

The Minister for Education: Unquestionably. What I said in respect of the earlier Bill applies to both.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION (Hon. H. P. Colebatch—East) [5.35]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, 1st March.

I wish again to express my regret at the necessity for asking members to return to-day, and I trust that their well-earned leisure will not again be interrupted. It has been said that "Occasion smiles upon a second leave," and I trust that will be so in this case.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 8th February, 1923.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways—1, Loco. staff's hours; 2, Overhead bridge, Claisebrook Road; 3, Brookton-Armadale project	3120
Mines, Prospecting, Jones' Mining Concessions, Ltd.	3121
Liquor licenses	3121
Fire Brigades' Board, election	3121
Police Inspectors	3122
Water Supply, Metropolitan area	3122
University buildings	3122
Sewerage man-hole, Fitzgerald Street	3122
Water Supply, South Fremantle School	3122
Standing Orders Suspension	3123
Bills: Albany-Denmark Railway Extension, all stages	3123
Albany-Denmark Railway Extension, returned	3136
Bridgetown-Jarnadup Railway Extension, all stages	3136
Bridgetown-Jarnadup Railway Extension, returned	3136
Adjournment: Close of Session	3136

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTIONS (3)—RAILWAYS.

Locomotive Staff's Hours.

Mr. MARSHALL (for Mr. Willcock) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Does the

agreement under which the loco. enginemen are working provide that as far as practicable shifts shall not exceed eight hours? 2, On how many occasions during the month of December were shifts in excess of eight hours worked by loco. enginemen? 3, What was the total cost during December, 1922, to the department of (a) penalty rate paid for hours worked in excess of 10 hours, (b) penalty rates for hours worked in excess of 48 per week? 4, What were the total numbers of hours occupied in cleaning locomotives in December, 1921, and December, 1922? 5, What were the numbers of hours occupied in running locomotives during the same periods?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, 8,257. (This includes both drivers and firemen.) 3, (a) £70 19s. 3d. (b) £74 7s. 7d. 4, 1921—18,274 hours (approximately). 1922—17,445 hours (approximately). 5, 1921—126,856 hours. 1922—123,644 hours.

Overhead Bridge, Claisebrook-road.

Mr. CORBOY (for Mr. Hughes) asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Is it the intention of the Government to construct an overhead bridge over the railway crossing at Claisebrook-road, East Perth? 2, If so, will the necessary funds be provided on the next Estimates?

The MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Not until many works of greater importance have been dealt with. 2, No provision is included in the Loan Estimates.

Brookton-Armadale Project.

Hon. F. T. BROWN asked the Premier: 1, Has he taken into consideration the fact that a railway from Brookton to Armadale will serve all present requirements west of the Great Southern between Brookton and Narrogin? 2, In view of lack of authentic information and the strong opposition to the Dwarda-Narrogin extension, will he instruct the Railway Advisory Board to report upon the proposed Dwarda extension and consider same before proceeding with the work? 3, Would it not be more profitable to the State for the Government to construct a similar distance of railway from Brookton through the fertile Dale district with a view to continuing the line to Armadale at some future date?

The PREMIER replied: 1, I have taken into consideration the construction of a railway from Brookton to Armadale, but not as the line best suited to serve all requirements of the Great Southern between Brookton and Narrogin. 2, We have full reports. 3, The proposed Brookton-Dale railway will serve a long settled and fertile district. I agree that this section should be constructed.

QUESTION—MINES, PROSPECTING.

Jones Mining Concessions, Ltd.

Mr. MARSHALL (for Mr. Cunningham) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has he read a news item appearing in the "West Australian" of the 22nd January, as follows:—"Mining News. A Perth Flotation. Jones Mining Concessions, Ltd. Goldfields off the Beaten Track. The Jones Mining Concessions, Ltd., has been formed in Perth to acquire two concessions, comprising 1,760 acres of gold-bearing country, and 320 acres of asbestos and gold-bearing areas, which were recently discovered in the 'never never' country East of Laverton by the State prospecting party, sent out under the leadership of Captain J. W. Jones, by the Government to find new goldfields off the beaten track. The objects of this company are to give options to sell leases, and Captain Jones and several members of the party are leaving Perth to-night for the new finds to do further prospecting, and to peg out leases. One option over a 48-acre block has already been given, and inquiries have been received from investors and others. The directors of the company are: Walter M. Collins, J.P., chairman, General Bessell Browne, C.M.G., D.S.O., Captain J. W. Jones, F. T. Piesse, and F. Thompson. The Government, in furtherance of its policy to stimulate the mining industry, is sending officials of the Mines and Water Supply Departments to inspect the new finds, and Captain Jones is confident that the official report of these officials will more than confirm that made by him to the Minister for Mines?" 2, Is it a fact that the concessions referred to have been granted? 3, If so, under what statutory authority?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Section 276 of the Mining Act, 1904. Concessions have been granted to the members of the first State Prospecting Party pursuant to an agreement entered into with the party when it was formed, and upon a recommendation of the State Prospecting Board. The agreement provided that upon report and application of the party the Minister could approve of a reservation being made of any area or areas of land and that the party could apply to be registered as the holders of a mining tenement in respect to any area or areas on which any discovery of minerals had been made by the party. The concession covers four reservations: (1) 1,280 acres; (2) 320 acres; (3) 160 acres; and (4) 320 acres: or in all 2,080 acres.

QUESTION—LIQUOR LICENSES.

Midland Junction Bench.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN asked the Premier: In view of the Government's decision to delay the appointment of the Licenses Reduction Board, and in view of the great dissatisfaction caused by the action of the licensing

bench at Midland Junction, will he take steps to reconstruct this bench before the next sitting of the licensing court?

The PREMIER replied: Until Section 20a of the Licensing Act, 1911, as enacted by Section 8 of the amending Act of this session becomes operative by proclamation, members of existing licensing courts continue in office for three years from the date of appointment unless a member dies, resigns, becomes disqualified, or is removed. Decisions of the court are not subject to review by the Government, and there are no grounds to justify the removal of the members of the court from office.

QUESTION—FIRE BRIGADES BOARD, ELECTION.

