an agreement put on the Table of the House?

The PRESIDENT: I am not prepared to say whether it is or not. I think the hon.

member is perfectly in order in making use of any information that he has at hand.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The agreement will be available for hon members as soon as I have done with it.

Hon. A. Sanderson: It will be available?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Yes. One paragraph of the agreement reads—

And whereas the State Government is desirous of accelerating the development of the South-West Division of the State of Western Australia, particularly the area between the south-west coast line and a line drawn from Bunbury on the west coast to Albany on the south coast, containing approximately 5,000,000 acres of Crown land. . . .

It is the intention to settle these people in what may be called, for convenience, the south-west corner of the State. But it would have been a very foolish thing to say in the agreement that we must settle them in that particular portion, so that if we happened to settle some of them elsewhere they would not be counted. The settlement of the 6,000 men is to be particularly, but not necessarily exclusively, in that area. Hon. members may ask in what state of preparedness are we to settle people? The Lands Department have 1,000 blocks surveyed and ready for settlement within the next few weeks, mostly in the South-West, where surveys are proceeding at the rate of 50 blocks per week. In the wheat areas 100 blocks have been prepared at Newdegate, and 120 in Westonia and Southern Cross, where 95 blocks were sold last year. There are also 120 blocks available at Esperance. So far as the wheat area is concerned, the demand for good wheat land within 20 miles of a railway exceeds the supply; and the London agency has been advised that all those wheat lands will be required for our own people. Therefore no one coming out from England at present is entitled to say that when he was leaving London he was told he could acquire good wheat land within reasonable reach of a railway. The demand by our own people is in excess of what we can supply, and while that is so we are not going to promise those lands to anybody else.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have you got enough surveyors on?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: We have got all the surveyors on that we can get. If any additional competent surveyors are available, we can give them work.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Have you tried to get them in the Eastern States?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is no chance of getting them there. At Newdegate we had 91 applications for 35 blocks. The Westonia blocks were applied for several times over. At Esperance 275 blocks have been sold. In every way possible development is being speeded up. In the case of Esperance we want to get the people settled so that when the railway is open there will be traffic for it. The selection of agri-

cultural lands for 1920-21 totalled 2872 selections covering 1,726,515 acres. For 1921-22 there were 3,265 selections totalling 1,922,540 acres of agricultural land. The area of land surveyed last year was the second highest in the history of the State. I think it is a very healthy sign that we should have the excess demand for our lands. It would be a bad thing for the State if we had land surveyed and waiting and nobody willing to go on it. Now, the settlement of men brought out under the immigration scheme does not necessarily begin until 12 months after their arrival. We do not enter into an obligation to a man to put him on the land until 12 months after he comes here. We do not say that we will not put him on before 12 months have elapsed, but there is no obligation on us to do it.

Hon. G. W. Miles: That is not what the Premier said in England.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: That is what the agreement sets out very clearly. It gives us from four to six years to settle this total of 6,000 men. But to come back to their absorption in the meantime. Since July, 1921, for clearing alone the Agricultural Bank has approved of advances totalling £460,207, or at the rate of £7,500 per week. The total approvals for the five weeks ended 18th August—that is from the date the scheme was finalised and we knew we could go ahead—were, for clearing £105,316, for other improvements £62,303, a total of £167,619, or an average from the date the agreement was signed of £33,500 per week. I think that is speeding up fairly rapidly. To clear a million acres costs a million and a half pounds. As the men employed are engaged also at harvest time, it will mean, roughly, work for 10,000 men during the year, while harvesting and the transport of the harvest will absorb permanently 8,000 men per annum. Then there is the erection of the necessary 6,000 cottages for the settlers, and 2,000 for our own people. Tenders have been accepted for the first thousand of those cottages. All that means extensive employment, together with which there will be road and railway construction and all the employment in the marketing of the additional produce.

Hon. H. Stewart: Are those cottages to be under the Workers' Homes Scheme?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Some of them are, some are not. The settlement of the new people under the agreement is to be group settlement. We provide in a general way—none of this is arbitrary—for bringing 25 acres under the plough, for fencing, for a house adequate and cheap, for ploughing the land, for laying down 20 acres of pasture and five acres in root and vegetable crops and, later, five acres for apples. The stock is to consist of cows, pigs and poultry. Very little machinery will be required. Dairying will be the basis of settlement, with the necessary side lines. Butter and bacon factories will be provided as necessity arises. They can be provided

