

ATTS.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. H. Gray	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. G. Fraser

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. E. H. H. Hall
Hon. J. Cornhill	Hon. A. Lovekin
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Ewing
Hon. W. T. Glasheen	

(Teller.)

Motion thus passed; debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 4.46 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 1st August, 1929.

Bill: Supply (No. 1), £1,900,000, returned ...	PAGE
Questions: 1, Vermin Act, reduction of tax; 2, Charge	88
for collection of tax	88
Machinery, hire purchase ...	88
Address-in-reply, fourth day ...	88

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

BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1) £1,900,000.

Returned from the Council without amendment.

QUESTIONS (2)—VERMIN ACT.

Reduction of Tax.

Mr. THOMSON (for Mr. Lindsay) asked the Premier: As the credit of the central vermin fund at the Treasury stood at £38,890 on the 30th June, will he agree to reduce the rate of tax to $\frac{1}{4}$ d. and $\frac{1}{2}$ d. for the year ending June, 1930?

The PREMIER replied: The matter will be considered.

Charge for collection of tax.

Mr. LINDSAY asked the Premier: Is the charge made for collecting taxation, on account of the central vermin fund, paid to the Federal Government in addition to the payment fixed under the agreement for the collection of State taxes?

The PREMIER replied: No.

QUESTION—MACHINERY, HIRE PURCHASE.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Justice: 1, Has the attention given by the present and past Governments to the Act relating to the hire purchase of machinery resulted in any decision being arrived at to rectify certain injustices? 2, If not, can the Minister indicate whether anything tangible is likely to occur this session in the direction of making certain amendments to the Act?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: 1, The matter is receiving consideration. 2, Answered by No. 1.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fourth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

THE PREMIER (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.36]: I have no wish to attempt to measure strides with the Marathon effort of the Leader of the Country Party last evening. I hope to be able to economise in time in the answering of some of the more important questions that have so far been dealt with. The hon. gentleman's speech came to us in the form of an oft-told tale. We have been familiar with it for many years. He covered the ground he has covered twice I think, in every session during the last five years. We had it on the Address-in-Reply and on the Budget debate in each of those sessions. There was really nothing new in it. We heard repeated the statement that I could be described as "Lucky Collier" in that we have had a considerable amount of financial assistance from the Federal Government during the past five years. The hon. member knows that that financial assistance has not been of any benefit to the finances of the State. It certainly has been of considerable benefit to the taxpayers of Western Australia because

the Government did not do what perhaps they might have done, or some people in the State might have imagined they would have done, namely spend the money on fanciful schemes or experimental projects that they are at times inclined to say a Labour Government might indulge in. The whole of the financial advantage the Government have received has gone to the benefit of the people of the country, particularly of the taxpayers. We had the old story of Mr. McKay of harvester fame. The hon. member repeated the statements he has made every year for several years past concerning that matter. In order to confirm his statements, he quoted from the "Hansard" reports of his speeches in previous years. The hon. member manages to get into "Hansard" in the same speech a statement that is twice repeated. He makes the statement first of all on precisely similar lines to one he has made in past years, and then by way of confirmation of his remarks he quotes his speech of last year or the year before. I do not know whether the hon. member intends it as a compliment to the House that he quotes the greatest authority known to him.

Mr. Sampson: The constant dripping of water wears away the hardest stone.

The PREMIER: He manages to get the statement repeated a second time in the one speech. I do not know whether the figures he has quoted with regard to the proposal to establish a branch of McKay's works at Maylands a few years ago are correct or not. I do not think anyone has taken the trouble to investigate them. The hon. member also repeats the same old story concerning day labour versus contract labour. Here again he quotes speeches he has made in past years. There is really nothing to say in reply to these which has not been answered on many occasions in the past. The hon. member did strike a new note, or portion of one, when he claimed credit on behalf of his party for all the particular matters of policy that have been carried out by this Government for the past five years. Although we have heard portions of that story, or variations of it, from time to time, he eclipsed himself last evening by the extent to which he claims that the Government have carried out the policy of the Primary Producers' Association. I think the hon. member was—if I may use the term—having a trial gallop last evening for the next general elections. He was trying him-

self out. I have no doubt that during the campaign the statement of his party having provided the Government with their policy and the Government having carried it out, will be repeated throughout the length and breadth of the agricultural areas. Having said that much, I have no doubt, too, that the hon. gentleman will proceed to advise the electors in the agricultural districts that the Government, who have done so much to give effect to their policy, more than has ever been done, on his own admission, by any other previous Government, ought immediately to be turned out of office. No doubt that will be the line of his argument. I rather fancy he will have considerable difficulty in reconciling the two statements. Some of the matters he mentioned, such as country water supplies and water supplies generally, and markets, were accomplished facts before the Country Party came into existence. So far back as 1911, and for the several succeeding years, the Labour Government were busily engaged in providing water supplies throughout those agricultural areas which had been settled only a few years previously. There are some members in the House who will recollect what was done by the Labour Government of those days in the provision of tanks for water conservation for the farmers in the newly settled localities in those areas. So, too, with his remarks regarding the markets. The land upon which the present markets are erected was resumed by the Government of the day in 1912. They had foresight enough to resume an area sufficiently large to meet all requirements for many generations to come.

Mr. Thomson: Still, the member for Perth set the matter going in the House!

The PREMIER: The Labour Government set the project going when they resumed land for the purpose.

Mr. Thomson: Of course, that is correct.

The PREMIER: Had not the war broken out in 1914, it is reasonable and safe to assume that the Government would have proceeded to erect the markets before they left office in 1916. So it will be seen that the provision of the markets really began with the Labour Government, and during the intervening years from 1916 to 1924, a period of eight years, the land that had been resumed remained unused for the purpose intended, and nothing was done. It was left to the present Government to proceed with the provision of mar-

kets and bring the work to completion. I have dealt with a couple of the points that the hon. member laid claim to last night, and I have no doubt that he and his supporters in the ranks of the Country Party will continue to claim credit in accordance with his remarks between now and election time. There are many other points that he made, but I do not propose to deal further with them at the moment. Then the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Sir James Mitchell) is not pleased with the Governor's Speech.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Are you?

The PREMIER: He told us that there was nothing in the Speech to comfort anyone. The hon. member did not quite complete his sentence. What he meant to say was that there was nothing in the Speech to comfort any member of the Opposition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: By Heavens, no! I meant nothing to comfort the people outside.

The PREMIER: Then I will take the hon. member up on that point. He now claims that there is nothing in the Governor's Speech to comfort the people outside. What was really at the back of the hon. member's mind, I am sure, was that there is nothing in the Governor's Speech to comfort him or his supporters.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are rather ashamed of the Speech yourself.

The PREMIER: I can quite imagine the position of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. G. Taylor: You have been there yourself.

The PREMIER: Quite so. I can imagine the Leader of the Opposition perusing the Governor's Speech and finding nothing tangible in it upon which to attack the Government. I can see him laying it aside and having another go at it the next day, racking his brains from Thursday till the following Tuesday in a vain endeavour to make out a case against the present Administration.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There is no need to rack brains over it because there is nothing in the Speech.

The PREMIER: If there is nothing in the Governor's Speech that is calculated to comfort anyone, let us consider some of the points dealt with.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Take the finances first.

The PREMIER: No, I will come to that phase later on. Is there nothing to comfort

people in the fact that the harvest last year produced nearly 34,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The people knew that.

The PREMIER: A good thing will stand repetition.

Hon. G. Taylor: You did not say that to the Leader of the Country Party just now.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will observe that I qualified my statement by referring to any "good" thing. That did not apply to the remarks of the member for Katanning (Mr. Thomson). Is it not a good thing for the people of this State, whether they be engaged in wheat production or in commercial or professional life, to know that, although the harvest did not come up to expectations, nevertheless there was a yield of nearly 34,000,000 bushels?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the good of that? The people knew that six months ago.

The PREMIER: Does the hon. member say there is nothing in that fact to bring comfort to anyone? Does it not bring comfort to anyone to know that during the year ended the 31st December last, the number of sheep in the State increased by over half a million?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They have known that fact for a long time, too.

The PREMIER: I venture to say there are quite a number of people who are just as careless about these matters as are the citizens the hon. member referred to, who are so careless about the finances. So it is just as well to bring these important matters under their notice. Moreover the Leader of the Opposition is fully aware that this Speech goes far beyond the confines of Western Australia.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I did not know that, or I would have made my remarks much hotter.

The PREMIER: I did not refer to the hon. member's speech but to the Governor's Speech. The hon. member is aware that it is read by people who are interested in the progress and prosperity of the State, who reside overseas or in the Eastern States. For that reason alone it is well that at least once a year the progress of the State should be outlined in this way.

Mr. Mann: You will bring more people into the State.

Mr. Thomson: At any rate, it is good publicity.

The PREMIER: It is not a matter of publicity. I venture to assert that there is in the minds of a number of people a suggestion of disappointment that the State should make progress under a Labour Government at all!

Mr. Thomson: That would be absurd.

The PREMIER: It does not fit in with their political aspirations.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They would surely not adopt that attitude.

The PREMIER: If not, why are people annoyed at the announcement of the fact that the number of sheep in Western Australia has increased by over half a million during the last 12 months?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They are not annoyed; what about those twins of yours?

The PREMIER: There are a few included in the total I have referred to. Surely the fact I have mentioned will bring great comfort to those who will directly benefit as well as to the people throughout the State, because our prosperity is so largely bound up with the pastoral industry! Is it of no comfort to anyone to know there were 6,114 applications for land under the conditional purchase system during the year?

Mr. Latham: How many of the applications were granted?

The PREMIER: I will come to that.

Mr. Latham: Not half of them.

The PREMIER: All these important points will bear repetition. In addition there were 164 applications for pastoral leases. The member for York (Mr. Latham) asked me a question regarding the applications. I will now inform him that the applications approved for conditional purchase holdings totalled 2,602 for an area of 2,616,762 acres. Is it of no comfort to anyone to know that over 2½ million acres of land were taken up under conditional purchase conditions during the last financial year, and that there were added that number of settlers in the one year?

Mr. Latham: You could not satisfy half the applicants.

The PREMIER: I do not say that we did, but we did satisfy 2,602 applicants.

Mr. Latham: You should have been able to double that number.

The PREMIER: At any rate, that represents a considerable measure of progress in one year. For pastoral leases there were 199 applications for an area of 14,777,802 acres.

Mr. Latham: Have you noticed that there were more applications approved than there were applicants? There were 164 applications and 199 were granted. You did pretty good business there!

The PREMIER: Yes, and that increase will be of no comfort to anyone in the State, I suppose!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But this is all stale. The people knew this all the time.

The PREMIER: And there is no comfort in all this! There is no comfort in the fact that loans approved by the Agricultural Bank totalled £905,075, of which £806,009 was for clearing virgin land and £298,966 for fencing, water conservation, etc. Of course there is no comfort in that either! I can quite understand that when the people read these figures and are able to judge what measure of progress has been made during the year, it will afford no comfort to the members of the Opposition. That is really what the Leader of the Opposition meant. Notwithstanding the discomforture of the Opposition, there will be considerable satisfaction felt by the public generally.

Mr. Lindsay: There will be considerable satisfaction if we get a good wheat harvest and good prices.

The PREMIER: That is important.

Mr. Davy: Much more important than the good government of the country!

The PREMIER: Evidently so! However, I do not know that the members of the Country Party will agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he said that there was no comfort to be found in that portion of the Governor's Speech that deals with work carried out during the year in connection with agricultural water supplies. I should imagine it would bring a lot of comfort to many people in the Barbalin district to know that an area of 447,000 acres is being provided with a water supply and that the reticulation work will be completed during this summer. I should imagine that will meet with the approval of all who will be affected by that work. The same thing applies in other parts regarding the agricultural water supplies that have been provided. Then again there has been a fair measure of comfort to the people of the metropolitan area arising from the fact that they have been supplied with a pure hill water supply. Seeing that bore water is no longer provided to householders, I am sure that that has brought comfort to many

housewives who formerly had to undertake the family washing under conditions that provided such themes for discussion in this House in years gone by.