Mr. MARSHALL asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, What was the date of the last election for a representative to the Western Australian Fire Brigade Board by the various municipal councils and road boards concerned? 2, Who was the successful candidate, and what were the actual figures in regard to the election? 3, Have the results of the election been published in the usual manner? 4, If not, for what reason, and if so, when? 5, Is it a fact that municipalities and road boards concerned have received no official communication regarding the election? 6, If not, for what reason? 7, Is it a fact that the candidates concerned have received no official communication regarding the result of the election? 8, If not, for what reason? 9, Is it a fact that a meeting of the board referred to has been held since the election?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, 31st December, 1922. 2, There were several successful candidates, the regulations providing for the election of representatives of the various bodies mentioned in the Second Schedule of the Act. The actual figures were as follows:—

Part.	Candidates.	Votes.
II.	Ferguson, T. C.	2
	Gibbons, C. M.	1
	Parker, Chas.	4
	Richardsn, W.	4
	Stevens, G. P.	4 (elected)
III.	Davidson, H. W.	6 (elected)
	Docherty, P.	1
IV.	Hickey, J. W.	11 (elected)
	Reading, G. E.	2

There being an equality of votes under Part II., the returning officer, in accordance with the regulations, exercised a casting vote, which was given in favour of the retiring member. The other members of the board are Joseph Robert Campbell (president) and Alfred William Byfield, elected by the Governor in Council; Frederick Collingwood Liggins and Charles Herbert Curlewis, elected

by the insurance companies; James Thomas Franklin, elected by the City of Perth; and John Charles Brennan, elected by the registered volunteer fire brigades. 3, Yes. 4, In the "Government Gazette" of the 5th January, 1932. 5, Yes. 6, Because the regulations provide that "the names of all persons appointed or elected members of the board shall forthwith be notified by the returning officer in the 'Government Gazette' and such notification shall be deemed a declaration by the returning officer of the result of the election." 7, Yes. 8, See answer to No. 6. 9, Yes.

QUESTION—POLICE INSPECTORS.

Mr. CORBOY (for Mr. Hughes) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Is it intended to appoint an inspector of police in the near future? 2, If so, will such appointment be made from the ranks of junior officers who have qualified by examination for promotion to the rank of inspector? 3, Will he give the names of the officers in the police force who have qualified by examination for promotion to the rank of inspector?

The MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, No. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Sergeants M. Leen, M. O'Halloran, R. Anderson, J. Tehan, J. McDonald, J. McLernon, A. Cassidy, R. G. Buttle, W. S. Crowe, M. Tuohy, H. E. Nottley, W. Douglas; Det. Sergeants S. H. Read, G. V. Purdue, B. H. E. McKeown.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, METROPOLITAN AREA.

To inquire by Royal Commission.

Mr. MacCallum SMITH, without notice, asked the Premier:—1, In view of the several public meetings of citizens, supported by the fire brigade authorities, protesting against the inadequate and filthy water supply in portions of the metropolitan area, and the contradictory statements made by the Minister for Works to the House concerning the position, and bearing in mind the serious and dangerous menace of a dirty and inefficient water supply to the health of the community, will the Premier appoint a Royal Commission to investigate the present state of affairs in the Water Supply Department? 2, If the Premier agrees to do so, will he make the appointment immediately in order to cause inquiries and secure evidence whilst the trouble is at its maximum?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is making a statement, and not asking a question. I hardly think the hon. member is in order.

The PREMIER: All I can say is that the matter will have consideration.

Mr. MacCallum Smith: After that reply I will change my seat in the House.

QUESTION—UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS.

Competitive Designs.

Mr. PICKERING, without notice, asked the Premier:—In view of the fact that a sum of £15,000 appears on the Loan Estimates for the erection of science buildings in connection with the University at Crawley, will the Premier give his favourable consideration to the calling for competitive designs for the general scheme of University buildings contemplated, so that uniformity in design and lay-out may be assured?

The PREMIER: I cannot give the hon. member an answer to that question this afternoon, but I will give the matter consideration.

QUESTION—SEWERAGE MAN-HOLE, FITZGERALD STREET.

Capt. CARTER, without notice, asked the Minister for Works:—1, Has application been made by Alexander Falconer, of 377 Fitzgerald-street, for the removal of a sewerage man-hole now situate on his property, so that building operations can be proceeded with? 2, Have the Sewerage Department refused to remove the man-hole? 3, If so, why, and under what section of the Metropolitan Water Supply, Sewerage, and Drainage Act? 4, Will the Minister reconsider the position with a view to enabling the owner to extend his premises as he desires to do?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. Mr. and Mrs. Falconer have been a perfect nuisance to the department, and they are not sustained by law. 2, Yes, because they are advised that they are within their rights according to the law. 3, Answered by No. 2. 4, There is no necessity to reconsider the position.

QUESTION—WATER SUPPLY, A SOUTH FREMANTLE SCHOOL.

Mr. McCALLUM, without notice, asked the Minister for Works: 1, Is he aware that the Convent School in Lefroy-road, South Fremantle, is without a water supply, and that all last week the children attending the school had to carry water in buckets for the purpose of flushing the lavatories, and that during the present week the water supply in the southern portion of South Fremantle has had to be cut off at lunch time each day in order that the school may obtain a supply? 2, Does the Minister propose to take any action in the matter, and, if so, when?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: I am not aware of the matter until now. I will cause inquiries to be made, and will see that the position is remedied. I have had it stated to me that a gentleman could not get a bath at his own house, and yet the evidence showed that there was an ample supply of water.

Mr. Marshall: The member for South Fremantle had better cross the floor.

MOTION—STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [2.45]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable the Albany-Denmark Railway Extension Bill and the Bridgetown-Jarnadup Railway Extension Bill to be introduced without notice this day.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion will need to be agreed to by an absolute majority of the House. There is an absolute majority of members present and in the absence of a negative vote, I will take it that the motion is carried unanimously, thus avoiding the necessity for a division.

Question put and passed; the Standing Orders suspended accordingly.

BILL—ALBANY-DENMARK RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

All Stages.