with greater assurance of success in the vicinity of group settlements than could be hoped for in our present scattered areas where, as Mr. Macfarlane knows, it is impossible to get that uniformity of and grading of cream necessary to the production of a high-class and well-keeping quality of butter.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Is the State going to provide those factories?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The State will assist co-operative companies, as in the past. Reference has been made to the Peel estate. Not long ago we had from England Mr. Hiam, one of the biggest farmers of the Old Country. He spent some time on the Peel estate, and on his return spoke to me of it in glowing terms. He discussed the matter with our engineers, and some of his suggestions were very helpful. He had no hesitation in saying that the value of the land, when the drainage is complete, will easily compensate us for our expenditure. Mr. Greig has spoken of land available for fruit and vine growing at Brookton and of millions of acres in one patch of agricultural land near the rabbit-proof fence. Mr. Mills and Mr. Moore referred to the Midland lands. There cannot be any doubt of our capacity to place on the land, on the wheat areas and in the South-West, a great many more people than we contemplate under the agreement; nor can there be any doubt that the placing of people on the land will afford necessary employment to the remainder of the immigrants. Reference has been made to the Government having closed down the policy of railway construction. We had no option. It was impossible to build railways with the price of rails obtaining until quite recently. It was only a few months ago that there was a sufficient reduction to justify the Government in placing orders for material for railways previously authorised by Parliament. Whilst we aim at absorbing the immigrants by giving them employment in agricultural districts, I see no reason why a very considerable number of people, say our own people at present unemployed, should not be absorbed in secondary industries. We have just made a start, and a fairly satisfactory one, in secondary industries, after having been held back ever since we entered Federation. In 1914 we had 917 factories and workshops; in 1921 we had 1,070—not a very large increase. The persons employed in those factories and workshops in 1914 numbered 18,641. In 1917 that number had dropped back to 13,341, including those persons employed in the timber industry. To-day the number of men employed in the timber industry is fewer by 500 than it was in 1914. Nevertheless we have overtaken the loss made between 1914 and 1917 and to-day we have employed 19,500, or an increase of 6,241 over 1917, and of 359 over 1914, notwithstanding that we are still short by a very large number, at least 500, of the men employed in the timber industry. In 1914 the gross value of the output of those

factories was £7,166,672. Last year it was £13,141,327, or an increase of nearly £6,000,000, a very large increase indeed. The capital employed in 1914 was £5,175,609 whereas last year it was £6,975,025. The wages have shown an increase of upwards of half a million. There is a marked increase in the activity of a number of small factories, and the possibilities for further expansion are illustrated by the very large value of our present imports in those particular lines. Take, for instance, biscuits and confectionery. In 1914 our biscuit and confectionery factories employed 279 people. In 1920 the number had risen to 499, almost double. Yet the imports for the year 1920-21 were valued at £156,000. Obviously, that industry can grow, is growing, and will continue to absorb an increasing number of employees. Butter and bacon factories employed 22 persons in 1914, and 111 in 1920, an increase of 89. Yet we have those products, to the value of £512,000 per annum, coming into the State. The manufacture of jams, pickles, and sauces employed 51 persons in 1914, and 71 in 1920, an increase of 20, the value of the imports being £175,000. The manufacture of boots and shoes employed 188 persons in 1914 and 295 in 1920, an increase of 107, the value of the imports being £358,000. Tanneries and bone mills in 1914 employed 74 persons, and in 1920, 125 were employed, an increase of 51; the value of imports in leather and leather manufactures was £96,000. Coach and motor body building, cycle and motor works, employed 409 persons in 1914 and 598 in 1920, an increase of 189; the value of imports in motor car bodies amounted to £44,000. Flour mills employed 224 persons in 1914 and 418 in 1920, an increase of 194. In the manufacture of furniture 367 persons were employed in 1914 and 486 in 1920, an increase of 119. In addition to that, many new industries which absorb a considerable number of men have been established in recent years. The cement works give employment both at Burswood and at Lake Clifton where the lime is secured. Asbestos roofing and sheet works have been established because they were able to secure supplies of cement locally and because of our valuable deposits of asbestos. Then we have porcelain works for the manufacture of china from local clays, the only works of their kind in the British Empire outside the British Isles. They are sending their products to the Eastern States. Only a few days ago they received from Messrs. Mark Foy, of Sydney, an order for 4,450 dozen plates. Glassbottle works have been established, and another glass works for the manufacture of domestic glassware has now commenced operations. The combined activities in these industries employ over 500 people, and the capital invested totals over £330,000. Wool-scouring works gave employment to 70 hands in 1920. The freezing works at Fremantle will start operations very soon. They are the most up-to-date in the Commonwealth.

Hon. H. Stewart: What about the works at Wyndham?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: The present Government were not responsible for their establishment. I think, when the time comes, I shall be able to demonstrate that the present Government acted wisely in operating the works this season. A start has been made with knitting mills. There are two such mills in the metropolitan area and one at Albany. The products of these concerns are regarded favourably by the trade. The possibilities of the industry will be realised when it is remembered that in hosiery and knitted articles of apparel we imported last year £700,000 worth. The distillation of essential oils has been entered upon, and two establishments are distilling sandalwood oil. Plaster of Paris is now being made in three local factories, and in one of these 40 tons of the raw material, gypsum, is used weekly. A good deal of our local plaster of Paris finds markets in the Eastern States. In one fertiliser works 5,000 tons of local pyrites are used annually for the sulphur contents. Blackboy is being utilised in a local plant and its products of wood alcohol, tar pitch, etc., find ready acceptance. The factory uses 4,000 tons of blackboy per annum. Among other new industries established in recent months are the manufacture of hats, caps and ties, paints, varnishes and colours, white lead works, disinfectant, ink, tiles, a substitute for marble from magnesite, toys, tool handles, margarine, oxides, and boot and floor polishes. The Returned Soldiers League are starting a boot factory, employing 37 hands. This is a list of small things, but it is very encouraging.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: In view of these, how do you account for all the unemployment?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What would the position be if it were not for these enterprises? Contrast our position in regard to unemployment with that in any other State of the Commonwealth or any other country in the world, and then give thanks that you live in Western Australia! This State formerly imported large numbers of roofing tiles. To-day the importation has practically ceased, for local factories are now meeting local requirements and the article is said to be as good as, if not better than, that of Marseilles. Now there is another enterprise in prospect and I think, if it is properly put up to the people of Western Australia, they will rise to the importance of it, that is for the establishment of woollen mills. It can be done with profit to the investors and immense profit to the State. When in Melbourne recently I had an opportunity to visit the Lincoln factory. Its history is a romance of industry. Eleven years ago six hand looms employed seven or eight girls. With the war people could not get the imported article and a demand came for the locally made stuff. In 1916 the proprietor realised that the suburban street in which he was located did not