Mr. Mann: They will be more satisfied when you get rid of the discolouration.

The PREMIER: We will get rid of that, too, if we are given time. There are not many things we cannot do if given time. The items I have mentioned surely indicate that the Government have not been going slow during the past five years. Will it bring no comfort to the people of the State who have the benefit of the road construction policy that has been carried out during the past three years? To the north, south, east and west all our main arterial highways and subsidiary roads have been rendered serviceable, whereas many of them were formerly impassable.

Mr. Latham: Surely you will not take the credit from the Federal Government!

The PREMIER: I am not attempting to do so, but this State contributed its share towards the work.

Mr. Latham: It was the policy of the Federal Government.

The PREMIER: Yes, but it was not put into operation until we started.

Mr. Latham: We did not have the money here until you came into office.

The PREMIER: It was here for nearly 12 months before that, but nothing was done.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We passed the money on to you. We could not arrive at an agreement with the Federal people. We were stuck up on the contract system, just the same as you were. You have not spent a fraction of your money!

The PREMIER: We have not spent all of it, of course.

The Minister for Works: The previous Government did not let a single contract.

The PREMIER: I believe I am safe in saying that the agreement with the Commonwealth Government had been settled about 12 months before the member for Northam went out of office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We had £96,000; that is all.

The PREMIER: Be that as it may, the money that has been expended during the past three years, and the improvements that have been effected in our highways, will bring considerable comfort to a great many people.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Yes, if there are no corrugations.

The PREMIER: Even with the corrugations thrown in. Further, even if it brings no comfort to the people of the present day, it will bring comfort to that section of posterity who may read the history of these times—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are an optimist.

The PREMIER: Yes. I do not say the whole of posterity will read our history. However, in every generation there will be a section who will read their country's history. Those who look through—I was going to say the pages of present day "Hansard"—

Mr. Lindsay: Now you are asking too much of them.

The PREMIER: I have no doubt it will be made known to them in some way. They will recognise the fact that they have a hardwood supply preserved to them practically for all time, if only they themselves attend to the forests; and they will realise that it is a matter of some importance that nearly 3,000,000 acres of land have been dedicated as State forests during the present Government's term of office. Prior to that the forests—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Were protected.

The PREMIER: They were protected to the extent that they could have been given away through a stroke of the pen by any Minister for Lands. There is no protection about that. When we took office there was only an area of 60,000 acres dedicated, and to-day there just on 3,000,000 acres dedicated.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Yes, and you ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

The PREMIER: During the past 12 months over 1,000,000 acres have been dedicated.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It is a disgrace to the country.

The PREMIER: There are men who whenever they see a magnificent forest tree want to rush in and destroy it.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Not at all.

The PREMIER: Such men have never learnt the poem "Woodman, spare that tree." They would rather, any day, see cabbages and cauliflowers growing than a magnificent hardwood forest. They belong to a school of thought that has never given the slightest consideration to the question of forestry, and they do not realise that the

hardwood supplies of the world, it is estimated, will at the present rate of cutting be exhausted within 30 years. What is the world, not only this country, going to do for hardwood supplies then?

Mr. J. H. Smith: Why should we be sacrificed to the world?

The PREMIER: Such men, because they want to cultivate cabbages, consider that timber should be destroyed.

Mr. J. H. Smith: They do not.

The PREMIER: Those who have no knowledge of or interest in forest conservation desire to acquire forest lands for farming or other purposes. That is something done.

Mr. J. H. Smith: What you have done in this matter is the greatest blunder ever made here.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It did not take much of an effort to do it, either.

The PREMIER: No; but considerable pressure was put upon previous Governments to conserve the hardwood forests for future generations.

Mr. J. H. Smith: By whom?

The PREMIER: Nothing was done in that regard.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: How could all this have been done by you if we had not done something? We did preserve the forests.

The PREMIER: A considerable area that has been given away should never have been given away, a considerable area that is better suited for forestry than for agricultural purposes.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Who says that? Not the Lands Department.

The PREMIER: At any rate, the hon. member does not know much about forestry.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Of course I do not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: It is questionable whether there would be, even at this late hour, a forests policy operating in this State had it not been for the fact that when I took over the Forests portfolio in the Scandan Ministry I made the discovery that the man then filling the position of Acting Conservator of Forests had filled it for 19 years, and that when appointed he was only a clerk in the department, without any forestry training and knowing nothing about the subject. Anyone who cares to investigate the matter must admit that the manner in which our forests, until comparatively recent years, were ruthlessly destroyed,

slaughtered and butchered, was a scandal to all those who were responsible.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Everybody agrees with that.

The PREMIER: Yes, and probably, although they agree with it, the same thing would be going on now but for the steps I took at that period to put the matter on a proper footing. So now we have a well defined forests policy which will ensure a permanent supply of our hardwoods. That policy of preservation to-day finds employment for 500 workers throughout the forests.

Mr. J. H. Smith: A black day for Western Australia.

The PREMIER: That is something, but not all. I suppose it will be of no comfort either to anyone, as the Leader of the Opposition puts it, to know that the butter production has increased during the past year by 25 per cent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: People know that already.

The PREMIER: The hon. member does not like it mentioned, anyhow. He does not want it to be known.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Why do you keep repeating it?

The PREMIER: The hon. member does not like that news going out. I do not deny the hon. member a share of the credit. He comes in for his share of the credit in regard to butter production, and I am doing him a good turn by broadcasting this news throughout the country.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is a pity if you cannot find something to say, but that is one of Mercer's stunts. He puts that in every week.

The PREMIER: But in that way it does not obtain the publicity that is ensured by mention in the Governor's Speech.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then I am sorry for you.

The PREMIER: Those are some of the things that have been going on during the past year, things that the Leader of the Opposition says will bring no comfort to anybody. I feel quite certain that the majority of the people of this State will not endorse such a view.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the use of telling us what we all know?

The PREMIER: The Leader of the Opposition complained of delay in bringing to finality what is known as the 3,500 farms scheme. When I interjected to the effect

that the Development and Migration Commission were engaged in investigating the scheme and the proposals under it, he asked, "What more information is required? It is a question of the quality of the land, the rainfall, and the area."

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is all.

The PREMIER: I believe the hon. member about covered the whole of the scheme in those three points. However, if there is one direction in which past Governments not only of this State but of every Australian State and the Commonwealth as well have been responsible for losing huge sums of money—running, I believe into scores of millions throughout the whole of Australia over a number of years—it is in rushing into ill-considered schemes of expenditure. We have had that experience in every State, and in many directions. For example, the amount of money that has been lost, not so much in Western Australia as in some of the Eastern States, on soldier settlement is simply enormous. Huge sums of money have been expended in repurchasing lands and establishing irrigation schemes to grow products, only to find, after the expenditure of the money, that there was no market in the world for those products at the prices at which they were to be placed on the market. Big schemes have been launched after mere haphazard investigation.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The question of getting a market is another thing.

The PREMIER: Yes, but those are factors that should be taken into calculation by Governments before schemes involving the expenditure of huge sums of money are launched. A most important factor is the possibility of finding profitable markets for the products when the schemes are in going order. Any proposal involving the expenditure of many millions of pounds cannot be too closely scrutinised. Surely it is mere business foresight and common sense to examine every aspect of such a proposal, even though delay is involved in the examination. What is a delay of a year or two in comparison with the loss involved in launching something that is going to be a failure, entailing on the State heavy expenditure for interest on borrowed money down all the years? We cannot have too much investigation. I venture to say that any man who sets out to invest any considerable capital of his own in an enterprise will spare

no pains whatever to examine its possibilities from every angle. So it will be well for us to know that when this scheme is launched, it is being launched only after the most thorough and minute investigation.

Mr. Stubbs: Every member of the House ought to be behind you in that attitude.

The PREMIER: That is the cause of the delay. The matter is now nearing finality, and we expect, at any rate, that something definite will be known within a month or two. The matter is in the hands of the Development and Migration Commission. Our part of the investigation, and theirs as well, has been finalised.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They have had two or three years at it. I do not know what they have been investigating. They have been down there half-a-dozen times.

Mr. Maun: Last session the Minister for Lands told us that all the information had been secured except as to the rainfall.

The PREMIER: Information as to rainfall is not easily ascertainable. In parts of that country, much of it unoccupied, the rainfall records have been kept in an irregular and haphazard manner, so that the point requires close examination. Further, the whole of that country had to be examined and classified by surveyors; water supplies had to be considered, and possible railway communication, harbour facilities, and other works that would naturally be associated with a scheme of this kind. I think it is much better that that should be done than that we should rush into schemes which later do not turn out as expected. I regret that this particular scheme has received so much publicity in the Eastern States, but the Government are not responsible for that. That kind of thing will leak out. At the outset the Government were not responsible for any statement being given to the Press with regard to it. It leaked out in some way, and the enterprising newspapers of this and other States started to write about the scheme. I entertain no doubt that to some extent that publicity during the past year or two is responsible for a number, at any rate, of the unemployed workers we have in Western Australia at the present time.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Prime Minister mentions it everywhere he goes.

The PREMIER: And I think the Development and Migration Commission themselves have mentioned it.

Mr. Mann: And several members of this Government have mentioned it.

The PREMIER: Because there were pressing inquiries for information. We were not responsible for any publicity being launched in the first place.

Mr. Mann: The member for Guildford said we could not expect a return from it immediately.

The PREMIER: That is so, he was right.

Mr. Mann: Was it for the Government that he was speaking?

The PREMIER: That was not by way of giving it publicity. The hon. member knows that the publicity originated from other quarters, and that it attracted people to this State who may have been disappointed in their search for land elsewhere. The members of the Development and Migration Commission themselves anticipated that the matter would be finalised 12 months ago, but the delay has been due to the fact that there have been many changes in the personnel of that Commission. There have been resignations and new appointments made, and the new members of the Commission before agreeing to a finalisation, desired to see the country for themselves. That is the reason why there has been a number of investigations by the members of the Commission.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A good deal of the country has been settled.

The PREMIER: Not a great deal of it. Two members of the Commission were appointed within the last six or 12 months and they had never seen this State before. Their desire was to satisfy themselves and that caused an unexpected delay. With regard to unemployment, it is admitted that we have a fair number of people out of work in this State at the present time. But this should always be remembered, that the position existing here to-day is not peculiar to this State and it is not peculiar to Australia; it is world-wide. Except perhaps in one or two of the continental nations, Europe and the Old Country have had this tremendous difficulty to contend with ever since the war. But let us look at it from an Australian aspect. There is no doubt in the world that Australia during the past year or two, and particularly during the past year, has been experiencing great financial stringency. It is well known that South Australia has had failures in its seasons during the past three years, and it must be remembered that that State de-

pends entirely upon primary production—wool and wheat.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, South Australia is a manufacturing State as well.

The PREMIER: They do not manufacture very much; their secondary industries are nothing as compared with their primary production.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They produce a great quantity of wine.

The PREMIER: The hon. member will understand that if there are bad seasons and comparative failures in the primary industries, so will there be slackness in the manufacturing industries, because those industries depend upon the prosperity of the primary industries. That is the position, not only in South Australia, but in the other States as well.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The figures are against that.

The PREMIER: The figures are not against it. That is the position in all the States. For some years the seasons in Queensland have been extremely bad and Victoria and New South Wales are not much better off. No State, so far as employment or economic conditions are concerned, can live as it were in a watertight compartment. I care not how good the seasons may be in Western Australia, I care not how bountiful our harvest may be, or how great may be our wool production, or our timber output, if there are depressed conditions in the other States, those conditions will react against us. So it is as between one State and any of the others. It is an unquestioned fact that bad conditions existing in Eastern Australia have been responsible for the migration to this State of a considerable number of working people. There is no doubt about that. I have the figures and can quote them if necessary. I did so the other evening and they show that there has been considerable movement of male population from the Eastern State to Western Australia during the past year or two.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They always have come here.