On motion by the Premier, Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [2.48] in moving the second reading said: I need not say much about the railway proposal, because we have already discussed the quality of the country between Denmark and Pemberton very fully. Members are aware of the possibilities of that great area. We know that the accepted policy of the State is progress. A vital part of that policy is land settlement. The line dealt with in the Bill is necessary to give effect to our policy. My responsibility to the country seems to be quite clear. Responsibility is placed upon me by this Assembly. My responsibility is only limited by my opportunities. Among the many opportunities open to us is the settlement of the land in the South-West. Every member knows that the Crown lands adjacent to our existing railways are rapidly being used up. For some time past we have been surveying those lands as speedily as possible. The surveyors at our disposal are cutting up the land, which has been settled just as rapidly. Quite apart from ordinary methods of settlement, during the last two years we have settled 1,000 men in groups on land adjacent to railways. We have also settled 900 of our own people. Hon. members know that part of the country in the South-West has been selected for many years. A portion of that part of the State must be reserved for timber conservation. The remaining portions are being surveyed and settled. We are coming

to the end of the available Crown lands within the limits of the railways already existing. Hon. members will remember, too, that I endeavoured to get Parliament to give me authority to resume privately-owned and unused lands adjacent to railways. Unfortunately, that Bill did not become law. In the circumstances, I am forced to come to the House and ask for authority to construct this line to open up new country. I want the House to realise what this means. Unless this land is settled, the policy which the people have endorsed from one end of the State to the other must be frustrated.

Mr. Lambert: Can we take it that if the Closer Settlement Bill had been passed, we could have avoided spending a million or more on this railway?

The PREMIER: I do not know that the hon. member can accept that understanding of the position, but had that Bill been passed, we could have carried on with the land adjacent to railways for some little time. In our policy to be frustrated because we disagree as to the method of construction? We agree as to the necessity for the policy and as to the necessity for opening up new Crown lands. The question that has troubled another place is the construction of the line by contract. I told this House that tenders would be called for the Jarnadup-Denmark railway. This House agreed that tenders should be called for the construction of the line. We agreed that if a satisfactory tender were received, that tender would be accepted. We shall call for tenders for the construction of this line and if the contract price be right, we shall accept it. I am not willing to agree that the contractor's price must be accepted whatever it may be, or, failing that, that no line shall be built. I cannot accept that position and it is not reasonable for another place to ask me to do so. The Government are responsible for their administrative acts. This House alone can deal with the Government if it is dissatisfied with their acts. If the Government do not do the right thing, the Assembly can deal with the Government. When it comes to a question of contract or day labour, I must remind the House that the Wilson Government were the first to build the railways by day labour. They did so because it was found the contract prices were too high.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You constructed them cheaper and better.

The PREMIER: There are very few railway contractors available.

Mr. O'Loughlen: They always retire.

The PREMIER: Little by little the contract prices went up until the Wilson Government were compelled, in the interests of the people, to build railways by day labour.

Mr. Lambert: The contractors require only one contract and then they can retire.

The PREMIER: It is true that we call for tenders and the Public Works Department puts in a tender. If its tender be the lowest one, the department is asked to do the work. Can anything more be expected from

the Government? I do not intend to agree to any other proposal. It is unthinkable that we should give the contractor his own price and because we cannot agree to that position, the line is not to be built!

Mr. Corboy: Why not hand over the Treasury to them altogether?

The PREMIER: If the supervision is right, day labour can be carried out as cheaply as contract work. It has always been more difficult to exercise close supervision over Government work than is the case with the contractor.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: No, it is not so.

The PREMIER: There are some reasons why it is as it is.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: But that is not so.

The PREMIER: I think the member for North-East Fremantle (Hon. W. C. Angwin) will agree that it is so, but the fact remains that in the past the Wilson Government were forced to construct lines by day labour in order to carry the work out as cheaply as possible. We want satisfactory work and satisfactory prices. I do not know why another place should hold up the proposal and prevent us from giving expression to the will of the people. We can get out of our financial difficulties permanently—some of those difficulties were inherited by this Government—only by means of land settlement.

Mr. O'Loughlen: You say you inherited these financial difficulties. Many of your colleagues were in the other Governments.

The PREMIER: That is so.

Hon. P. Collier: You got your share as well.

The PREMIER: I say that the present Government have inherited some of these difficulties.

Mr. O'Loughlen: But you have done your share as well.

The PREMIER: That may be, but no man could stem the tide of war.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Well, do not apportion the blame, so as to let yourself off.

The PREMIER: I am not doing so. I am endeavouring to show that when I came into power, the country said we might use this means to get ourselves out of these difficulties on a permanent footing. We must increase our population and our production; we must have increased activities all round and thus increase the prosperity of the people generally. To achieve this, Parliament agreed to the policy we are endeavouring to carry out. We are seeking to give effect to that policy in asking for authority to construct the railways necessary to open up the land in the South-West, so that it may be settled. If it were a matter of the method of settlement, one could understand the action taken in connection with this proposal. The method of settlement is not in question at all. Members of this House know what has been done and what the effect of our policy has been. The people who have participated in the work have in many cases been taken off the labour market permanently and

given a chance in life that they never had before. It is part of our policy to do that and it is part of the policy that must mean permanent prosperity. We must give the people a chance to open up the rich territory we hold in the South-West. I do not understand how this House or another place can hold up the authority to construct lines to make possible the settlement of a great many people. There is no need to talk about the possibilities of the South-West for that has been referred to time and again. It is important that the people should realise what a refusal by Parliament of authority to construct these railways will mean. The policy cannot be continued without this authority. With this authority it can be continued for some time to come. Given this authority I say with all confidence that thousands of new people can be settled in the South-West. The population of this State can probably be easily increased by one-third if the House agrees to the building of this railway. I do not intend to discuss the matter which led to the rejection of the other Bill, but I must impress upon the House the seriousness of the position. I think members agree with me that unless we increase our population, we cannot expect to continue as one of the British dominions. We cannot possibly hold Australia with its present population. Five and a-half millions of people is altogether too small a population to protect Australia, so, apart from the desire to provide permanent work for all our own people, we wish by our policy to provide for Australia's safety in future. If we are to enjoy long life as part of the British Empire we must see that our work is well done now. There is greatness ahead of the State, and I ask the House to ensure that the attainment of that greatness be not delayed until it is too late. I approach the House with the greatest confidence and move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [3.2]: The plans of this railway have just been laid upon the Table. I anticipate that this is the length of line suggested by another place.

The Premier: Yes, it is the same.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have had no opportunity to see where the terminus of the railway will be.

The Premier: The Frankland River.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Will it go to Norralup Inlet?

The Premier: Yes.

The Minister for Works: It is intended to carry it to the most suitable place for a siding.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Will it go sufficiently near to the sea so that the settlers can avail themselves of water carriage to export their produce? If the railway terminus is to be as some distance from the seaboard, settlers will have to continue to pay very dearly for railway haulage.

The Premier: There is no possibility of opening a port at Nornalup. Albany will be 70 miles away.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a possibility of making Nornalup navigable by small craft so that the produce can be taken to Albany.