contain sufficient room for expansion. He went to North Coburg, and there bought what was known as a cow pasture at so much per acre. In 1918 he started to build there. That is only four years ago. To-day that factory covers  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres of ground. The capital invested is two million pounds, and the value of the machinery in the factory is over £500,000. There are 1,200 people now employed, and the wages sheet amounts to £150,000 per annum. One thousand bales of wool are treated every month. The wool goes in at one end in greasy form in the morning, and in the afternoon the finished product comes out at the other end for the people to wear.

Hon. A. Lovekin: That is correct.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It seems to me an absolute romance in industry that in so short a time, less than five years, there should have been so great a growth in this particular direction. The land around this factory is now selling at £6 per foot and the district contains a prosperous and thriving community, where a few years ago there was no one. This factory works on Morwell coal, two tons of which are equal to one ton of Newcastle. Our Collie coal is about 33  $\frac{1}{3}$ rd per cent. better than Morwell coal, for  $1\frac{1}{2}$  tons is equal to one ton of Newcastle coal. We, therefore, have the advantage in that regard. The factory pays the city of Melbourne for electric power  $1\frac{1}{2}$ d. per unit. We can beat that to-day. It is expected that when the Morwell scheme is completed, current will be sold at from  $\frac{5}{8}$ d. to  $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per unit. We can do as well as that here, to say the least of it. In Victoria in 1918 there were 11 woollen mills employing 2,179 people. There are now 19 woollen mills employing 3,719 people, and new ones are starting every year. When I was in the Eastern States one new mill company had just gone to an allotment of shares, and another had just issued its prospectus. In 1918/19 there were 57 knitting mills in Victoria employing 1,600 persons, and to-day there are 142 employing 3,063 persons. In New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania, there is a similar advance being made. I do not say we can establish at once a mill on the same lines as the Lincoln mill, but I do say there is ample opportunity in Western Australia for the establishment of a good mill, to be followed shortly by others. I hope that, when the newspapers resume publication and the energetic people who have taken this project in hand place it before the public, it will be readily responded to. It will not only be an act of patriotism to put money into it, but should be a safe investment. I now wish to refer to Mr. Sanderson's remarks.

Hon. A. Lovekin: A fair thing!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: It did seem to me that all through his speech he was not in his usual form. He seemed to be oppressed. We realised what it was when he made his closing declaration. It was because of this closing declaration that he

introduced the speech made by Mr. Monger at the conference of the Farmers' and Settlers' Association. I have read that speech. In the portion read by Mr. Sanderson I do not find a single word or sentence inconsistent with support of the present immigration scheme of the Government. On the contrary, he emphasised the fact that the executive realised that increased population was an imperative necessity. The speech can be read in two ways. I read it simply taking the words at their ordinary meaning. I found not a single syllable inconsistent with support of the Government's immigration scheme. Mr. Sanderson, however, read it in another way. He introduced it by reference to the highly responsible and exalted position of the gentleman who made the speech. He then read the speech with "bated breath and whispering humbleness." He surrounded it with an air of solemn mystery. He read into it an awful occult warning, as though it were the utterance of a god. If members will take the extract read by the hon. member as it appeared in "Hansard," and read it in a common-sense fashion, they will not find in it a word inconsistent with the spirit of the immigration scheme. Then he turned to a pamphlet issued by Mr. Christopher Turnor. Mr. Turnor is by way of being, shall I say, within the shadow of the holy of holies. I do not think he is a member of the Country Party, but he has written a joint report with a prominent member of that party, Mr. Jowett. Mr. Turnor speaks of Mr. Jowett as 'leader of the Farmers' Party in the Federal House.' Of course he never was the leader, but that is a trifling inaccuracy compared with others in the publication. It is a common practice after a book is issued, and it is found that something has escaped attention, for some little correction to be made. I did not find that, but I did find something printed in red: "The Royal Colonial Institute is not responsible for the statements made or the opinions expressed in this report." If I had read that in the same manner as the hon. member had read Mr. Monger's speech, I should have followed it up by saying one could not expect the Royal Colonial Institute to say all he said was wrong, but as a responsible body, they took the precaution of putting that in.