The PREMIER: But lately they have been coming in greater numbers than ever before. It requires no demonstration. We know perfectly well that if thousands of men are displaced from employment say in South Australia and they have a little money, they will come to Western Australia which is reputed to be prosperous, just as water will gravitate to its lowest level,

and seeing no prospects in South Australia for a season or two at any rate, those who have saved up a little money have come to the Western State and they have come in large numbers. We know this from the Statistician's figures and we know it from the registrations at the Labour Bureau week after week and month after month.

Hon. G. Taylor: They ought to be good workmen.

The PREMIER: I have no doubt that they are, but it cannot be expected that this State can be in a position to employ the workmen of the other States in addition to its own. If we have a sudden influx of 500 or 1,000 men, surely it is recognised that the labour market will become dislocated. If we are not in a position to find work for those who are coming here from South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it all depends on the money we are getting.

The PREMIER: We are limited by the condition of things existing in Australia and the tightness of money in Australia. The hon. member knows perfectly well that the adverse economic conditions in the Eastern States affect this State, and he knows well that this or any other Government cannot find employment for those who are out of work in Eastern Australia.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The banks have lent over five millions.

The Minister for Railways: Yes, and every bank will tell you of the tightness of money in the other States.

The PREMIER: Any reasonable person will agree with my contention that the conditions that have obtained in the Eastern States during the last year or two have influenced a large number of people to migrate to the West and we are not able to absorb those people, and at the same time take a larger percentage than the other States, as we have been doing for some years, of migrants from overseas. They have been coming from three directions, from Great Britain and from Southern Europe for the past four years and from the Eastern States for the past two years. In those circumstances it cannot be expected that we should not have an unemployed difficulty. Let me explain again the influence the foreign element has had on the question of unemployment. I know there is in some quarters a desire to make little of it, to say that it does not count, but

the figures entirely refute any possible argument of that kind. Take the years the hon. member was in office. In his first year, 1920, the excess of the arrivals of foreigners over departures was 65—I am not taking females into account because they do not affect the unemployment situation. In the next year the excess of departures over arrivals was 259. I ask hon. members to note the numbers. In 1922 the excess of arrivals over departures was 383, in 1923 the excess was 722 and in 1924 the figures were a little less, 696. In the five years of the hon. member's term of office the excess of arrivals over departures of male foreigners was 1,607. The figures are authentic: they have been prepared by our Statistician. The hon. member cannot refute them. I know that he has contradicted them in the papers.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then my figures are not to be published.

The PREMIER: The hon. member has not the figures that I am quoting.

The Minister for Railways: He is not dealing with foreigners and you are.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: All the same, my figures do not support you.

The PREMIER: The hon. member is misquoting the figures.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Nothing of the sort.

The PREMIER: Then he misunderstands mine or we are not using the same set of figures.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Mine are right.

The PREMIER: I wish the hon. member would not keep on doubting my figures, which are authentic, and they are that in the five years of his term of office the labour market was affected by the introduction of foreigners to the extent of only 1,607. Now take the past five years. The figures increased from 696 in 1924 to an excess of arrivals over departures in 1925 of 2,216. In 1926 the excess was 838. In 1927 it was 2,219 and in 1928 it was 2,286, while for the six months of 1929 the figures were 154, making a total for the past 4½ years of an excess of arrivals over departures of foreigners of 7,713 as against 1,607 in the previous five years. We have had in that period about 5,500 more than during the hon. member's term of office. It may be said that it is rather a strange thing that the numbers should increase so suddenly as compared with the previous years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We managed better.

The PREMIER: No, it is due to the fact that it was in 1923 that the United States of America adopted the quota policy limiting the number of migrants entering into that country. And the open migration movement from the Continent, more particularly from Southern Europe, that had been going on for generations past into America, was shut off. Having the door of America closed in their faces, the migrants looked around for some other country occupied by a white race to which they might migrate: and Australia was the only one in the world that offered opportunities. That is why there was such an enormous increase in our foreign immigration. The fact is, too, that those men have been given preference of employment throughout this country. The Leader of the Country Party, who last evening had something to say regarding the disabilities of country road boards because of the conditions in the terms of their contracts, might well turn his attention to the fact that many of the country people are giving preference to foreigners in the work in country districts. They have been doing that until the foreigners have captured the whole of the hewing work in this State, a great deal of the road work in this State, and a great deal of the clearing work in this State, all of them almost entirely being unskilled workers. If we have had poured into this State during the past five years 7,700 foreigners who must of necessity displace our own people, is it any wonder that we have a number of people out of work to-day? It is all very well to talk about unemployment, but many of those people outside who would criticise the Government in this matter have themselves contributed to the existing condition of things by the preference they have given to foreigners wherever they have had the necessary influence.

Hon. G. Taylor: What is their object?

The PREMIER: The hon. member knows it is because the foreigner is a more satisfactory worker from the boss's point of view. He does not answer back, and he will work any hours for whatever wages are paid to him; at any rate, for a while, until he comes to understand the conditions of employment in this State.

Mr. Sleeman: Some of the road boards last year admitted they were giving pre-

ference to foreigners, and said they would do it again.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, no.

The Minister for Works: Why, your own road board at Northam is doing it!

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, I am not, although I know some in this House that have done it. The Premier should not accuse everybody of doing it.

The PREMIER: I am not accusing everybody. But it is obvious that if these foreigners are absorbed into our life and given employment, somebody is to be accused of giving them preference. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) could talk about it if he cared to. It was mentioned the other night that he had a petition from 60 men who wanted work on the Pemberton line. He knows they are out of work because all around his district foreigners are to be found working on the roads.

Mr. J. H. Smith: No, that is not right.

The PREMIER: That is the position with regard to unemployment. The Government are employing as large a number of men as have ever been employed directly by the Government of the day, but the Government cannot do impossibilities. Had it not been for the attitude of the Commonwealth Government in regard to the Main Roads Agreement, which caused considerable delay, possibly a greater number of men would have been employed to-day. The Minister for Works tells me that during the past month contracts totalling £50,000 have been let by the Main Roads Board and that they are letting or will be letting within the next three weeks contracts to the extent of £37,000 per week. Surely contracts of such magnitude ought to go far to absorb the unemployed. Yet it is doubtful, unless some restrictions are placed upon people who desire to employ foreigners, whether it will have a very serious effect upon the labour market in the direction of relieving Australians and Britishers.

Mr. J. H. Smith: I do not think any foreigners are working on our roads.

The PREMIER: That is the position, and I think it is well known. It is a complete answer to any charge of neglect or indifference on the part of the Government to those who find themselves out of work at the present time.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Why did you not expend all the available money on the roads last year?

The PREMIER: I am coming to that. It was mentioned by the Leader of the Op-

position, who asked whether work had been held up last year and said that if it had been, it was no wonder there was unemployment. The best answer I can give to that is to read the answer given to the statement by the Main Roads Board. They say—

Although the board's actual expenditure for the year just closed was £365,956, there were commitments in addition to the extent of £219,863, so the works arranged last year amounted to £585,819 as compared with the 1½ million pounds' worth of work hoped to be undertaken during the current year. For the first three years' operations of the Federal aid scheme the board is behind to the extent of £580,000.

That is to say that not in any year has the full programme of work been carried out and the full amount of money available expended. It was nobody's fault. The report continues—

This leeway occurred in the second year's operations, and was occasioned by the change over from the day labour to the contract system, whereby the board is required to prepare detailed plans and specifications for every contract, amounting mostly to about £1,000 each job for works on developmental roads, which under the earlier scheme were arranged direct with local authorities, without so much formality, preliminary work and delay. With this leeway of £580,000, and the normal appropriation of £672,000 for the year, the board has available for expenditure by the 30th June next a total of about £1,250,000. Last year's operations almost covered the normal appropriation for the year, but this year, with improved organisation and methods, the board hopes to catch up the arrears. That good progress is being made in that direction is indicated by the fact that tenders gazetted and closing during the next three weeks average £37,000 per week.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is a good thing to know. You say they have £219,000 worth of work in hand now.

The PREMIER: I did not say that. That is the explanation offered by the Main Roads Board through their annual report. It is known that because of the change over from day work to contract the whole position was disorganised and a new organisation had to be created. That is now being done, and so they are in a position to go forward with the work. The Leader of the Opposition said that the Government had failed in every department of finance. That is a pretty sweeping statement. There are no reservations about that. He said we had failed in every department of finance. I admire the hardihood of the hon. member

in charging this Government with having failed in every department of finance, and I think I am justified, although the hon. member will object that it is not fair, in again calling the attention of the House and of the people to the fact that if we have failed in every department of finance in five years because we have gone to the bad or have a deficit for those five years of £431,000, certainly the hon. member failed when he had a deficit of £2,721,000.

Mr. Kenneally: He forgets that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No, I do not forget it.

The PREMIER: There are no words in the dictionary to describe the hon. member's degree of failure if we have failed in every department of finance.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Now you are failing to be fair.

The PREMIER: No. I know the hon. member will say that he inherited a deficit—which he did, of course—and I am not for one moment contending that he did not have a difficult situation to face, as I think all Treasurers in this State have had for many generations past.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Will you admit that I reduced the deficit to a very small thing?

The PREMIER: Yes, after some years, but it was a pretty slow process.

Mr. Lindsay: Yours is starting to go up now.

The PREMIER: At all events, it is only a pup alongside the hon. member's deficit. Allowing for the difficulty of the years preceding the advent of the Mitchell Government, at the same time the results of the hon. member's five years of administration do not justify a sweeping charge against this Government of having failed in every department of finance.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the position to-day?

The PREMIER: Well, take £431,000 and set it down on the opposite side of the balance sheet against the entry of £2,721,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is not fair; I inherited your deficit.

The PREMIER: I need not give the annual results, but the figures I have given were the net results of our respective quinquennial periods.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is what you tell the public, but you know damned well you are wrong.

The PREMIER: Those are the actual figures. The hon. member can make any

explanation he likes, but those are the results. I perhaps would not have brought them forward so prominently but for the hon. member's charge that this Government had failed in every department of finance. Had he been a little moderate in his statement, I would not have stressed those figures; but I am entitled to bring those figures before the minds of the public when the hon. member charges this Government with having failed in every department of finance.

Mr. Lindsay: You have had a great deal more revenue than the hon. member has.

The PREMIER: That is another child's trap. I will deal with it. That is kept up for the unsophisticated, for those men who do not take any interest in finance.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is for your party.

The PREMIER: And for a fair number of your party too. That will be the cry all round, that this Government had two millions more last year than had the Mitchell Government in their last year.

Mr. Lindsay: Correct.

The PREMIER: And the inference to the public is what have the Government done with the £2,000,000 more that they have received; they ought to have an overflowing Treasury. But the hon. member forgets that while it is true I had £2,000,000 more—as a matter of fact last year the revenue was £2,082,000 more than the revenue received by the hon. member in his last year of office—he, in his last year of office received £2,920,000 more revenue than in his first year of office and yet went to the bad to the extent of £2,700,000.

Mr. Lindsay: Not in the last year.

The PREMIER: One would imagine that the present Government had enjoyed an increase of revenue to the extent of £2,000,000 while the revenue received during the five years the hon. member was in office had remained stationary.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have averaged £4,000,000 a year more.

The PREMIER: Now the hon. member is bringing in loan moneys. We cannot jump from revenue to loan moneys. Let us stick to these figures for a moment. The hon. member argued that we ought to have had a surplus because we had received £2,000,000 more revenue than he received in his last year of office. Notwithstanding that we have had that £2,000,000 increase in five years and a deficit of £431,000, the hon. member, in his five years of office, had a revenue increase of £2,900,000 and so far from balancing the

ledger he went to the bad to the tune of £2,721,000. The hon. member has put forward his figures merely to mislead the public.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are misleading the public.