The Premier: I do not think so.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then Nornalup will be of no use as a seaport.

The Premier: It is not a sea port.

Mr. O'Loughlen: Will this railway go to the rest house?

The Premier: Quite close to it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I glanced at the plan in another place yesterday, and there was no indication where the 44 miles of railway would terminate.

The Premier: Quite near to the river.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Judging from the plan, the first section should be carried on to Nornalup Inlet.

The Premier: It will go near to Nornalup.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: But if it is to terminate some distance away the settlers will be unable to avail themselves of water carriage. The member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) recently stressed the necessity for enabling these settlers to avail themselves of water carriage. If the line is not extended sufficiently to give them the advantage of water carriage, there will be little or no gain from the water. It has been demonstrated for many years that railways constructed along our great stretches of coast line should be built with a view to giving settlers means of communication with the sea. There is no chance of a primary industry like agriculture proving successful in Western Australia for many years to come on account of our small population, unless facilities are provided to export the produce overseas. We had an instance of this the other day when the Minister for Works mentioned that he had to pay so much for railage on timber from the State Sawmills to the sea board, and it was almost impossible for him to compete with overseas timbers being brought to Australia, because they were obtained near to the sea coast and were not burdened with the heavy railage charges which have to be paid here. When this railway is to be constructed so near to the sea board—

The Premier: It will go within a mile.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then the line should be so constructed as to permit of the water service being availed of as well.

The Premier: It will go as near as possible to the sea.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) [3.7]: The ruling grade of the proposed line is one in 60 and the sharpest curve will have a radius of 10 chains, and 60 lb. rails will be used. The line of survey will be portion of the railway previously projected, and will serve a very fair population already settled along

the route and open up a lot of land for additional settlement.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Stubbs in the Chair; the Premier in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Power to Governor to compulsorily purchase land within 15 miles of railway:

Mr. MUNSIE: What necessity is there for this clause? I admit that a similar clause appeared in the other Bill, but we were told there were some holdings which had been occupied for a considerable number of years and through which it might be necessary to run the line in order to secure good grades. If this railway is intended to be part of the Premier's immigration scheme, the amount to be expended on the repurchase of land—

The Premier: Really I do not know of any.

Mr. MUNSIE: I have been out a good way from Denmark and I know there are a fair number of settlers there.

The Premier: They hold only small lots.

Mr. MUNSIE: If the construction of this line means the repurchasing of estates to settle people, the line should not be built. The Committee should consider this phase. If the repurchase clause is necessary, the money should be devoted to railway construction elsewhere.

The PREMIER: A similar clause finds a place in every railway Bill. Not more than one or two holdings at the most will come within the scope of this measure.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5 to 8—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

Third Reading.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

BILL—BRIDGETOWN-JARNADUP RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Message.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation in connection with the Bill.

All stages.

Introduced by the Minister for Works and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. J. George—Murray-Wellington) in moving the second reading said: The length of this

proposed railway is about $44\frac{1}{2}$ miles, and it will comprise $16\frac{1}{2}$ miles of the existing State Sawmills siding from Jarnadup to Pemberton. The balance will be a portion of the proposed new railway from Pemberton to Denmark. The length of the line to be actually constructed will be about 28 miles, the ruling grade will be one in 60, the sharpest curve a 10-chain radius and the rails it is proposed to use will be 60lbs. to the yard. The existing line from Jarnadup to Pemberton was built as a siding in connection with the State Sawmills, and it has been run as a saw-mill railway ever since the start of that important undertaking.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: Was the cost of that put into the sawmills?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It has been capitalised. It has been impossible, of course, for the State Sawmills to run that railway so as to give the same facilities and help to the settlers which would have been done, had the line been in the control of the working railways, because carrying on trade in connection with the timber industry is entirely different from conducting the line as the Railway Department would do. There have been various agitations from time to time—quite justified too—in favour of the line being run as the working railways would have run it had it been in their charge. When the Bill before the House becomes an Act it will then be possible for the department to negotiate with the Commissioner of Railways to transfer to his care the $16\frac{1}{2}$ miles already constructed, and the settlers then will be able to receive the same consideration as is given to other settlers in different parts of Western Australia.

Mr. Munsie: I hope you will make arrangements to credit the State Sawmills with the amount involved.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I shall mention it to my friend the Minister for Trading concerns, who is pretty keen on this matter, and who will see that the hon. member's request receives attention. I went into this question pretty fully a short time ago, but I do not know that there is much more information that I can give to the House, except to state that there never was the slightest idea in connection with the construction of this proposed railway that it should be built otherwise than by calling for tenders, and so giving contractors and other suitable persons an opportunity to put in a price. But it surely cannot be contended that a Government should deal only with those tenders that might be submitted, and that it should leave out altogether its own officers who have been accustomed to construction work of this kind. The part which any Government worthy of the name must take, is to use its discretion in connection with a matter of this sort, and if it is found that the tenders submitted from outside be unsuitable for some reason or other, either in regard to price or condition, it will be for the Government to take the full responsibility, knowing that

they will be answerable to Parliament for whatever may happen in connection with the work. The suggestion with regard to estimates is one that must have the fullest consideration at the hands of any Government, and whether or not the job be ultimately carried out by day labour or by contract is a matter which any self-respecting Government must retain to itself the liberty to decide. There is no desire on the part of the Department to build the line unless ordered by the Government to do so, and as to fears some members may have had with regard to day work, let me inform the House that since the 1st July last the Public Works Department has let petty contracts of a value of £116,000. That is a pretty fair amount for about seven months. Moreover, there has not been a single job that could have been done by contract since I have been Minister in regard to which there has not been fair play. I would prefer to keep the officers of the Public Works Department employed in the positions for which they have been trained, that is, as designers, originators and critics. Their business is to look after the works that are carried out in the State. In some instances these have been done by day work quite successfully, and in others perhaps not so successfully. The railways which have been constructed in this State by the Public Works Department will bear inspection from any person whose life's training has given him experience and knowledge sufficient to make his criticism of value. Unfortunately we have a great amount of criticism which is not of value because it simply comes from hearsay and imagination. The Department I have the honour to direct at the present time, I am sure, will welcome criticism which will be helpful, especially if it comes from those who are competent to criticise. I am satisfied in connection with this proposed line that when tenders are called we shall receive quite a number because there have been inquiries made from abroad in relation to it. But whether we do or whether we do not, if I should happen to be the Minister in charge when tenders are called, it is my intention that the Department shall put in a tender of its own, and that that tender shall be put in the tender box at least two days before tenders from outside are submitted. There will then be no opportunity for anyone to say that the officers of the department have seen the outside tenders and framed theirs accordingly. In the construction of railways we know that as the line proceeds, various alterations which may appeal to the engineers, may have to be made. That is why there is always a margin allowed for deviation. But if anyone should have the idea, as I saw it stated in one of our newspapers, that the officers of the Public Works Department would so alter or fake the estimates if they got the job—