Hon. A. Sanderson: They put that in every paper they issue.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: They have done so in this case, at all events. The Premier found it necessary to correct several statements made by Mr. Turnor. I do not know whether hon. members have seen this book. It is devoted to the settlement of British ex-service men on the land in the Dominions. It gives a great deal of space to different parts. When it comes to Western Australia it covers that with  $1\frac{1}{2}$  pages, chiefly explanatory of the fact that Mr. Turnor was not able to see anything of Western Australia, but was only able to spend an

hour or two while the boat was in port. He motored to Perth, had a talk with the Premier, and saw two or three other people. The remarks contained in this chapter are not opposed to immigration or to the scheme of immigration. In the report to which I refer, and which he wrote conjointly with Mr. Jowett, Mr. Turnor says:—

The fact is that for the lack of that special effort migration from England is pouring into Canada and Australia is losing the pick of the settlers. Yet we believe that Australia offers those settlers better opportunities than are to be found in any other part of the Empire. And from the Imperial and strategic point of view Australia is undoubtedly the most important part of the Empire to fill with English speaking people.

He did find some fault with Western Australia on the ground that we were not prepared to accept people under the group settlement scheme. I daresay that was right. We did not do anything in that respect until a couple of years ago. This book was written in 1920. The Premier wrote to the Colonial Institute pointing out certain mis-statements made by Mr. Turnor. He had cut down by half, the quantity of Crown land that was available, and placed our population at much less than it was. He said the Premier had told him that £200 would be sufficient for an immigrant to start with. The Premier had said that if a man had £200 he could get assistance from the Agricultural Bank to carry him through. Mr. Turnor wrote a reply and made it clear that he had nothing to say against Western Australia as a country for people to settle in, and that the whole of his criticism was directed against the unpreparedness of the State to receive British ex-service men for group settlement. He goes on to say:—

My criticism centred entirely upon the Western Australian Government's policy of settlement, and I must frankly say that after reading the Premier and Sir James Connolly's letters I feel that my criticism still holds good. Although my stay in Western Australia was so brief I am quite satisfied that there are excellent opportunities for the creation of group settlements; to mention one locality, Mt. Barker, near Albany, is, to my mind, as attractive as anything in Australia.

I am glad to have that admission from Mr. Turnor, but I should value it a great deal more if it had come from someone who had seen Mt. Barker. This gentleman was only in the State for a few hours, and he got all his information second hand from other people. He says:—

I met Mr. Neil McNeil in Perth, who is interested in a large property 30 miles from Albany, and at an elevation of 1,500 feet. This land is particularly suited for apple growing. There are already 17,000 trees in bearing, and he is anxious to deal with English settlers direct. His plan is to employ them half the week in developing the whole estate, and the other half they

would have for developing their own holdings, which certainly sounds a good scheme. He saw Mr. Neil McNeil and could not have seen a better or a safer man. He says "Mt. Barker is, to my mind, as attractive as anything in Australia." My only regret is that Mr. Turnor did not spend as much time in this State as he did in the other States, and did not meet a dozen men like Mr. Neil McNeil, when he would have found that there were many other parts of Western Australia as attractive for group settlement as any thing he had seen in Australia or any part of the British Empire. I will not say much about Mr. Sanderson's transference of his affections to the Country Party. I made some remarks in a speech soon after I came to the House setting out my ideas of public finance. I may have set too high a standard. The hon. member has quoted them against me so often that the House must be tired of the repetition. Apparently it is the one instance of inconsistency on my part he has been able to discover. I might, had I chosen, have gone through "Hansard" and quoted some of the hon. member's references to the Country Party, as an instance of inconsistency on his part. I do not propose to do so. I am glad the hon. member has taken the step he has. There is one feature about the Liberal Party, to which the hon. member belonged in the past, and that is that it gives to its members an almost absolute freedom. They can say or do what they like. For some time past we have been confronted with this position, that Mr. Sanderson, one of the stalwarts of the Liberal Party, has been in season and out of season advocating unification, which is in deadly opposition to the policy of the Liberal Party. Now the hon. member has joined a party which will not allow him to advocate things in opposition to its policy. The hon. member was a prominent Liberal and advocated unification. As such I regarded him, if I may say so without offence, as a public menace. As a member of the Country Party and pledged by that party to stand up for the rights of the States against the unifying tendencies of the Commonwealth he will at least do no harm.

Hon. J. W. Hickey: He is a Government supporter.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: There is the phase of our immigration proposals relating to markets. One factor we might always keep in mind, and we do not keep it in mind as much as we should, is the quality of Australian goods. That is what will find us a market in the long run. Whether it be wheat, wool, or fruit, our quality will win through. I do not think we ought to be influenced too much by present-day conditions in the old world. If we were to allow ourselves to be influenced by the condition of affairs as they exist in Europe to-day, we might well throw up everything in despair. I do not think the German mark will always remain at 8,500 to the pound sterling. I do

think that in the fulness of time the trade conditions will right themselves and with the growing population of the world, there will be need for an increase in the food supplies. When that time comes, a market will be found for all we can produce. When finding markets it will be of immense value to us that we have entered into this Imperial partnership. With it, we will have every assistance in finding a market. The closer the bond and the more intimate the partnership that exists between Great Britain and Australia, the better will be the market for Australian goods. At the present time there is a stream of shipping passing through Colombo almost entirely from dear food ports. There are opportunities we have not yet exploited, which should mean an enormous market for Australian goods. Then reference has been made to the advantage South Africa holds on account of her nearness to Great Britain, and her markets. I think there is nothing more certain than that distance will be largely eliminated by the development of high speed steamers, and then we will be placed in a different position to that obtaining now. In addition to that, we must remember the enormous distance we must go before we can overcome our own requirements. We should not lose sight of the fact that during the last five years the interstate imports of food stuffs, excluding sugar, averaged £1,845,000 and for the last financial year, they amounted to £2,080,000. I need not go into the details as hon. members know the position. While in the Eastern States recently I was interviewed by the "Register" in Adelaide, and the "Age" in Melbourne. They afforded me extensive interviews. I was rather amused to see that while the "Age" most courteously gave me a column, they struck out one paragraph, which, in the opinion of that paper, might have been a matter of offence to their readers. That paragraph was to the effect that one outcome of the immigration and developmental scheme would be that, we should cease to draw our food requirements from the Eastern States. That, and that only, was excluded from the report.