The PREMIER: The hon. member said we have had £2,000,000 more revenue and should have balanced the ledger. That statement will be repeated throughout the country. Yet the hon. member had increased revenue to the extent of £2,900,000—

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And I brought the deficit down by £400,000.

The PREMIER: During the five years in which the hon. member's revenue increased by £2,900,000, he went to the bad to the extent of £2,700,000. Where then is the foundation for his argument against the present Government?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I reduced the deficit.

The PREMIER: Reduced it! The hon. member would make it appear that because revenue has increased by £2,000,000 we should have an overflowing Treasury.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: So you should. You have had £4,000,000 more than I had.

The PREMIER: Yes, including loan money, but the hon. member during his five years of office had a revenue increase of £2,900,000 and did not say anything about it. Those are the facts, and they reveal that the hon. member's attempt to make it appear that the Government have not done as well as they should have done has no foundation at all.

Mr. Lindsay: Well, reduce taxation a bit.

The PREMIER: I will come to that question. The hon. member knows perfectly well that the State has been expanding every year and that increased revenue always brings with it responsibilities for increased expenditure. The hon. member should not try to make it appear that the revenue is increasing and that the expenditure is standing still. Let me show that, although the results as I have stated them reveal an improvement upon the hon. member's finance, we have achieved them notwithstanding that we have had to meet increased expenditure all along the line during the last five years. The hon. member knows that of the £2,000,000 referred to, half a million is made up under special Acts, interest charges, which is a growing sum each year.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are financing in precisely the same way as we did.

The PREMIER: But I am not blaming the hon. member. I am not the one who is making a complaint against the hon. member for not having done better, although his revenue increased so greatly during his five years of office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I did very much better than you have done.

The PREMIER: The figures do not bear out that statement.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are building up the deficit, whereas I brought it down.

The Minister for Mines: You built it up for a start.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No. I inherited it.

The PREMIER: Well, special Acts account for half a million. Since 1924 there has been an all-round increase in the rates of pay for all Government employees due to awards of the court and the basic wage.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There has always been that.

The PREMIER: No, only during the last four or five years have those increases taken place.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Not at all.

The PREMIER: There was reclassification of the Public Service in 1926. There had not been a reclassification for the previous seven years. There was also a reclassification of teachers in 1926. The police received a new award in 1925 and another in 1928, and the basic wage and other awards, of course, meant added expenditure. Let me give some of the principal amounts involved in those increases of pay. Awards for the police alone meant an increase of £41,000 in salaries and wages. That amount does not cover the whole of the increase because it does not take into account the increase in the personnel of the force. The reclassification of teachers cost approximately £44,000, and the cost of reclassification of the Civil Service and the subsequent annual increments, which after having been withheld for many years, the Government restored during their first year of office, amounted to £90,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Automatic increases were always given.

The PREMIER: They had to be paid.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You know that the civil servants got a £60 increase during my time.

The PREMIER: That applied only to the lower salaried officers. For many years there had been no increments for the officers above the automatic range. Railways, tramways and electricity supply, three big departments, owing to awards and the increase in the basic wage granted by the Arbitration Court, involved us last year in an increase of no less than £250,000 over the expenditure of the last year in which the hon. member held office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: They went up a million a year in my time.

The PREMIER: Even the items I have quoted do not cover all. Education Department salaries were increased by £44,000, but the actual increased expenditure covering new schools and teachers amounted to £98,471. Medical and health accounted for £31,274; police, including increased salaries and increased personnel, £56,153; gaols, £5,006; lunacy, £16,000 and charities £42,699, making a total under those headings alone of £249,603. For the medical and dental inspection of schools, the number of medical officers has been increased since 1923-24 from one to three, and we now have three dentists for the schools where none existed before. Those two items have involved an expenditure of £3,784. To-day there are 16 infant health centres compared with two in 1923-24, and the expenditure is now £1,509 compared with £200 five years ago.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That does not cover much of the £2,000,000.

The PREMIER: Doesn't it? I took off half a million to begin with, representing expenditure under special Acts; then £250,000 for the railways, tramways and electricity departments, £90,000 for the Public Service, £44,000 for the teachers and £41,000 for the police. How much of the two millions is left?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We put them up twice as much as that.

The PREMIER: Those increases have been given by the present Government. In many instances they were not given during the time the hon. member was in office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: In every instance everybody received more pay in my time.

The PREMIER: Then there is an entirely new form of expenditure that has had to be met since the hon. member was in office. On the statute-book is a Miners' Phthisis Act, which was passed by Parlia-

ment some few years before we took office, but was not proclaimed. The present Government proclaimed that Act.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: When you were sworn in, or two years afterwards?

The PREMIER: No, on the 7th June, 1925 it was proclaimed, within 12 months of our having taken office. The number of persons withdrawn from the mines under that Act is 323. Let me mention the expenditure by way of compensation that the Government have had to find out of revenue. In the first year it was £5,109; in 1926-27, £20,518; 1927-28, £37,922 and 1928-29, £41,101. Thus the total compensation paid under the Miners Phthisis Act to the 30th June, 1929, was £104,650.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Have you taken any of it out of the special grant from the Commonwealth?

The PREMIER: No, it is all from revenue. The examinations and other work incidental to taking the men out of the mines run into £6,048, making a total expenditure of £110,698.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You have had eight millions of money in the four years.

The PREMIER: I think I have shown that there is not much in the point that the hon. member has sought to make regarding the £2,000,000 increase of revenue.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I hope that everyone will buy the "Government Gazette" of the 15th of next month.

The PREMIER: I hope everyone will buy this week's "Hansard," and read my speech. I think we shall have to take steps to see that the people get it. Recently the Leader of the Opposition made a statement as follows:—

A few days ago Mr. Collier claimed that his Government had reduced the income tax by 48½ per cent. That is true, but he omitted to mention that the amount was made good from the Federal Government special grant of £300,000, and that the land tax had been tremendously increased—in the case of the farmer by over 200 per cent.

Mr. Brown: That is correct.

The Minister for Mines: That is absolutely incorrect.

The PREMIER: It might pass as correct in Pingelly or along the Dale River, but I shall show that it is incorrect.

Mr. Thomson: It is certainly correct for the people who have to pay it.

The PREMIER: It is incorrect to say that the 48 1/3rd per cent. reduction in income tax was made good from the Federal Government's grant of £300,000. The 33 1/3 was taken off (not the 48 1/3) because the Government prior to that had remitted the 15 per cent. super tax.

Mr. Thomson: You had to do that to get your land tax.

The PREMIER: We did it at all events. The 48½ per cent. did not come out of Commonwealth money but the 33½ per cent. did.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The £300,000 of Commonwealth money more than made that good.

The PREMIER: It did not.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it did.

The PREMIER: The hon. member also said the land tax had been tremendously increased, and increased to the farmer by over 200 per cent. The hon. member is only 125 per cent. out there. It was not increased to the farmer by 200 per cent., but by 85 per cent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Of course it was increased.

The PREMIER: Yes, but not by 200 per cent. The tax was doubled, and when a tax is doubled, whether it be a halfpenny or a penny, it means it is increased 100 per cent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: A halfpenny with another halfpenny on top of it means 200 per cent.

The PREMIER: It means 100 per cent. Before the increased land tax had been passed we had reduced the income tax, as it stood when the Mitchell Government took office, by the abolition of the 15 per cent. super tax. If we take 15 per cent. from 100 per cent., it leaves a net increase in the land tax of 85 per cent. and not 200 per cent.

Mr. Lindsay: What about exemptions?

The PREMIER: What about lots of things, the rabbit tax, the vermin tax, and so on? I am not denying an increase in the land tax. I am merely stating that the increase was 85 per cent. and not 200 per cent. as stated by the Leader of the Opposition. I do not want members to roam about the country in the near future telling the farmer that we increased the land tax by 200 per cent.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: He knows it already.

The PREMIER: He does not know it. The hon. member hopes that the Press will take up his interjection, and that his word will then be as good as mine. The figures are plain and indisputable, and are as I have given them. If the land tax has been increased it has been increased in the case of others besides farmers, because nearly half of it is paid by the owners of land in the metropolitan area.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Who said it was only the farmers?

The PREMIER: At the time that increase was estimated to amount to £42,000, and the Government made a corresponding reduction in railway freights.

Mr. Thomson: To meet the motor competition.

The PREMIER: That was a reduction to the extent of the full amount of the increase in the land tax. Whilst the land owners in the metropolitan area paid the increased land tax without getting the benefit of reduced railway freights, the farmer got it both ways.

Mr. Thomson: The farmer did not get the benefit.

The PREMIER: It is of no use trying to bulldoze the farmer. He is an intelligent man these days.

Mr. Thomson: You are trying to bulldoze him.

The PREMIER: The hon. member's stories, though oft repeated, will not be accepted by the farmer.

Mr. Thomson: You are trying to bulldoze him when you tell him he is not obliged to pay more land tax.

The PREMIER: I have never said that, but I have said that the increase was 85 per cent. and not 200. Against that there was a corresponding reduction in railway charges. The Treasury itself did not benefit at all by the increased tax.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Then we will reduce the tax.

Mr. Thomson: By increasing it.

The PREMIER: The elections are approaching, and I have no doubt attempts will be made to do things like that.

Mr. Kenneally: It is nice to find two members in such agreement.

The PREMIER: It must be remembered that the direct Opposition are not entitled to talk for "we."

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is pretty hard for you to put up a case at all.

The PREMIER: I have never seen a man struggle so much to put up a case as the hon. member did, because his case has been flooded all along the line. His statements are without foundation.

Mr. Mann: You are going to a lot of trouble to contradict him.

The PREMIER: He holds a responsible position. I do not want statements to go out that are not in accordance with actual facts.

Mr. Mann: You are putting another interpretation upon them.

The PREMIER: I am quoting facts and figures. There has been a repeated and continuous misrepresentation to farmers on the subject of the land tax. There has been a recklessness about the statements which I suggest is unbecoming in a man holding a responsible position. Some people do not care whether they talk of 100 per cent. or 200 per cent.; a hundred or so is neither here nor there with them.

Mr. Thomson: Except that farmers have to pay considerably more land tax than they paid before.

The PREMIER: Of course, because land valuations have gone up. The Government are not responsible for the increase in the valuations.

Mr. Thomson: Are they not?

The PREMIER: No. The valuers were at work when the Government assumed office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And they were stopped at once?

The PREMIER: No. The hon. member put them on and paid the whole of their salaries. He put them on to revalue land. Some of the valuations have gone up as high as 300 per cent.

Mr. Lindsay: And some 400 per cent.

The PREMIER: That shows that land owners must have been on a pretty good wicket before.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: We paid eleven-twelfths of the cost and they paid one-twelfth. That was the arrangement.

The PREMIER: The hon. member need not have paid the eleven-twelfths. The valuers were at work, and I accept no responsibility for the increase in the valuations. No doubt farmers will be told that we were responsible for the whole thing.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you say we should not have had the re-valuations?

The PREMIER: I do not say it was wrong to have them.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You are trying to persuade the farmer that it was wrong.

The PREMIER: I am telling the farmer that this Government were not responsible for what happened. I do not say it was wrong.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You do.

The PREMIER: I want the facts to be known, showing who was responsible.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not mind being responsible for doing my duty. That is all I did. I think you increased the tax at the wrong period.

The PREMIER: That is a matter of opinion. I realise there will be a difference of opinion amongst members and the public generally as to whether the land tax ought to be increased. It is a matter for the judgment of the individual. It was the policy of the Government to do this, and we accept responsibility so far as we have taken action in that direction, and no further responsibility when it does not belong to us.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you wish the farmer—the man who owns the land—to believe that you never have had the revaluations made?