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member quoting from a report in another place?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No, I am dealing with a respectable newspaper. To say that the officers of the department would be likely to fake their figures or plans is unwarranted. Whatever difference of opinion there may be in this House, I am sure members are satisfied that the officers of the Public Works Department are honourable men and can be trusted to do a fair thing. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN (North-East Fremantle) [3.22]: I noticed in the Press this morning that instructions had been issued that we should have a debate on the second measure. Those instructions are being followed, the first Bill having been passed and sent to the Legislative Council. The Premier in introducing the first Bill referred to what had been done in the past. In dealing with the construction of railways it was said that the Government had a deficit which had been inherited. When the present Government took office in May, 1919, there was a deficit of £3,418,480. On the 31st January last that deficit had been increased to £6,009,296, the increase in the period having been £2,590,816.

The Premier: I said I inherited financial trouble.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier did inherit a certain deficit, but the present Government have since then nearly doubled it.

The Minister for Works: On the principle of double or quits.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: After the Labour Party left office, the Government funded the existing deficit. That is the way in which they wiped it out. With regard to the Bill before the House I was sorry to hear one of the statements made by the Minister for Works. It is a well known fact that ever since railways have been constructed departmentally the cost has been less than that of the construction by contract.

The Premier: I would not say that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In nearly every instance. The system of departmental construction was instituted long before the Labour Party came into office; it was instituted at the time when it was said that agricultural railways could be built at £1,000 per mile. This was the price which was quoted by a well known contractor.

Mr. A. Thomson: He did some at that price.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is a great difference between constructing a railway line and a tramway line. Even in those cases the prices were not anywhere near £1,000 per mile. A number of railways were constructed cheaply and it cost the State a considerable sum of money to render them safe. The Labor Party had to spend nearly three millions to make them fit for the traffic they had to carry.

Mr. Pickering: Whose fault was that?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: After the present Minister for Works ceased to control the railways, the system was conducted in such a way as to show a surplus and the outcome was that a thorough examination had to be made to ensure safe working.

The Minister for Works: I left the system in tiptop order.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: In many instances it was necessary to rebuild some of those cheaply constructed railways. I was surprised to hear the Minister say when introducing the Bill a few minutes ago that it was the intention of the Government to call for tenders and that so far as he was concerned, if he was in charge of the department, if those tenders were reasonable the work would be carried out by contract. If the Minister had stopped there, there would have been no cause for complaint, but he went further and said, "I will also see that the Public Works Department put in a tender, and that they do so at least two days before outside tenders are submitted so that there shall be no complaint that those other tenders have been seen." I know the Minister did not intend that as a reflection but there could not be any stronger words used to reflect upon officers of the department than those he uttered. I do not believe that an officer of the department ever sees an outside tender before he puts his in.

The Minister for Works: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That being so, no matter what price is put in the tender for any work, the departmental tender is opened and dealt with on similar lines to those received from private contractors.

The Minister for Works: My words were intended to deal with what appeared in the Press.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I know that, but still the words were used and it could be inferred that the officers of the department would have an opportunity to see the tenders that were put in before they submitted their own. As a matter of fact, tenders are opened by the Tender Board and not by the officers of the Public Works Department. The board consists of officers from various departments and there is no opportunity for an officer from the Public Works Department to see the tenders before they are dealt with. The Tender Board used to meet in Murray-street, well away from the Public Works Department.

The Minister for Works: They meet in the Stores Department in Marquis-street now.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The Premier seems to be under the impression that railways built departmentally cannot have the same supervision as those constructed by contract. I cannot see why that should be. I know it is not so. There is always a ganger in charge of the men and an engineer directly in charge of the work. Hon. members should realise that that engineer is not the

officer responsible for the submission of the tender; he is sent down by the department specially to supervise the work. This engineer is there all the time while the work is in progress. I remember being at the opening of a railway line at Lake Grace. The member for Wagin (Mr. Stubbs) was there at the time and he said it had been stated on many occasions that railways constructed departmentally took longer to build, because the men did not work so hard on day work as under the contract system. He said that so far as the Lake Grace railway was concerned, from his own observation and from statements made to him by people residing in the district, there had been no loafing on the job and that no railway had been constructed so expeditiously as the one he referred to. That was the testimony of the people served by that line. The same thing applies to all railways constructed departmentally. The opposition to that system is based on sentiment. There appears to be a general impression that once a man starts to work for the Government, he is immediately changed from a worker into a loafer. Experience shows that the opposite is true.

Mr. Teesdale: Not necessarily.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is recognised by the workmen themselves that they work harder when they enter the Government service, than under a private employer.

Mr. A. Thomson: Oh, rot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: It is not rot. It is a fact. The impression seems to be that because a man is in Government employment, he does not have to work so hard. If there is any inducement for the men to pay greater attention to their work and to give greater satisfaction, it is in the Government service, because, in all probability, if a man is industrious, his job will become a permanent one. That is not so in outside employment because there is no permanency attached to those jobs and a man is a casual labourer all the time, constantly shifting from one job to another.

Mr. Money: Promotion by merit is understood to be absent in the Government service.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Do not make any mistake about that!

Mr. Money: Well, that is the general impression.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The member for Bunbury (Mr. Money) is referring to the Public Service Act under which the Government are tied down by seniority in connection with promotion. That is a different matter from the one I am discussing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member had better confine his remarks to the railway construction.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There is no employee permanently employed in connection with railway construction. We had an instance in the Assistant Engineer-in-Chief, who was also responsible for carrying out railway construction, who had been for 25 years in the department and when he retired was still not a permanent officer.

Mr. A. Thomson: Twenty-five years employment seems to be pretty permanent!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: There was another instance of the foreman at the Fremantle Harbour Works who had been 21 years in the service and yet was not entitled to any of the advantages accruing to those employed under the Public Service Act. Irrespective of whether the Government concerned be the present Administration or whether the Government be comprised of members of the present Opposition or of the Country Party, the Government of the day must be put in the same position as the private individual. The Government should have the sole right of saying how their work shall be carried out.