Hon. J. Duffell: That did not suit them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Burvill referred to bonuses on butter production. I wish the Federal Constitution would permit us to give bonuses, but unfortunately it does not do so. The Government, however, are assisting the butter factories that are in existence and will continue to do so as in the past. Boiled down, the financial aspect of our immigration scheme means cheap money. If the scheme had not been entered upon, we must have gone on; we could not have stopped. The financial aspect, therefore, when boiled down, means cheap money for five years, the State paying one-third of the interest. Mr. Potter referred to the immensity of the amount. After all, £6,000,000 is not very much to spend in

this country over that period, particularly when compared with the enormous amount of money spent during the war purely for destructive purposes. Surely we can find this money which is necessary from the point of view of a world that requires food, and we will find it necessary to expend money on the development of our idle lands which must be used. Mr. Hamersley referred to delays in issuing Crown grants. It is a fact that agricultural inspectors have been exceptionally pressed in connection with the I.A.B. and soldier settlement work. Prior to his speech three additional inspectors had been put on to deal specially with forfeitable blocks and Crown grant inspection. If we could get more surveyors, we would have them, because there is plenty of work for them to do. He made reference to the case of a soldier at Dalwallinu, whose block had been forfeited and subsequently reinstated. As he gave the particulars, it appeared to be rather a startling story. I have secured the facts, however, and these show that the Lands Department issued the usual formal notice that the rents were in arrear to the extent of £130, and that the holding was consequently forfeitable. The notice was addressed to Dalwallinu, which was the man's registered address; but he did not receive it, and so did not reply. The Lands Department referred the matter to the Agricultural Bank as mortgagee and the bank wrote to the owner at Pithara. That was the first the man heard of the matter. When he received the letter he wired to the bank that it was the first he had heard of it. The bank advised the Lands Department, which then brought the holding under the provisions of the Discharged Soldier Settlement Act, thus extending to him the concession of half-price for his land and exemption from payment of rent for five years. This had the effect of wiping off the arrears and the owner was notified of the position. He had never applied for this concession. There was never any approval for the actual forfeiture. Formal notices are forwarded in all cases of arrears so that the lessees may pay up. This man did not notify the department that he intended to go to the war and the facts show that in this case it was the settler's own fault.

Hon. V. Hamersley: That is the statement put up to you.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Mr. Baxter said that the Government were making inquiries regarding the carnation weed but those inquiries were rather late in the day. The facts are that Mr. Wickens, the officer in charge of the fruit industries, was attending a conference in Melbourne and his Minister instructed him to stop in South Australia on his way back and make inquiries regarding this matter. It was a wise policy to adopt, and I think it will assist us considerably. Mr. Moore said that it was peculiar that both England and Australia should be enriched because of the immigration

scheme. That hon. member seemed to think that one country must be the loser if the other gained, and that there could be no bargain that could benefit both. He said—

England will send their worst men because they will be from the unemployed, and the best men always retain their employment longest.

It caused me, Mr. President, to look back at the "Hansard" report of the debate on the Income and Public Entertainments Taxation Bill introduced for the purpose of relieving unemployed. That measure was before this Chamber on the 2nd March, 1915. Some hon. members will remember the incident to which I refer. The galleries were crowded and, in the course of a speech in opposing the Bill, I said—

I do not wish to speak disparagingly of the unemployed, but we know that the competitive element enters into the labour market as it has done in everything else, and it is not the best workers who first become unemployed.

This moderate statement by me was hissed by the people who were in the galleries. Indeed, to such an extent was the interruption that the President found it necessary to clear the galleries. Now, Mr. Moore goes very much further than I did, and asserts that the unemployed are all the worst men—as the best men always retain their employment longest. I did not hear Mr. Moore or any other members of his party make similar statements during the recent unemployed troubles in Perth. I do not think it is likely that we would get the worst men simply because they were unemployed, at a time when great masses of good and bad workers are thrown out of industries. So it is that I have noticed here that some of our best men are those who cannot find employment. Mr. Moore referred to the pulling up of the Sandstone railway line. I sympathise with him on that question. I do not like pulling up lines; we have a lot of building up to do yet. It is only in the extreme cases, where there is no prospect of further usefulness, that we should contemplate pulling up lines. It was with delight that we all saw Mr. Dodd with us again and we heard with extreme pleasure the fine speech he made. He referred to the state of the Legislative Council rolls at the last election and said that the Metropolitan-Suburban Province roll probably contained 5,000 or 6,000 fewer names of regular taxpayers than should have been included. I referred that statement to the Acting Chief Electoral Officer, and that officer said that if Mr. Dodd had said there were 12,000 names off the roll, he would have been nearer the mark. I trace the whole trouble to the mistake which was committed by Parliament in 1907 when they repealed that section of the Electoral Act which compelled the Electoral Department to take the municipal and road board lists as the basis for compiling the electoral rolls.