The PREMIER: I say it does not rest with those who are continually commenting upon the Government for increasing the land tax, to criticise them for doing it when they themselves were responsible for the increase in valuations.

Mr. Thomson: When you raised the tax you said you anticipated getting only £40,000, and would give it back by way of railway freights. You are now getting £100,000.

The PREMIER: The matter was considered only in the light of the position as it existed at the time. No one could say what the amount would be in the future. It must be admitted that last year's financial results were entirely due to the operations of the railway system. Members who have studied the figures, which have been supplied to the House, will find them most illuminating. We had a preponderance of low-rate traffic during the year, that was in coal, wheat, fertilisers, etc., which represent over half the haulage for the year. These commodities returned only 30 per cent. of the total earnings, although representing more than half the haulage. There has been a falling off in wool of about 3,000 tons. That also affected the earnings. There was a reduction of 7,000 tons in hay, straw,

and chaff, and a tremendous falling off in timber of 97,000 tons, a decrease as compared with the previous year which affected the railway revenue to the extent of £48,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Do you mean the profit?

The PREMIER: No, the receipts. There was a decrease in revenue of £48,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: On the whole, you got a lot more revenue than in the year before.

The Minister for Railways. We did not get as much.

The PREMIER: The earnings for the year thus fell off and the working expenses increased by £144,000. The department was therefore hit by a decrease in revenue and an increase in working expenses. Had the season been normal, or had it continued as it existed when the Estimates were prepared, the railway revenue would have come up to expectations, and the deficit would have disappeared. After that the maritime strike took place. This caused a falling off in timber receipts and in other directions, which made up the whole of the difference.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: There always are strikes.

The PREMIER: Unfortunately that is so. We are lucky in that respect in this State, compared with some of the others.

Mr. Kenneally: Lucky Collier again!

Mr. Thomson: Yes, lucky Collier.

The PREMIER: It is a marvellous run of luck.

Mr. Thomson: Good seasons and plenty of money from the Federal Government.

The PREMIER: Of course all this luck is entirely outside the influence of the Government.

Mr. Thomson: You are not responsible for the good season, though I hope it may continue.

Mr. Davy: We are not sure about that.

The PREMIER: We are not claiming any credit for that.

Mr. Thomson: The member for East Perth did last night.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Is there much traffic over the Perth-Fremantle Road in general goods?

The PREMIER: Yes. These returns indicate an enormous falling off in some directions. The revenue must be largely influenced by the road competition both with regard to passenger services and to certain

classes of goods. The railways suffer most from road competition in those classes where the rate is highest.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The PREMIER: I have already exceeded considerably the time I had allowed myself; but that fact is due to the volume and frequency of interjections, to which, needless to say, I offer no objection. The Leader of the Opposition has said that the £350,000 saved because of the Financial Agreement has been taken, together with past contributions, and used as revenue.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I say that you will be so using it.

The PREMIER: The hon. member said that we had been doing so. He declared that what straightening out of the finances there had been was achieved by taking into revenue moneys that all other Governments had paid to the sinking fund trustees in London. That statement is entirely incorrect. So far, our finances have not benefited at all by the amount saved because of the Financial Agreement.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: What is the amount?

The PREMIER: It is £350,000.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But you said £227,000.

The PREMIER: That is for one year. There are two years now, or nearly three years altogether. That money has been set aside, and has not in any way benefited the Government finances. Suggestions have been made during the debate as to what should be done with the money, but I do not propose to deal with that aspect to-night. When the Budget comes down for consideration we shall have an opportunity to decide how the amount placed in reserve shall be appropriated. We are not taking in any of that money at all. We have not touched a penny of it, and we do not propose to touch any of it until Parliament has dealt with the question. I cannot to-night give any indication as to what we shall do. Suggestions that the money should go in reduction of taxation have been freely offered; and it is very easy to talk about reduction of taxation, but the times are not propitious for that purpose. So far the Western Australian Government are the only Government in Australia who have reduced taxation in recent years.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The Federal Government have done so.

The PREMIER: The only State Government, I intended to say. The Leader of the Opposition also declares that Ministers have not been able to make up their minds, that there is a lack of promptness, of courage, and of energy on their part. I venture to say there are not many people who will agree with that description of the Government. Whatever may be our faults—and we do not claim to be quite perfect—certainly lack of courage and energy, and of promptness of decision, is not one of them. If an impartial observer will look abroad in the land and consider the work done during the past five years in the building of railways and harbours, the provision of both town and country water supplies, in land settlement and drainage, in the erection of an Agricultural College and of metropolitan markets, in the huge programme of road construction that has been carried out, in the provision that has been made for the stricken miners of the goldfields, I venture to say the observer will not agree with the hon. member's statement. From Wyndham to Esperance, and from Geraldton to the Leeuwin, everywhere may be seen evidence of the work, courage, energy, and promptness of decision that have characterised the Government. There has been, too—not least important, perhaps most important of all—complete industrial peace in Western Australia. Am I claiming too much on behalf of the Government when I say that that fortunate condition of affairs has been due largely, or almost entirely, to the industrial legislation we have placed on the statute book?

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Was not there the tea room strike?

The PREMIER: Yes, a strike of a few girls.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And the water-side strike.

The PREMIER: Whatever industrial trouble there has been in this State did not originate here, and had nothing to do with the Government of the State or with any of the laws of this country. It was trouble transported to Western Australia from the Eastern States. Looking back over a long number of years—

Mr. Thomson: What about the trouble at Geraldton?

The PREMIER: A 25-minutes trouble between two unions who were having an argument. Does the hon. member call that industrial trouble?

Mr. Thomson: Certainly I do.

The PREMIER: If those are the only troubles that can be brought forward, troubles such as a few tearoom girls parading the streets for an hour one day, it shows how desperately hard put to it members opposite are to prove that there has been industrial trouble. I hope I have made it perfectly clear that when I spoke of the absence of industrial troubles, I had in mind the fact that the waterside trouble had not its origin in this State. Broadly, we have had industrial peace here during the past five years. I believe that never in the history of Western Australia, certainly not within a couple of decades, has there been such contentment in the industrial arena on the part of both employers and employees as there has been during the past five years; and that, I claim, is due to the fact that the policy and the legislation of the present Government have created the opportunity for such a position of affairs.

Mr. Sampson: There was trouble in the printing industry for over three months.

The PREMIER: No set of men under Heaven could agree with the hon. member as an employer in the printing industry. I marvel that there is ever any work carried on in the hon. member's establishment. It is a great testimony to the forbearance of employees in the printing industry that there has been only one trouble during 30 years.

Mr. Sampson: This trouble was spread from Midland Junction right to Fremantle.

The PREMIER: In the good old days of 30 years ago, employees did not question the right of the boss to determine wages, hours and conditions.

Mr. Sampson: The trouble was common to the whole of the industry in the metropolitan area, from Midland Junction to Fremantle.

The PREMIER: Where did it originate?

Mr. Sampson: It originated in the Trades Hall, I think. It certainly did not originate in my office.

The PREMIER: I am not claiming, of course, that there has not been some little trouble.

Mr. Sampson: That was a trouble of three months.

The PREMIER: We have not reached the millennium, and we are not enjoying perfect peace yet; but, relatively speaking, we have had five years of industrial peace. That is apart from one or two small things to which hon. members opposite have referred. Moreover, there has been a contented Public Service, which is a very important considera-

tion. I do not think the Public Service of Western Australia has ever been more contented or has ever rendered the State better service than during the past five years. The position Australia at present finds herself in is fairly serious. All sections of the community ought to realise the fact that this Commonwealth is literally living on its primary industries, wool and wheat.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: On its exports.

The PREMIER: The Commonwealth does not export any manufactured goods.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And it never will.

The PREMIER: The only wealth exported from Australia is the wealth of its primary industries, principally wool and wheat. The consternation that was caused a month or two ago, when a fall in the price of wheat took place, ought to be an indication to the Australian people of the results which would follow any serious drop in that commodity or in wool. The fact is that in the price of wool there has been a fall of about 15 per cent. We must have regard for the fact that substitutes for wool are being used; and this, perhaps with competition, threatens a further fall in the price of wool next year. We must have regard to the balance of trade. Although in the year just closed that balance has been favourable to the Commonwealth to the extent of £6,000,000, in the previous year it had been favourable to the extent of £19,000,000. Any falling-off in the volume of production of either wool or wheat, if accompanied by a fall in price, would create a most serious situation for the Australian people. That seems to me to bring us to the point that the cost of production in this country is too high. We have to compete in the world's markets. The producer of wool and the producer of wheat themselves have no say in fixing the prices of the commodities they produce. Those prices are determined by external influences over which the Australian producers have no control whatever. If we are going to compete with other countries of the world, we shall have to consider seriously the question of cost of production. When the recent fall in the price of wheat occurred, a number of people thought it would be unwise for growers to crop as much land this year as previously. Indeed, in some quarters it was argued that there should be a decrease in the area cropped. But that way would spell absolute insolvency for the State. We shall never get over our difficulties by decreasing the area under

wheat because of the price having fallen. Rather should we set about endeavouring to enable the farmer to compete in overseas markets by reduction in the cost of production. An increase in the area under crop and a reduction in the cost of production would make the farmer's position to-day equal, even with the lower price, to what it was a year or two ago with the higher price.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: The price of wheat will not be low this year.

The PREMIER: No. I said it threatened to be low. Undoubtedly it is most difficult for anyone to say to what the high cost of production is due. I daresay there are many contributing factors.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Taxation.

The PREMIER: One important factor, so far as the primary producer is concerned, is the tariff. There can be no question about that.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: It is all taxation, of course.

The PREMIER: While the tariff has been piled up year after year, the primary producer has been helpless in regard to passing on the increased cost of production caused by the rising tariff. He has no say in that matter. He is not in the happy position of the manufacturer, who merely puts the increased cost on to the price of his commodity, so that the increase is borne by the consumer. This means, in its turn, an increase in the cost of living, and consequently an increase in the rate of wages. The thing seems to be merely taking us round in a vicious circle. I am afraid a considerable number of people in Australia do not realise the fact that this country is living practically upon its wool and wheat production. At any rate, I hope the Federal Government will not continue to pile burdens upon the primary producers through the Customs House. There is, too, another contributing factor in that many of the people engaged in our manufacturing industries have not kept pace with the progress of the world with regard to up-to-date machinery. In the old world, practically all the pre-war methods of production have been scrapped, and newer and more economical methods adopted. That has enabled the manufacturers to produce more cheaply and to become more formidable competitors in the world's markets. That is a phase that the Australian manufacturers will have to consider seriously.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Taxation represents 20 per cent. of the cost of production. No country in the world can stand up against that.

The PREMIER: I agree that high taxation diminishes the extent of employment, curtails production, and affects the whole of the community. If money is taken from the people by way of taxation, it means that so much less is available for investment or for employment in furthering wealth production. That is an aspect of the whole position that will have to be considered seriously.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: And pretty soon, too.

The PREMIER: It will have to be considered by the whole of the people of Australia. In Western Australia we are facing the prospect of an excellent season. Our flocks and our herds as well as our cultivation are all on the increase and the current season has opened up magnificently. All the indications are that this State is about to enjoy one of the best seasons on record for many years past.

MR. LINDSAY (Toodyay) [7.48]: During the course of his remarks the Premier said there was a good deal of comfort to be found in the Governor's Speech. I agree that there is some comfort to be found in it from my point of view. He particularly mentioned a certain railway that is in my electorate, and also the provision of the Barbalin district water supply. On the other hand there was not much comfort for the people concerned when he said that the latter scheme would not be finished until next summer.

The Premier: I thought you were aware that the scheme is to be opened next month.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am aware that the opening is to take place then, but I hope the work will be completed much sooner than the Premier indicated. The work has been in hand for a long time and there is still some that has to be completed. Although the pipes have been taken through to Trayning, there is a considerable distance to be laid down yet.