Mr. A. Thomson: You did not give them that right when it was a question of selling the State trading concerns.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: No, we did not.

Mr. A. Thomson: It was a different proposition then!

Mr. Pickering: You could not trust the Government then!

Mr. A. Thomson: Not in such a matter as that.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: That concerned an alteration of an Act of Parliament put into force by the National Government, and we kept them up to their word. If a Government, who have pledged their word to certain lines of action, cannot be trusted, and clauses must be put into Bills binding them down to give effect to their pledged word, then the sooner we get rid of such a Government, the better.

Mr. Teesdale: But what about the crowd who wanted to put it in?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Government cannot be carried on by 80 members. The details must be left to the Government. The general principles can be discussed and decided upon by the 80 members of Parliament, but if we are to have what is known as responsible or constitutional Government, there must be a certain amount of confidence reposed in the Government of the day, no matter who they may be. I do not know what the position will be regarding these Bills. I do not care what Government is in power. My vote will go to uphold the rights of the Government in the direction I have indicated. If hon. members say they cannot trust the Government in these matters, they should vote against them and replace the present Ministers with others. There is no necessity to pursue that line of argument, for no member of this Chamber would suggest moving to insert a clause to force these lines to be constructed by contract.

Mr. A. Thomson: I tried to get such a clause inserted.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: When?

Mr. A. Thomson: When the original Bill was discussed.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Then I withdraw what I said the other night when I stated that there were 50 members of the Chamber

who supported the Government in this matter. I find now that there were only 49.

Mr. Pickering: Then the member for Katanning should also go over to the other side!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I trust the House will uphold the Government and maintain the confidence placed in the Government of the day in connection with this matter. Only the Government should decide whether the work should be carried out by day labour or by contract. I gave an instance the other night regarding a building in William-street. Tenders were called and the architect informed those who were erecting the building that the tender was altogether too high. He advised them that the work could be done within the contract price and recommended that it should be carried out by day labour. This was done and the work was finished for £1,000 or £2,000 under the architect's own estimate.

Mr. A. Thomson: What about Wyndham?

Mr. McCallum: I will give you something about Wyndham.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not wish to deal with the Wyndham Meat Works, but if I did, I could wipe the floor with the member for Katanning (Mr. A. Thomson) and so could the Minister for Works, too.

Mr. A. Thomson: I do not think you could.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Yes, I could, because the hon. member goes on hearsay, and not on knowledge of the facts.

Mr. A. Thomson: Then why was the estimate exceeded to such an extent?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I will give one instance. On three occasions certain material required for the construction of the Wyndham Meat Works went to the bottom of the sea, and on each of those occasions it was necessary to procure similar material at a much higher price. Perhaps the hon. member did not know that?

Mr. Wilson: He did not know that the war was on!

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: The hon. member must know there is no comparison between similar work done by private people and the Wyndham Meat Works. If he looked into the matter he would see that the Wyndham Meat Works were erected for much less than similar works undertaken by private people.

Mr. A. Thomson: All the same, the works were erected for a great deal more than the estimate.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: Hon. members cannot compare estimates given prior to the war with work carried out during the war.

The Minister for Works: Of course you cannot.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: We have many instances where contractors had to get their prices increased owing to the great increase in the cost of materials. I hope the Bill will be carried, and that the Government will stick to their guns. If another place insists on its previous line of action, I hope to see—it is not too late yet—a Bill introduced to force another place to go to the country, if

we are forced to do so. If that were done, we could see who was right and who was wrong.

Mr. Pickering: Do you think another place would agree to such a Bill?

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: If they did not do so, it would show that they were afraid to meet their masters. It would be an admission of guilt and make the position of the Assembly so much stronger.

Mr. Angelo: I do not think they would dare reject it.

Hon. W. C. ANGWIN: I do not think they would. Therefore I trust the Government will stick to their guns and insist that they as the Executive supported by a majority of members in this Chamber, alone have the right to say in what manner works authorised by Parliament shall be carried out.

Mr. McCALLUM (South Fremantle) [3.46]: I regret that in one respect the Government have given way to the Council and that, in consequence, the settlers along the railway will be heavily penalised, in that their products will have to be carried anything from 120 to 130 miles by rail to an existing port, whereas, if the railway had been taken to Nornalup and a port there created, the railway carriage would have been only 30 or 40 miles. As it is, the settlers' product will have to come back to Bunbury, or even to Fremantle.

Mr. Money: It should go to Bunbury, not Fremantle.

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not in favour of centralisation at all. The port for this railway should have been at Nornalup. We all understood that if the line were constructed, the settlers' produce, instead of having to be railed hundreds of miles, would be taken to Nornalup.

Mr. A. Thomson: Is this an argument for a railway or for a port?

Mr. McCALLUM: For both. In the Eastern States, particularly in New South Wales, for generations the products of the settlers have been borne past natural ports into Sydney in order to build up an enormous unearned increment on property at the cost of the producers. I am sorry the Government have not entirely repudiated the attitude of the Council and brought down a Bill to provide for the construction of the full length of railway.

The Minister for Works: It could not be done in the same session.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the session could easily have been closed last week and a new one opened to-day. Again, I do not know whether we on this side should not now move to have included in the Bill a proviso that the line shall be constructed by day labour.

The Minister for Works: I hope you will not do that.

Mr. McCALLUM: I think we should do so. I am still of two minds as to whether I shall not move it in Committee.

Mr. Teesdale: You were generous before; do not spoil it now.

Mr. McCALLUM: But I do not wish to have it said that we on this side accept all that has been put forward by another place in respect of day labour versus contract.

The Minister for Works: What has been said here to-day is sufficient to show the attitude of this House.

Mr. McCALLUM: I believe that, on the question of day labour versus contract, there would be found just as big a difference of opinion in this House as there is between the Council and the Assembly. Even now I do not know whether I should not move this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: It cannot be done at this stage.

Mr. McCALLUM: Of course not, but I am at liberty to intimate now that I shall move it when in Committee.

Mr. A. Thomson: Is that a threat?

Mr. McCALLUM: It does not matter in the slightest how the hon. member may regard it. We ought not to let it go out to the country that we on this side have nothing whatever to say to the challenge thrown out by another place that in no circumstances must the new line be built by day labour. I am not for a moment prepared to admit that there is no effective answer to that challenge. I should have liked to see the Minister for Works come down to-day with facts from his department to refute what has been said by another place, and in the Press by members of another place.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow a general discussion on the principle of day labour versus contract.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the Bill is before the Chamber in consequence of that principle.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will be able to discuss it more freely in Committee if and when he moves his proposed amendment.