Members: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: I am not speaking disrespectfully of the ac-

tions of Parliament on that occasion, but I think a grave mistake was made in decreeing that the Electoral Department should not compile the rolls on the old system by taking the municipal and road board lists. If it is a fact that 12,000 people were disfranchised, it shows the extent of the error. The Acting Chief Electoral Officer said that it was largely the fault of the electors themselves, because 8,000 cards were issued to these people asking them to enrol. Only about 2,000 of the electors took any notice of them. They did not bother to return the cards at all. It is a great pity that there was ever a departure from making the municipal and road board lists the basis for compiling the Legislative Council rolls. That can be done so easily by the local people who have a direct rating interest in the matter, and this tends to make their lists more accurate. I hope that Mr. Dodd will be here, when the different Bills are before the House, to discuss some of the matters to which he made reference. Mr. Stewart referred to an error that crept into the Land Tax and Income Assessment Act of last session. I believe it is rare that errors occur here. Errors have occurred in other Parliaments and it is the practice there to remedy the error in the following session. That will be done in this instance. Both Mr. Willmott and Mr. Rose referred to the marketing of fruit. I hope that when the newspaper strike is over, we shall be able to place before the people the whole of the results of the fruitgrowers' conference held in Melbourne a few weeks ago. That conference dealt with the question of Imperial preference, the marketing of fruit, the establishment of Federal and State organisations—the Federal body, to deal with exports, and the State body to deal with matters affecting local consumption—freights and many other matters. The conference sat for several days and there is every reason to hope that good will result. I am not prepared to go into details this evening. Mr. Greig made reference to the Dwarda-Narrogin railway. His speech impressed me very much, because it is unusual for any hon. member to speak against the construction of a railway that is in his own province, unless there are very good reasons for doing so. In view of what has been stated, the clearing operations that had been started have been held up pending an investigation. It is interesting to look back to the debates on the Bill when it was before Parliament. It was introduced in the Legislative Assembly by the then Minister for Works, Hon. W. C. Angwin. In his speech he detailed all the facts Mr. Greig referred to. He gave the House all the particulars regarding grades and so forth. The debate was adjourned on the motion of the present Premier who was then Mr. Mitchell. About a week later, Mr. Mitchell spoke in support of the Bill, which passed through all the remaining stages without any further discussion. The measure came to the Legislative



Council on the 28th January, 1915. The second reading of the Bill was moved by the then Colonial Secretary, Hon. J. M. Drew. In his speech, he said that the opinions of the Commissioner of Railways and the Surveyor General had been obtained and that both those responsible officers had reported in favour of Narrogin. The substance of the Commissioner of Railways' report, which he referred to, read as follows:—

Narrogin is 162 miles from Perth, via Spencer's Brook; via Dwarda it is only 143 miles. The practice is that where a station can be reached by two or more routes to charge freight on the shortest mileage. We shall, therefore, lose freight on 19 miles on all the traffic from Perth and Fremantle to Narrogin and all stations to the southward thereof, and in a lesser degree northward as far as about Cuballing, from which point the distance to Perth via either route is equal. Moreover the grades on the Hotham section are so steep and the curves of such small radius that, although we shall be bound to charge as for the shorter distance, we shall have to haul the traffic via Spencer's Brook at a less rate than we are now receiving. The settlers between Dwarda and Narrogin will not, it seems to me, be greatly inconvenienced if the extension is not made, for they are at the present time within 15 miles of either Williams, Narrogin, or Popanyinning, and the settlers at Williams are more favourably placed under the existing conditions, so far as distance from the metropolis is concerned, than many of our settlers on other spur lines.

That was all given to this House by the Colonial Secretary when the Bill was presented for the second reading. The debate was adjourned, and a speech strongly supporting the railway was made by the late Mr. McLarty, a man very well conversant with the land in that portion of the State. After he had spoken, the Bill was passed through all the remaining stages without further comment. If anyone looks at the map it seems natural to extend the line from Dwarda to Narrogin. As I have remarked, however, following on the remarks of Mr. Greig and on a motion tabled in another place, further investigation is being made. Mr. Burvill recommended the restoration of the subsidies for agricultural halls. I am entirely in sympathy with his proposal. Mr. Rose stressed the same thing. We must make country life attractive to the young people. We must be more generous in future in the expenditure in these directions than we have been in the past. I am sorry that Mr. Nicholson is not in his seat. In his absence I do not propose to go into the object lesson he placed before us regarding Kendenup. Kendenup is based on this scheme: Buy your land for 14s. an acre and sell it for £14 an acre and use the difference to guarantee the settler a market over a period of years, and by means of the dehydrator, make sure of getting always the maximum price for your

product. It is one of the most interesting experiments attempted in Western Australia or anywhere else, and we all earnestly hope it will be entirely successful, but I am not prepared to admit that it would be a safe example for the Government to follow.