The Premier: It is a big job.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is so. I am perfectly aware that the work was rushed when it was necessary. The people urgently required water, and the Government did good work when they put on two shifts in order to get the water through to the farmers.

From my knowledge of the district and of the water available at Goomalling from the Goldfields Water Supply scheme, I am able to say that had the department not established stand pipes at various sidings promptly, many of the settlers concerned would have had to leave their holdings. It would have been impossible for the railways to have conveyed water there to cope with the requirements of all concerned. Reference is made in the Governor's Speech to the construction of the Kulja eastward railway, which is in progress. I would like the Premier to bear in mind the necessity for the extension of that line to the north past Lake Hillman. During last session deputations waited upon the Premier, who made certain promises regarding this matter. I hope those promises will be fulfilled before next summer.

The Premier: The members of the Railway Advisory Board have not been able to make any recommendation yet.

Mr. LINDSAY: I understand that they will be going out soon. There is one statement in the Governor's Speech that strikes me as very peculiar. The Premier said that the Speech is circulated all over the world. I do not know whether there is a misprint, but there is a most peculiar statement with reference to land settlement matters. The Speech contains the following paragraph:—

A total of 6,114 applications for land under conditional purchase was received, and 164 applications for pastoral leases. The applications approved for conditional purchase blocks totalled 2,602 for an area of 2,616,762 acres, and for pastoral leases 199 for an area of 14,777,802 acres.

Although only 164 applications for pastoral leases were received, 199 applications were granted! I think there must be some mistake there; I do not understand the statement at all. In reply to a question, the Minister for Works stated that £580,000 available from the Commonwealth Government for expenditure on main roads, had not been utilised. I want to remind him that this is the time when road construction should be carried out in the wheat belt areas. For every £1 spent during the winter and spring months, more value is received than is obtainable from the expenditure of 30s. during the summer months. I hope that work to be done in the wheat belt areas will be done before the rains have finished, or that it will not be done at all

during the summer months. It should be borne in mind that it is during the winter months that there is usually a great deal of unemployment. I believe that if the Government had given consideration to the expenditure of money on the main roads during the winter months, the present unemployed difficulty would have been materially relieved. Then, during harvest time when there is a considerable demand for labour, the men would have been relieved from road work in order to undertake jobs on the farms. The Premier dealt exhaustively with the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the financial position. Naturally it is his duty to show that the finances are in the best possible condition. As Leader of the Government, it is probably regarded as his duty to prove that the position is much better than that obtaining when his predecessors were in office. As I understand the finances, while I agree that he has done well in some years, I cannot compliment the Premier on the position at the end of the last financial year. When the present Leader of the Opposition was Premier, he certainly continued to carry out the policy that he embarked upon, of reducing the deficit that he inherited. To-night the Premier stated that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was in charge of the finances, had had an increase in revenue amounting to £2,900,000. That also has been the experience of the present Government. The Leader of the Opposition inherited a deficit in the year he took office of £668,000, which he had reduced in the last year of his administration to £229,000. That is what the present Government inherited and the Premier certainly reduced that deficit, but now we find that he has a deficit of £275,000. That has been the result of his administration, notwithstanding the fact that every year he has had a great increase in revenue. In 1923-24 the expenditure by the Mitchell Government amounted to £8,094,000, whereas the expenditure by the present Government in 1928-29 amounted to £9,834,000. Then with regard to Loan money, the present Government spent nearly £750,000 more last year than did the Government in 1923-24. To put it another way, the expenditure of Government moneys was £30 10s. per head in 1923-24, whereas in 1928-29 the expenditure by the present Government was £36 10s. per head of the

population. It naturally follows that money spent amongst the people to that extent must have created a certain amount of work and prosperity. It also indicates, however, that the people themselves have had to shoulder a heavy increase in taxation.

The Minister for Railways: A heavy increase!

Mr. LINDSAY: That there have been many increases in taxation is reflected in the amount of revenue received. It should naturally follow that the Government of the day should have been able to continue the good work of the Mitchell Government, and place the finances of the State in a better position than they appear to be in to-day. The Premier advanced as one reason for the deficit the reduced quantity of timber and wheat hauled over the railways. If that be correct, surely that explanation should have had more force in 1923-24 than at present. In that year we produced 13,000,000 bushels of wheat, whereas last year the harvest represented 34,000,000 bushels. With a greatly augmented wheat traffic, the railways should have been able to make much more money by way of revenue.

The Minister for Railways: It is useless talking like that. Every bag of wheat that we carry is carried at a loss.

Mr. LINDSAY: We are told that continually.

The Minister for Railways: You can find that out for yourself.

Mr. LINDSAY: The remarkable thing about it all is that the only time when the railways pay is during the three months of the year when wheat is being hauled. It is remarkable that the Commissioner for Railways could advance the explanation that one of the reasons for the loss on the railways was the reduction in the wheat traffic.

The Minister for Railways: There was no reduction in that traffic.

Mr. LINDSAY: There was a reduction upon the anticipated haulage.

The Premier: There was in fact an increased traffic last year.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Premier made the same statement.

The Premier: I did not make it.

Mr. LINDSAY: Anyone who gives the slightest consideration to the matter knows that the wheat is carried in train loads, not in lb.-weight or cwt. parcels. If I de-

sire to send a case of groceries to Wyalatchem, it has to be handled and put into a small wayside truck that has to be shunted off here and there, and then taken out at the other end. All that costs a lot more than is entailed in handling a truck of wheat.

The Minister for Railways: It costs six times as much.

Mr. Thomson: And it costs six times as much to handle it.

Mr. LINDSAY: It must be acknowledged that a full train load is a much cheaper form of traffic than the conveyance of small parcels in trucks.

The Minister for Railways: But not six times as cheap!

Mr. Thomson: You do not carry six times the quantity.

Mr. LINDSAY: The fact remains that the only time the railways pay is during the three months when the wheat traffic is available.

Mr. Withers: Other commodities make up for it.

The Premier: It is the hon. member's opinion against that of the Commissioner of Railways, whose statement it was.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is so. Now it is my opinion against the Premier's. The other night when the Premier made a statement about the land tax, he said the tax had been increased by only 85 per cent., not by 200 per cent. as some people had declared. When that Bill was amended we doubled the rate of land tax, but there was a 15 per cent. super tax removed from the income tax. That Bill also took away all land tax exemptions. At that time we had an exemption of £250 on agricultural land and £50 on land in the metropolitan area. Both those exemptions were removed by the Bill. The result is that if we take a 1,200-acre farm valued at £1 per acre at a tax of 1d. in the pound, the taxpayer has to pay £5. Before the tax was altered, the owner of a 1,200-acre farm valued at £1 per acre was allowed an exemption of £250 to begin with, and was then charged tax at the rate of one half-penny. So the owner paid £1 19s. 7d. instead of the £5 that he has to pay to-day. Therefore, when I say that the land tax has been increased by more than 85 per cent. or 100 per cent., I think those figures prove it.

The Minister for Railways: Take out another illustration, that of a man in the city with a valuable property.

Mr. LINDSAY: Just now I am dealing with agricultural land.

The Minister for Railways: But to be fair you must deal with all lands.

Mr. LINDSAY: Very well. I said that previously there was an exemption of £50 on a home in Perth. That exemption has been removed, and the tax has been doubled. So a block of land in the city, valued at £100, pays 100 twopences, whereas under the old Act the tax was paid on £50, not £100, in addition to which the rate was then only half what it is to-day. So even in the city the land taxation has been increased. Then there is another point: Under the old Act, although we had only the exemptions I have mentioned for land tax, after we had paid our land tax and were paying our income tax, we had an exemption under the Income Tax Act of 50 per cent. of the amount we had paid in land tax. That has been removed. We do not pay more land tax, because of that, but we certainly have to pay more income tax. So, when we say the land tax has been increased by more than 100 per cent. to a certain extent we are correct.

The Premier: I am glad you say "to a certain extent."

Mr. LINDSAY: The member for Forrest (Miss Holman), when speaking on the Address-in-Reply, dealt with those engaged in the timber industry and declared that the new forest regulations were of great advantage to those men. She went on to give certain figures to the House. She said that amongst the total of 3,292 men engaged in the industry, there were 850 accidents per annum, or a percentage of 25.8. It is a very serious thing that that should obtain in any industry.

Mr. Pantou: The question is what was the percentage of accidents before that Act came into operation?

Mr. LINDSAY: We have all read in the Press of the very great increase in the premiums that have to be paid under the Workers' Compensation Act. No less than £25 per £100 has to be paid on a hewer.

Mr. Sleeman: We will have to cover them under State insurance.

Mr. Davy: That means 25 per cent., anyhow.

Mr. LINDSAY: The timber regulations were passed by the House for the purpose of protecting those engaged in the industry.

Mr. Pantou: But we cannot protect the hewer.

Mr. LINDSAY: Still there are all the other people engaged in the forest industry.

The Premier: But this high rate you speak of applies to hewers.

Mr. LINDSAY: Well, take the hewers. The member for Forrest said the timber regulations had been of great benefit to the industry and were for the purpose of protecting the employees in that industry. Then we have the statement from the hon. member that among 3,292 men engaged in the timber industry—they are not all hewers—there were 850 accidents. It is appalling to think that such a state of things could obtain. A little while ago the Premier was talking about the costs of production. This sort of thing is going to increase the cost of production, and also the cost of living.

Mr. Pantou: Yet this Parliament passed that Act.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, and we have to realise the seriousness of the position. It cannot be allowed to go on. It is commonly stated in the street that there is a conspiracy between the doctors and the victims of accidents sustained in the timber industry. We know that it is so. Something must be done in order to protect the people who are producing the wealth of the country.

Mr. Sleeman: Would the hon. member repeal that Act?

Mr. LINDSAY: Even if I tried to repeal it, I could not. It is for the Government to consider, and I hope they will consider it. The premium on clearers is 250s. per £100. What is the position? The clearer who earns less than the basic wage, say £200, has to be covered by this premium. If I employ him, I must first of all pay a premium of £25. In other words, clearing that costs 30s. per acre has to bear an extra impost of 3s. 9d. per acre for the insuring of the clearer. It is going to add that much to the cost of clearing land. And we are told that the timber hewers are all Southern Europeans, and that there are toes and fingers lying all about over the South-West. That may apply to the clearers also, because there is a certain proportion of Southern Europeans amongst them.

Mr. Sleeman: You know it is quite a big proportion.

Mr. LINDSAY: But they are not the only people. Here we have the premium on butchers increased from 27s. 6d. to 90s. per £100. Probably they would average

£300 per annum, so there is £13 a year to insure a butcher. I do not think there are any Southern Europeans amongst them, but it is going to add to the cost of selling meat, and therefore to the cost of living. It is a most serious thing for the people of Western Australia, and inquiries should be made to find out whether some reduction of these high rates could not be effected.

Mr. Sleeman: We shall have to push State insurance a little more.

Mr. Thomson: That is not the remedy.

Mr. LINDSAY: The other night I asked a question about the Alsatian wolf-hound, and the Premier said the Government would give consideration to the recommendation made by the recent conference of Ministers of Agriculture. This is a very serious question. There are in this State people interested in the breeding and sale of Alsations, who will tell us they are sheep dogs. I happen to have here the catalogue for a show exhibit of Alsations. It was prepared for that show by one of the Alsatian breeders in this State. That very man has declared that Alsations are not wolf-hounds. Yet listen to this, which I find printed in that catalogue—

Extracts from the "Watchdog" by Lieut.-Colonel E. H. Richardson, late Commandant of the British Wardog School, Chapter 16, British v. German police dogs: "This shepherd dog has always been crossed every now and then with wolves to keep him fierce, and now that a large strong dog was purposely manufactured by expert breeders, it was again thought advisable to bring in the strain of wolf once more to ensure the character, and several of the first dogs registered in the 'Deutscher-Schäferhund Verein' were half wolf. This accounts for the curious character of the breed, the mixture of timidity and ferocity that lurks in so many of the dogs. The German police dog as trained by the German police, is a powerful animal capable of great severity. That such an animal needs a considerable amount of control may well be understood, and with the usual capacity for dragging everything with which he comes in contact, the German official has instituted a form of training according to plan in which strict discipline is inculcated by various words of command."