Mr. McCALLUM: But surely I can refer to it on the second reading, since the meeting of the House to-day has been called because of that principle?

The Minister for Works: You have indicated your views on the subject.

Mr. McCALLUM: But I want to give definite instances in refutation of what has been said elsewhere.

The Minister for Works: You need not trouble about that.

Mr. McCALLUM: But the people are looking for some answer to the statements put forward by another place.

Mr. Teesdale: Statements similar to that accusing us in this House of suborning the truth. You are quite right in doing that—if you are permitted.

Mr. McCALLUM: The actions of another place call for refutation.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing under this Bill the actions of another place. I am not preventing the hon. member from giving reasons why the Bill should be passed, but I do not want a general discussion on contract versus day labour.

Mr. McCALLUM: One of the purposes in bringing down the Bill in its present shape is to combat the stand taken by the recent conference of managers of both Houses, where an endeavour was made to insert a clause binding the Government to construct the line by contract. The Bill before us does not contain a clause which was in the measure previously before the House, a clause which provided that the Government were to call for tenders, that a price could also be submitted by the department, and that the Government should be left free to determine between contract and departmental estimates. That clause is no longer in the Bill. One of the reasons for its omission was the conflict between the two Houses. As to the cost of constructing the Wyndham freezers, not only were quantities of materials sunk on the way out here, but if a comparison be made between the Wyndham freezers and the Darwin freezers, in point both of originally estimated cost and of ultimate cost, it will be found to be wholly in favour of Wyndham, which was erected by the State, whereas the Darwin works were erected by private enterprise. There is a substantial difference between the ultimate cost and the original estimate in respect of the Fremantle meat works also.

Mr. Pickering: Are there any reasons for that?

Mr. McCALLUM: Of course, just as there were reasons for the seeming high cost of the Wyndham works; but all those reasons have been suppressed. Again, the construction of the Trans-Australian railway was not carried out exclusively by day labour. Many instances could be given of contracts let for earthworks adjacent to sections of earthworks carried out by day labour, and it could be shown that the contract price exceeded the cost of the day labour work.

The Minister for Works: There was a special reason for that.

Mr. McCALLUM: The portion of the work done by day labour will stand comparison with that done by contract.

Mr. Pickering: You are wholly opposed to contract?

Mr. McCALLUM: Not necessarily. In some instances the contract system would be in the interests of the State; but there is no excuse whatever for railway construction being carried out by contract.

Mr. Money: Have you any reason why railway construction should be carried out by day labour?

Mr. McCALLUM: Yes. In this respect I will give you, not my own views, but the views of independent technical men.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I am allowing the debate to get wide of the subject before the Chair, which is the construction of the railway. There is no mention in the Bill of the way in which the railway is to be constructed.

Mr. O'Loghlen: But that is why the Bill is here.

Mr. McCALLUM: It is the whole reason.

Mr. SPEAKER: Although it may be the whole reason, it is not the question before the Chair. However, I will let the hon. member read a paragraph in support of his argument.

Mr. McCALLUM: For the information of those who think the only people who support day labour are those connected with the Labour Party, I will give the opinions of experienced independent men who have stood for day labour. In 1913 the then Acting Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Rolland, in a report to the Minister, touched upon the construction of the Port Hedland-Marble Bar railway, and proceeded as follows:—

Eliminating this in order to give a perfectly fair comparison, the rate per mile under contract comes out at £1,865. It should also be noted that included in the above figures are three especially expensive lines built by day labour, namely:—Naraling-Yuna, rate per mile, £3,710; Upper Darling Range railway extension, rate per mile £3,363; Northampton-Ajana, rate per mile £2,858. Deducting these, the average cost per mile by day labour, for 446.8 miles works out at £1,680, compared with £1,565 per mile for 513.5 miles constructed under contract, showing a difference in favour of day labour construction of £185 per mile.

Mr. Mann: Might there not be some expensive lines under the contract system?

Mr. McCALLUM: He starts off by striking out the Marble Bar railway.

Mr. A. Thomson: What about the Bridgetown line?

Mr. McCALLUM: That did not come in this period. The engineer goes on to say:—

There can be little doubt but that under departmental construction railways can be built for approximately 10 per cent. less than under contract.

The present Engineer-in-Chief in submitting a report to the late Mr. Frank Wilson who was then his Minister, and who can be accused by no one of labour sympathies, said:—

I recommend the acceptance of the lowest tender, namely that of Messrs. Hill and Rennie for the sum of £30,778 0s. 10d. I am of opinion that when tenders are called one should be accepted, provided that it does not exceed the departmental estimate by more than a fair amount for profit and risk. I can always do work of this nature cheaper than a contractor, and if tenders are called and the tenderers put to the expense and trouble of preparing their tenders only to find the work given to the department, very soon there will be no tendering. Where it is considered desirable to do work departmentally, no tender should be called. The departmental estimate for the work is £54,000; the lowest tender £63,699 9s. 9d. I have already stated on other papers (see extract from P.W. 7702/10 attached), that owing to many advantages, the department is able to carry out the work of construction cheaper than a contractor.

I have a list of cases that came under my notice when dealing with the trades union movement. I could refer to the construction of Parliament House, of the law courts, and of the Claremont Asylum.

Mr. A. Thomson: And you could refer to the construction of the Trades Hall.

Mr. McCALLUM: That was built at a price considerably lower than the estimate, because it was built under the day labour system. When the financial magnates entered into the question and advanced money for additions they laid down the conditions under which this money should be spent, conditions that I would not have agreed with had I had anything to do with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Trades Hall does not come into this Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: I wish it did. I could quote instances of concessions having been given to private contractors. Why all this consideration for the private contractor, and why all this barracking for him? When a private contractor is building a line for the Government a departmental engineer is sent out to supervise him. Why cannot that engineer be supervising work while it is being done by the State?

Mr. Money: The intention is to look after the taxpayers.

Mr. McCALLUM: Who sends him out?

Mr. SPEAKER: We had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: I should like to have a full-dress debate on this matter

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit it under this Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: Statements have been made to the public that departmental labour is costing the State an enormous amount. I should like to show the true position between that system and the system of private contract. Deals have been entered into with private contractors and every consideration has been given to such people. They have had allowances for extras, and alterations to their contracts have been permitted.