Members: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: Dr. Saw made reference to the Perth Hospital and I am sure every member must have been profoundly impressed with his remarks regarding the x-ray treatment of cancer. I asked him to call on me, and I took from him a more exhaustive statement, which I forwarded to my colleague in charge of the administration of hospitals. If what Dr. Saw says can be substantiated, and I know he speaks with a great deal of authority, every member will agree that if instead of only £2,000 or £3,000 it involved an expenditure of £30,000, £40,000, or even £50,000, it should be done. If the investigation proves to be as he expects, then undoubtedly it will be the duty of the Government to carry it out. Dr. Saw referred to the University. I trust the Government will see their way to give the University, not all it would like, but all that is absolutely necessary to enable it to steadily expand and continue in the good work it is doing. I fully agree with him and other members who advocated the early establishment in Western Australia of an agricultural college. I have frequently visited the agricultural college at Roseworthy, South Australia, and I know a good deal about that institution. The capital cost of the Roseworthy College was about £60,000. The cost of running it per annum is about £15,000. It has a revenue of about £7,000, so that its net cost to the Treasury is about £8,000 per annum. I do not doubt that it could be made almost to pay but for the large amount of work done in the interests of agricultural settlement generally, the expenditure on which, I am sure, is amply returned. There are 62 boys in college: 14 of them are Western Australian boys. The fee charged is £30 per head. The cost to the taxpayers of South Australia is £130 per head, so that we at the present time have the advantage of having 14 Western Australian boys educated at the expense of the South Australian taxpayers. It is not a bad proposition from our point of view, but I do not think it will last long. In South Australia they are now waking up to the necessity for improving their educational system. They have moved greatly during the last two or three years. They are going in for secondary education and I think they will fill their agricultural college themselves. Thanks to the establishment of the Narrogin farm school years ago and to the more recent establishment of district high schools, we are in a position to find all the students necessary for an agricultural college, and I agree with those members who say we should provide one at once. Mr. Potter asked that parents might be assisted in the purchase of books for children attending the State schools. This is a matter we have gone into exhaustively on several occasions. To provide books would cost £30,000 per annum. Under an excellent scheme of interchange between London County Council teachers and teachers in the Dominions, two of our teachers recently

spent a year in England. I was talking with one of them and he expressed the view that one of the worst features in England, though probably it was impossible to get away from it there, was that everything was given to the children. The children not only destroyed books in a way they would not do if their parents had to find them, but showed a lack of the self-reliance and independence displayed by Australian children, and from that point of view he hoped we would not supply free books to our school children. In cases of distress we do supply free books at present, but it would be a great mistake to make a general practice of it. Reference was made to the necessity for a re-distribution of seats, particularly to give more members to the metropolitan area. I would like to direct attention to what has been done in the Federal Parliament. It seems to me to be nothing less than a scandal and yet no protest has been made. I have mentioned it a dozen times. The Federal Parliament has re-distributed the seats in Western Australia from the point of view of the House of Representatives, so that Perth and Fremantle are constituencies that could be covered on the map with the point of the little finger. Swan and Forrest take up the other settled portion of the South-West—a very small area on a map a yard or so square, an area which could be covered with the palm of the hand; and the rest of the State is one electorate. This is entirely contrary to the spirit of the constitution, and of the Electoral Act, which says that the commissioners shall consider community and diversity of interest, means of communication, etc., and permits of a margin of one-fifth more or one-fifth less in order to give effect to these considerations. Under this re-distribution scheme, however, no such consideration has been shown. They have simply divided the whole population of the State by five and settled the electorates accordingly, having no regard to the interests I have mentioned. If there is a re-distribution of seats in this State, I hope that whatever regard is paid to the city population, due regard will also be paid to the requirements of the country, and that we shall not follow the lines adopted by the Federal Parliament. There are a great many other matters to which I should like to refer, but I feel that I have detained the House too long. There are two questions of first-class importance upon which I have not and do not intend to touch. The first is finance, and the second is the development of the North-West. I shall say nothing about finance because we have recently had a debate on it, and because the Premier has now practically completed the preparation of his Budget Speech. It is his intention to deliver the Budget Speech on Thursday of this week or soon after. It will be delivered before long, and no good purpose would be served by my talking finance on the eve of that speech. The immigration policy to secure additional population free of cost and money at a cheap rate of interest for development purposes is the Government's method for stopping the deficit and restoring the State to sound finance. I agree with Mr. Cornell that this will not be accomplished immediately. No one expects that. No country is recovering immediately from the trials and tribulations of the war,

and any country which can say it is on the sound track again, no matter how far distant the goal is, has reason to congratulate itself. We say this is the method and the only method we know of which will restore the financial position of the State. The present condition of the finances is due to loss on public utilities, because we have huge services catering for a small number of people. Get the people, and get production, and the loss will disappear and the deficit with it. I have said nothing regarding the development of the North-West. I hope that at a very early date we may have an opportunity to discuss the North-West on a motion to be moved by Mr. Miles. I must express my deep appreciation to the hon. member for the telegram he sent to the Mayor of Perth on the occasion of the Premier's return. I feel sure the hon. member, by his visit to England, America, and Canada, has done a great deal of good for this State, and I shall await with interest the motion which I believe he intends to submit. The development of the North-West will only be carried out comprehensively when we get some big scheme of Imperial, Commonwealth and State partnership to do it. In connection with the immigration agreement, a letter was written by Col. Amery to the Premier before the Bill was passed by the Imperial Parliament. I shall not read it all, it will be available to hon. members. He says—