Then he goes on—

As witness to this wolf cross, I would refer to such breeders as Herr Strebel and Monsieur Sodenkamp, well known continental breeders who bear testimony to the fact of the crossing with the wolf. As a matter of fact, I find from personal investigation that the cross is still being made at local zoos in Germany. I have already explained that the

Germans like an attacking dog. They are very pleased with the wolf cross, and consider it renders the breed virile and determined. There are some English owners of the dogs who are now trying to disclaim this wolf cross, but the most trivial inquiries amongst present-day German breeders and exporters to this country confirm the fact, and they seem to do so with pride. Herr Strebel mentions the curious behaviour of the Borzois at a show at Dresden whenever the well-known Alsatian Julian 1 (which was a wolf cross) passed their benches.

The Premier: Do you say that is written by a breeder of Alsations?

Mr. LINDSAY: No, this is an extract from the "Watchdog," written by Lieut.-Col. E. H. Richardson. I have other information here. For instance, Mr. Sanderson, secretary to the Pastoralists' Association, published a letter in the "West Australian" and mentioned Mr. J. W. Pennington, M.L.A., chairman of the conference held recently in the Eastern States, quoting the fact that his daughter imported an Alsatian wolf-hound from England. That lady was over 21 years of age and the Alsatian tackled her to such an extent that 11 stitches had to be put in her throat. The dog put its teeth through the girl's breast and thigh and the result was that she was 12 months in hospital. The Alsatian is likely to be too much of a menace to be allowed to live in Australia. I think the Government should take action to have such dogs sterilised or destroyed, as the conference of Ministers for Agriculture recently unanimously recommended. Another matter I wish to deal with is the reply of the Premier to questions I asked to-day. I asked him certain questions dealing with the vermin fund. I wish members of the House to understand that I am the representative of the agriculturists on the fund. I was nominated by the Vermin Boards Association and the Government saw fit to appoint me. I have received all possible assistance to collect information and carry out my duties. The board consisting of Mr. Paterson, Mr. Craig and myself have worked in harmony. The Vermin Act was passed for a special purpose. When the Bill was before the House I bitterly opposed the rate of tax and gave certain information as to how much would be collected. My statement was repeatedly denied by the Minister. To-day I am in a position to say, "I told you so." The statements I then made were true. The position has arisen that we are taxing people for

a special purpose and the money is being used for other purposes. That is not right. It was never suggested at the time that we should create such a balance as £38,890 in the fund, an amount which is now held in a Government trust fund, which the Government are using and thus saving interest on an equivalent amount, and on which we are receiving no interest. When money is collected for a special purpose and there is a surplus—there ought not to be a surplus—it should be paid into a fund and the interest it earns should be credited to the fund and not to the Government.

Mr. Marshall: Was not it a special tax?

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes, for a special purpose.

Mr. Marshall: Why go beyond the necessary amount?

Mr. Thomson: Suspend the tax for a year.

Mr. LINDSAY: I can answer the member for Murchison. While I have been a member of the fund I have gone to some trouble to ascertain how much money we were likely to get. The Taxation Department officials never seemed quite sure how much would be collected during the ensuing year, but this year's collections have amounted to £50,174. Such a large sum was never dreamed of. From personal experience I can give one reason why such a large amount has been collected. This year I paid three years' taxation, because I had not been previously assessed, and I assume that an accumulation of assessments has gone out this year and thus the amount collected has been greatly increased.

Mr. Marshall: But it must be an ever-increasing amount.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. The fact remains that at the 30th June there was £38,890 in the fund collected for the special purpose. I have no doubt that before the end of June, 1930, there will be at least £48,000, and probably £50,000, in the fund.

Mr. Marshall: What are you, as a member of the board, doing?

Mr. LINDSAY: Last year I called for certain information. We had very little money in hand at the time. The accumulation has occurred during the last 12 months. The surplus a year ago was £10,023. When we analysed the position I could not persuade the other members of the board to recommend a reduction of the tax. Of course we cannot reduce the tax; we can only make a recommendation to the Government. As soon as I obtained the

figures, I asked for a meeting of the advisory board in order that a recommendation might be forwarded to the Government in favour of a reduction of the tax. Unfortunately Mr. Paterson lives at the north end of Meekatharra and cannot run down every five minutes, so I did the only other thing possible—I asked the Government in this House to reduce the rate of tax by one-half for the present year. I believe we have sufficient money in hand to carry on if we reduced the rate of tax to $\frac{1}{2}$ d. and $\frac{3}{4}$ d. for the ensuing year.

Mr. Marshall: You have to remember that with the eradication of the dingo the expenditure from the fund will be less and less.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is not quite correct. Although dingoes have slightly decreased, foxes have increased more than 200 per cent. during the last 12 months. During the year ended 30th June last, the number of dingoes paid for was 623 less than in the previous year. We paid for 15,400 dingoes in the year before last and for 14,800 odd last year. In the year before last we paid for 1,000 foxes, but this year we paid for 3,060. The number of eagles paid for in the year just closed was more than double the number in the year before. Therefore, although the figures show a slight decrease for dingoes, they show a big increase for foxes and eagles. We hope to get the wild dogs under control, but unfortunately foxes are increasing in numbers. I asked the Premier another question in connection with the fund. Last year I found out that the fund was being debited with the expense for collection. Last session the Premier told us that the State was paying the Federal Government £30,000 a year for the collection of all taxes. The vermin tax is taxation. In order to ascertain the position, I asked the Premier whether the charge made for collecting vermin taxation was paid to the Federal Government in addition to the payment fixed under the agreement for the collection of State taxes, and the Premier replied, "No." I can only assume that if the amount is not paid to the Federal Government, it is paid into State revenue and I do not think that is quite fair.

Mr. Marshall: Whether it is a form of taxation or not, tell us who collects the tax?

Mr. LINDSAY: The Commissioner of Taxation. The result is that during the last three years we have been charged by the Commissioner of Taxation a total of £2,528

for collecting the tax, and according to the reply of the Premier it is not a charge by the Commonwealth Taxation Department, because that department is collecting the State taxes for £30,000. Evidently, therefore, the money is paid into State revenue. I do not think it was ever intended by Parliament that revenue should benefit by any amount from this special fund.

Mr. Thomson: Certainly it was not.

Mr. LINDSAY: In fact, this fund has saved the State an expenditure of more than £3,500 per annum. Before the tax was imposed, the State paid for a certain number of dingoes at 5s. or 10s. per scalp to the amount of £3,500 per annum. When the tax came into existence the money was paid out of the fund and the Government saved that £3,500 a year. In addition the Government have charged the fund this year £1,250 for the cost of collecting the tax. I do not think that is fair. What is more, I am beginning to think the Act is rather beneficial to the Government, inasmuch as £38,890 is lying in a Government trust fund, of which the Government have the use. If we put that money out at interest we would get some return for it. Interest at 3 per cent. would give us £1,200 a year, and the Government by having the use of that money are saving 4 or 5 per cent. on an equivalent amount. I have often been placed in a peculiar position on account of my being one of the few agriculturists who believe in this Act. I have always maintained that the people should bear the cost of destroying vermin, but when I find this sort of thing happening, I am forced to the conclusion that I may have made some mistakes.

Mr. Marshall: You have not made any mistake.

Mr. LINDSAY: I cannot help remarking on the statement made by the Premier to-night—it was also indicated by the Speech—that the salvation of this country lies in greater production. The Premier also said that we would have to do something to reduce the cost of production. With that statement I agree. The Premier mentioned that one of the causes of the high cost of production was the tariff. I sincerely hope his words will reach the ears of people in the Eastern States. His party in Federal politics, judging from my reading of the Press, are almost prohibitionists as regards importations, but it is also up to other parties to give us some relief from the high tariff.

Mr. Marshall: Earle Page, for instance.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. If the hon. member will have a word with Mr. Scullin and other members of his party, I will undertake to have a word with Dr. Earle Page.

Mr. Panton: But Earle Page is in the saddle.

Mr. Marshall: You know that your party have the reins in their hands at present.

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. Dr. Earle Page visited this State last year and I was requested to place certain matters before him regarding the duty of tubular piping. I was able to show him that the 40 per cent. duty, which was to be imposed last February, would cost the settlers under one water scheme £10 6s. per thousand acres. I had a talk with Dr. Earle Page and that duty has not been imposed yet, so there was some little result from my efforts. If other members will only do as much good by their talk with Mr. Scullin, we may be able to secure some reduction of costs. The tariff increases not only the cost of production but also the cost of living and the natural corollary is that the Arbitration Court awards higher wages and so it continues.

Mr. Marshall: You had better talk to Earle Page about that also.

Mr. LINDSAY: The Federal Government have already announced their intention of abolishing the Arbitration Court. Again the hon. member is a little bit too late. The other night the member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally) is reported as having made a certain statement at a meeting in the Town Hall.

Mr. Sleeman: Were you present?

Mr. LINDSAY: The Press gave it as follows:—

More production would not solve unemployment. In order that workers might get the benefit of labour-saving machinery the hours of labour should be reduced.

I am rather surprised that the hon. member should have made such a statement.

Mr. Kenneally: The hon. member would be well advised to leave it at that if he did not hear it.

Mr. LINDSAY: If I, as the representative of a big organisation, were reported in the Press to have made such a statement and it was not correct, I would take steps to refute it. The very fact that the hon. member has not done so shows that he has been rather lax in defending his good name. It is rather remarkable that any man should make a statement from a

public platform that the only way to solve the problem of unemployment was to work less and not produce more.

Mr. Kenneally: Can the hon. member contend that with improved machinery there should not be lessened hours of labour?

Mr. LINDSAY: The hon. member has asked me a question—

Hon. G. Taylor: Without notice.

Mr. LINDSAY: But I shall try to reply to it. I would sooner deal with it on another occasion, as I have quite a lot of information that I think would convince even the hon. member. Some time ago the Association for the Advancement of Science held a congress in Perth. In the report of its proceedings is a statement by the Commonwealth Statistician showing that the increased production of Australia had been less than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the preceding 19 years, notwithstanding the adoption of all the improved machinery. On a previous occasion I quoted a report by Professor Perkins, Director of Agriculture in South Australia, who showed that the increased efficiency of wheat farmers on Yorke's Peninsula during the same period was 87 per cent., due to the use of improved machinery but not to shorter working hours. They increased their efficiency, as they have to do to live. They have no Arbitration Court award to protect them. The wheat growers of Australia produce more wheat per man than is produced in any other part of the world. If they could not produce it as cheaply as in any other country I should be very much surprised. Quite recently I found out something very interesting. Canada and America are our two strongest competitors. They practically fix the price of wheat in the world, because they account for 65 per cent. of the world's exportations. It is remarkable that in the last four years America has been using a combined harvester that we have used in Australia for the last 20 years. She has reduced her cost of production so far as harvesting is concerned to almost the same figure that we have reached here.

Mr. Kenneally: And I suppose now they should work longer hours.

Mr. LINDSAY: Any farmer who thinks he is going to farm his land by working 44 hours a week, and by working his men that length of time, will soon end in the bankrupt court.

Mr. Kenneally: You think he should work still longer hours.