Broadly speaking, the scheme commends itself to me, and you will, I am sure, have been pleased at the favourable references to it by Sir D. MacLean, the Leader of the Opposition, and other speakers, during the second reading of the Empire Settlement Bill in the House of Commons. So far as one can judge at present, it would seem very probable that if the Bill goes through and is acceptable to Oversea Governments, one of the earliest and probably the earliest, agreed scheme under the New Act will be one for development and land settlement in Western Australia on the lines of the one which has been discussed between Mr. Hughes and yourself. If so, this scheme will be invested with an importance even greater than would attach to it in other circumstances. The Bill inaugurates a profound departure in policy which should, in my opinion, be of immense and lasting service in developing, consolidating and strengthening the Empire. That being so, the whole Empire will watch with deep interest the working of the first projects upon which we embark under the New Act, and the success of the new policy will depend upon the measure of success which we achieve in our initial schemes. In these circumstances, it is vital that the scheme should be thought out and perfected in every detail, not only by your Government and the Commonwealth Government, but also by the Government here, and it is evident that as the Home Government will be asked to undertake considerable financial responsibilities under all agreed schemes, the schemes must be put before them officially.

There is no suggestion in that letter that Mr. Amery wants to get any advantage by making a good bargain for the Imperial Government, which would be a bad bargain for us.

Hon. A. Lovekin: He says so.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: What, that it was a bad bargain for us?

Hon. A. Lovekin: No, that it was a good bargain for them.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: He said it was necessary that it should be a success as it was the first step in the scheme and the whole of the Empire would watch it. Col. Amery's scheme depends on the success of this initial undertaking, and success not only from his point of view, but from ours. In this letter we have the right spirit of this scheme—"a profound departure in policy for developing, consolidating and strengthening the Empire." It is not with foreigners that we have made this agreement. The Imperial Government, the Commonwealth Government, and the State Government are three members of one family and between them there could be no huckstering spirit. We are told it is good for the Commonwealth. If it were bad for the Commonwealth, it would be bad for us. We are told it is good for the Imperial Government. If it were bad for England, it would be bad for us. Our dependence on the old country of which England is the heart, has prevailed since Australia was founded, and anything bad for the old country would be bad for us. We dare not enter into an agreement which would not be for their advantage. Similarly any agreement bad for us would be bad for the Commonwealth, and futile from the point of view of the Imperial Government. This is but the first scheme of many others that will be put into practice in Western Australia, all over the Commonwealth and throughout the British Dominions. Mr. Seddon touched on the point of view of the immigrants to be brought out. We all know that Australia has been colonised largely by self-sacrificing people who left comfortable homes in the old land because they thought our wide spaces offered greater opportunities for their sons and daughters. It is no small thing to offer to 75,000 of our kith and kin in the old country the broader vision that prosperous, growing sane and sunny Australia affords; it is no small thing to be the first in the great Commonwealth of British Nations to seal a bond of partnership under that "profound departure in British policy for developing, consolidating and strengthening the Empire."

Hon. A. SANDERSON: I wish to ask your direction Mr. President about a matter relating to the printing of a document. Standing Order 341 provides that a document relating to public affairs quoted from a Minister of the Crown, unless stated to be of a confidential nature, may be called for and made a public document. The Minister has agreed to lay on the Table the document from which he has extensively quoted. Would I be in order in moving that the document be printed?

The Minister for Education: There cannot be two motions before the House at the one time.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member's remarks are superfluous owing to the fact that the Minister has stated he will place the paper on the Table.

Hon. A. SANDERSON: What I wish to know is whether I would be in order in moving that it be printed?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member may move in that direction at the next sitting.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION: This document and quite a number of others will be placed before Parliament when the scheme comes forward for discussion. In the meantime the House is quite welcome to this and any other paper which any hon. member may wish to peruse. If the hon. member desires that the document be printed it can be printed. I will see that that is done.

Question put and passed; the Address-in-reply adopted

House adjourned at 10.5 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 5th September, 1922.

	Page
Question: Appeal case, costs	557
State ferries, s.s. "Perth"	557
Water Supply, Metropolitan area	558
Bills: Licensing Act Amendment, Message, 2a.	558
Married Women's Protection, 2a., Com., report	573
Closer Settlement, 2a.	575
Miners' Phtalsls, 2a.	584

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

### QUESTION—APPEAL CASE, COSTS.

Capt. CARTER asked the Premier: 1, Were the costs of the appellant (estate of Mireho Groseff) in an appeal from a decision of the Local Court in a case against Messrs. Lewis & Reid, Ltd., which was heard by the Full Court sitting at Perth recently, borne by the Government? 2, If so, what were the reasons actuating the Government in consenting to bear the costs? 3, Is it the intention of the Government to bear the costs of the respondent-defendant in this matter?

The PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, The desire to obtain an authoritative interpretation of the Workers' Compensation Act before dealing with a request that had been made for an amendment of the law. 3, The matter has not been considered.

### QUESTION—STATE FERRIES, S.S. "PERTH."

Mr. LUTEY asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Have the decks of the ferry steamer "Perth" lately been recaulked? 2, If so, what was the cost of the recaulking?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, Yes. 2, £44 18s. 6d.