Mr. LINDSAY: Certainly. This fallacy of 44 hours a week is one of the things that is ruining the country. We want more work to be done by everybody. If we reduce the value of a man's earnings, what does it matter if we give him £1 a day and that £1 is not worth 15s.? We should produce more wealth, and produce our commodities at a cheaper rate. The member for East Perth is a sensible man and knows these things. If he would only reason things out, he would see that the people of Australia must work in order to benefit themselves. If he would look at things in that light he would be doing some good for those he represents. This is a serious question. It means that we in Australia have not the advantage we had previously. I have been reading the United States Year Book of Agriculture for 1927. I find that the American farmers were doing as Professor Perkins said the farmers in South Australia were doing, namely taking the other man's farm from him and increasing their own areas. The good man was buying out the bad man, and the small man was selling to the big one. With the increase in the use of machinery, there was a decrease in the amount of labour used. If all the people in Australia were only as efficient as the man who is growing wheat, what a great country this would be. Professor Perkins said that whilst South Australia has doubled her production, she has 3,000 fewer people engaged in the rural industry than she had before the production was doubled. In America it cost 18s. per acre to cut the crop with a binder and thrasher, whereas to-day with the combined harvester such as we use here, it is costing only 6s. per acre.

Mr. Kenneally: Does the hon. member say how he proposes to place the 3,000 persons that the machinery has displaced?

Mr. LINDSAY: Yes. If we can reduce the cost of production we can sell the things we manufacture somewhere outside Australia. The tariff on farm machinery opens up a very big question. I have here a book dealing with the subject. To-day we pay £110 for a machine that is selling retail in America for £48, and the wages in America are higher than they are here.

Mr. Sleeman: How much are the local manufacturers of machinery there being patronised?

Mr. LINDSAY: I wish to compare the wages paid in Toronto with those paid in Melbourne. In the former place a blacksmith

working 48 hours receives £6 3s. 3d., and in the latter £4 17s. a week. I am not in favour of reduced wages. High wages are good for any country, but the men receiving them must work for them. No man can be paid 20s. a day for long if he is only earning 18s. In Toronto machinists are earning £5 15s. a week and in Melbourne £4 6s. 6d. And yet we cannot produce machinery in Australia in competition with that produced in Canada. To send a combined drill from Toronto to Melbourne costs £8 11s. 7d. without the duty of 45 per cent. Despite that, we have manufacturing industries in Australia that cannot compete with those in Canada. It is remarkable.

Mr. Panton: There is nothing remarkable about it. They have industrial organisations in America and good machinery.

Mr. LINDSAY: This writer talks about industrial machinery. I have here the evidence placed before the Tariff Board. This shows that McKay's machinery manufactured in Melbourne is as up-to-date as any machinery in the world.

Mr. Panton: And he is making a big fortune out of it.

Mr. LINDSAY: But he and his men go before a Tariff Board and complain that they cannot compete with the imported article.

The Minister for Mines: That is why he can sell his implements in the Argentine at £15 apiece cheaper than he does in Australia.

Mr. LINDSAY: That is a fallacy I can explode.

The Minister for Mines: He is doing it.

Mr. LINDSAY: I defy anyone to prove that that is so. Between 1911 and 1913 McKay sent 2,000 combined harvesters to the Argentine. Some of these are still in the sheds there. No more have since been sent. He is unable to sell one.

Mr. Sleeman: Perhaps they are being made locally.

Mr. LINDSAY: Those that were sold fetched a high price. In those days the American manufacturer would not make them, but to-day farmers are extensively using machines in the Argentine. McKay has not sent one there since 1913. I wish now to quote some figures showing prices. The price of the Australian manufacturer for a 6ft. binder is £75. Massey Harris's price in Toronto is £47. It costs Massey Harris £8 10s. to pack up, ship and freight

the implement to Australia, and there is an addition of 45 per cent. duty when it lands. Another Massey Harris binder is landed at £92 after duty and freight are paid. The American farmer, however, buys the article at £47.

Mr. Sleeman: Why not make these things ourselves?

Mr. LINDSAY: Farmers have lost hundreds of pounds' worth of wheat here through using the locally-manufactured farming implements. Why cannot the State Implement Works manufacture machinery that completely fills the bill?

Mr. Sleeman: You are a very loyal citizen.

Mr. LINDSAY: McKay sells his machinery in Melbourne at between £10 and £12 cheaper than he does here. He has to build it there, pull it down again, pack it, ship it, rebuild it here and sell it to us.

Mr. Sleeman: You would rather buy machinery from a Chow.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LINDSAY: There are not only the high duties, but there is the distance between Canada and Fremantle, and also the distance between Melbourne and Fremantle, all of which have to be added to the cost of machinery; and yet we cannot make machines here to compare with those made in the other States.

The Minister for Railways: Give us something about ploughs and other things.

Mr. LINDSAY: One would assume from the remarks of some members that there was an unholy conspiracy on the part of primary producers not to purchase machinery made by the State Implement Works. The primary producer is just as sensible as any other man. He will buy the machinery that suits him best. I will show why the State implements are not efficient. I will show the kind of thing that is done when it comes to a question of improving machinery. Some four or five years ago a truck arrived at Wyalcatchem. Upon it was a new reaper thrasher of a kind no one had ever seen before. It lay on the truck for weeks, and the local agent for the State Implement Works, Mr. McDowell, eventually put it on the ramp. I asked him what the machine was and he replied that it had evidently been sent up for some purpose. I said I supposed he would give it a trial, and he replied that he would write to the works about it. He did write, and a fitter was

subsequently sent up to fit the machine together. Mr. McDowell then said he would get the loan of some horses and give the machine a trial. We assembled a number of farmers to have a look at it. There was some semblance of good about the machine.

Mr. Sleeman: That is the first good word you have ever uttered for the works.

Mr. LINDSAY: But it was not altogether successful. It was some new thing the works had to assemble. They had obtained it from somewhere and it had been sent up for trial. Would any machinery firm have sent a new machine into the country and allowed it to remain there for weeks before giving it a trial? Not a soul was sent up with it. The works went to the cost of sending it to Wyalcatchem, and no one with any mechanical knowledge except an ordinary fitter was told off to put it in condition for a trial. The machine was put together and we walked around it. The farmers who were present were just as keen on its being successful in its trial as anyone else could be. After the trial the machine was put back on the ramp and left there until Mr. McDowell was told to return it to the works. I could see that several improvements were required here and there. I saw the same machine at the Royal Show some time later on. I also saw Mr. McDowell and asked him why the improvements which had been suggested had not been made. He told me I had better see Mr. Murray, to whom I was introduced. I was going to make some suggestions to that gentleman concerning improvements that had occurred to me. When I told Mr. Murray about them he said, "We will pay your fare to South Australia, and then you can tell May Bros. all about it." I replied I did not want any damned cheap insults, and that I could pay my own fare if I so desired. The machine was eventually sold to a man in Bruce Rock, and no attempt has ever been made to improve it. Could anyone understand McKay's doing a thing like that? Yet members want to know why the State machinery is not successful.

Mr. Sleeman: You ought to be ashamed of your attitude upon the State Implement Works.

Mr. LINDSAY: I have done more for the State Implement Works in the matter of getting improvements made to machinery than has the member for Fremantle.

Mr. Sleeman: You have endeavoured to blacken them whenever you could.

Mr. LINDSAY: The road making machine they now have in operation was the result of my own endeavours. I was the chairman of a road board which imported a road-grading machine from America, the second of its kind ever imported to Australia. The State Implement Works gave a demonstration of a road-grader plough, and I was invited as a member of the Road Boards Association to witness it. Mr. Shaw asked me what was wrong with the machine and I told him what I thought. I said we had a good machine in my district, and that I would have it put in operation at any time it was suitable to him. Mr. Shaw, Mr. Munt and Mr. George, who was Minister then, and Mr. Willmott were with me at the time. It was agreed that a demonstration should be given on the following Sunday. I approached our contractor about it, and we had the machine put into operation on the Sunday. Mr. Shaw, Mr. Munt and the foreman of the plough department took drawings of the machine, although there were 200 patents taken out in connection with it. The works subsequently built a machine which is doing good work to-day. Has the member for Fremantle ever done as much for the State Implement Works?

Mr. Sleeman: You have done nothing but blacken them.

Mr. LINDSAY: I am trying to show the difference in the cost of various types of machinery. The Australian manufacturer's price in Australia of an 8ft. spring-tooth cultivator is £35 odd. The same thing in Canada is £15 15s., in New Zealand £32 2s. 6d., and in Victoria and New South Wales £35 12s. 6d. In Canada high wages are paid, a matter of 30 per cent. more than our men get here, notwithstanding which the manufacturers there can turn out and sell this cultivator at £15 15s. against £35 12s. 6d. in Australia.

The Minister for Railways: They have piecework there.

Mr. LINDSAY: Of course they have. Why should they not?

The Minister for Railways: McKay's have piecework, I mean. You have said there is tremendous virtue in that, and now you are running it down.

Mr. LINDSAY: No. However, McKay's are the only people who can compete. Where is the virtue in the Government organisation preventing McKay from starting here?

The Minister for Railways: With all his virtue, he charges twice as much here.

Mr. LINDSAY: What I have said previously on this subject I am prepared to repeat now. I was in the Eastern States with Mr. Sam McKay for two days going through his works. He questioned me about the possibilities of wheat production in Western Australia. I then told him, and I am prepared now to maintain, that the firm could sell more machines in Western Australia than in all the rest of Australia. Mr. McKay agreed with me, saying "I will go over to Western Australia, and if I can get the same conditions I will start the making"—not the assembling, it is to be noted—"of machines there." When he came over here to consult, a meeting of the metropolitan council of the A.L.P. told him, "You cannot have piecework." His reply was, "If I cannot have piecework here, I will not start at all." The Minister for Railways says Mr. McKay has piecework in the East. Of course he has. Had he been allowed to institute the piecework system in Western Australia, the farmers of Western Australia would have derived the advantages I have indicated. They would have been saved the cost of assembling in the Eastern States, the cost of freight from the East to Western Australia, and the cost of reassembling here. The machines would have cost them fully 10 per cent. less than they are costing to-day. Let me illustrate the difference by quoting figures. In Melbourne a reaper and harvester of 10 feet costs £170. In Perth the same machine costs £181. A 20-disc drill costs £80 in Melbourne, and in Perth costs £88 10s. A combined 16 x 33 in Melbourne costs £76, and in Perth £88 10s. Those prices indicate the saving which would result to Western Australian farmers if the implements were manufactured here. Under those conditions, moreover, there would be 300 or 400 citizens of this State receiving 30 per cent. more than the award of the Arbitration Court. I realise as well as anybody else that in the past there have been serious difficulties about piecework. However, I investigated the piecework system in Victoria. I consulted the men, and I even went so far as to ask how they arrived at prices. Their manner of doing so is remarkable. It appears that three men out of the shop consult with three foremen or officials in like positions. There has been no friction. There has never been a strike in the works. The wages sheets showed that the average person employed there received 30

per cent. more than the wages fixed by the Arbitration Court. However, more than 30 per cent. additional work is done. The overhead costs remain the same whether a man turns out only one ploughshare per day or a greater number. The same amount of supervision is required in either case. If the output of a man is doubled, overhead charges, so far as he is concerned, are reduced by 50 per cent. Consequently the manufacturer must be able to reduce the price of the article. I had not expected to be drawn into all these arguments to-night. If I had foreseen a few of the interjections, I would have collected more data to enable me to deal with the questions that have been raised. I hope that on some future date I shall have the opportunity of addressing myself to them again.

On motion by Mr. Brown, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 8.50 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 6th August, 1929.

	PAGE
Questions: Workers' Compensation Act, abuses	116
Duration of life	117
Superphosphate	117
Sleepers, selling prices	117
Address-in-reply, fifth day	117

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

QUESTION—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT, ABUSES.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN asked the Chief Secretary: In view of the abuses of the Workers' Compensation Act, as disclosed by the insurance companies, do the Government propose to amend that Act during the present session?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied: It is not admitted that the information published by the insurance companies is correct. A statement dealing with the matter will be made shortly.