Mr. Pickering: Are you not reflecting on the department?

Mr. McCALLUM: Undoubtedly I am. I know that this sort of thing went on years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member had better get back to the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM: I drew the attention of the public to this matter at the time. If a private contractor were building this railway the department would send an engineer along the track to pass the work, and see that it was according to specifications and at the same time look after the interests of the State. That engineer would be on the track all the time. Why, therefore, can we not dispense with the private contractor? If the engineer can look after the State's interests with a contractor, why cannot he do so without one? If it were not for the possibility of hampering the Government in this clash between the two branches of the legislature,

I should move an amendment to this Bill to provide that the line must be constructed by day labour. I do not, however, wish it to be thought that we are in any way playing into the hands of another place. If there is to be a clash, I do not want that position to be set up.

Mr. Lambert: We are not to be in the scrap.

Mr. McCALLUM: If it comes to a scrap before the public, we will make our position clear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McCALLUM: I am not going to help another place, which is elected on a restricted franchise and which wrests from the Government the power to administer the country, when the Government and this Chamber are elected by the votes of the people.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss another place on this Bill. I have already allowed too much latitude.

Mr. McCALLUM: I appreciate your action, Mr. Speaker, but it is a pity we cannot go into the question as it has appeared before the public. It places members in an unfortunate position.

Mr. Pickering: An invidious position.

Mr. McCALLUM: I should like the position of our party placed before the public.

Mr. A. Thomson: I do not think we had any doubt as to which side you were on.

Mr. McCALLUM: I know that, but I wanted to give the House our case in answer to the arguments put forward by another place.

Mr. A. Thomson: You have done it pretty well.

Mr. McCALLUM: I have not been able to do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McCALLUM: Members are tempting me to go on with the discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member had better leave that matter until another time.

Mr. McCALLUM: But for the fact that I do not desire to hamper the Government, I would take the step I have suggested in order to force a decision between the two policies.

Mr. PICKERING (Sussex) [4.7]: The Minister in introducing the Bill made it clear that one of the reasons for its introduction was the action of another place in rejecting the Bill a few days ago.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not discuss the action of another place on this Bill. I have already allowed hon. members too much latitude on this Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: I should have thought you would have allowed a lot of latitude.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss another place except on a substantive motion.

Mr. PICKERING: I favour the contract system as against that of day labour. By adopting the system of contract we get trained men engaged upon the work.

Mr. Lambert: Do you take exception to the day labour going on in your own district?

Mr. PICKERING: No, not if the position is properly understood. Tenders should be called for the work in the first instance.

Mr. Lambert: Will you tell the group settlers that?

Mr. PICKERING: Of course I would be prepared to do so. I am glad the Government thought it wise to call us together again to deal with these two measures. It is evident, in view of what has appeared recently in the Press in regard to the proposals of the Imperial Government that an increase of 50 per cent. in the migration policy should be undertaken by the Government of Western Australia, that this line will be necessary to enable the Government to cater for the greater influx of people. The policy for this State is one of migration. If we can increase the quota to the extent of 50 per cent. as indicated in to-day's paper, it is a wise policy for the Government to assist in the construction of railways to open up this fertile portion of the State. This railway will best be given effect to if carried out on the contract principle. I am glad the Minister gave us an assurance that there would be opportunities given for the outside public to tender for the work. The suggestion of the Minister that Government tenders should be put in two days before the closing of tenders, is not a wise one. Much as I might trust officers of the department, it is possible leakages may occur, and the private contractors might obtain an advantage over this State because of such leakages.

The Minister for Works: Tenders are deposited in a box which is kept locked, and to which no one has any access.

Mr. PICKERING: It is possible that information will leak out to the detriment of the Government. A lot has been said about the advantage of the day labour system versus the contract system. If there is any fault resulting from the contract system in the matter of road construction, the sole responsibility must lie with the particular Government department. It is a direct slur on departments to say that the work carried out by contract is inferior to that carried out by day labour.

Mr. Munsie: It has always proved to be so in this State.

Mr. PICKERING: There have been rumours that certain railways constructed by day labour were not taken over by the Commissioner because of the state in which they were.

Mr. Corboy: Rumours?

Mr. PICKERING: These statements have been definitely made.

Mr. Corboy: Why not give us facts to back up your statements?

Hon. P. Collier: You cannot give facts and rumours as well.

Mr. PICKERING: I have heard it stated.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must confine himself to the Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: Provision is made in the Bill for the resumption of land. I con-

gratulate the Government upon their having recognised the principle of arbitration in respect to land that is resumed. I do not know how far this power will give effect to the position set forth in the Closer Settlement Bill. In that Bill provision was made for the purchase of land from members of Parliament. I do not know whether on the route of this proposed line there is land owned by members of Parliament. I do not know whether under the Constitution Act—

Mr. SPEAKER: The Constitution Act provides for that matter.

Mr. PICKERING: It prevents that?

Mr. SPEAKER: It provides for that.

Mr. PICKERING: I am glad of your assurance to that effect, Sir. I recognise that the line is necessary, and I trust that the Government will do as the Minister for Works has indicated—give every opportunity for fair tenders for this work. I am quite satisfied that if the Minister gives us his assurance that tenders will be called, and that the opening of tenders will be conducted in a proper manner—

The Minister for Works: It always has been.

Mr. PICKERING: Then this House need have no hesitation in passing the Bill. I regret very much that when the discussion occurred on the measure which these Bills replace, the House did not have the confidence of the managers at the conference. There are rumours about the town that a compromise could have been reached.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must discuss the Bill, and not what happened last week.

Mr. PICKERING: But we have had interjections on that point from hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. PICKERING: It has been said that another place should be outed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry, but I cannot allow the hon. member to say that again here. The hon. member must confine himself to the Bill.

Mr. PICKERING: It is not my wish to make any such statement. I am glad that the Government have re-introduced their proposal in a new guise, and I trust that these Bills will be passed by another place.

Mr. LAMBERT (Coolgardie) [4.18]: In pursuing their developmental policy the Government have been somewhat balked. If they wish to preserve their self-respect and dignity, they will probably have to carry the fight beyond the walls of this House, and into the provinces of this State. Speaking previously on developmental railways, I stated that there was a tendency to throw down agricultural lines in a haphazard fashion, without proper regard for their ultimate terminals or the economical working of the railway system. However, such a statement hardly applies to the present Bill. Appar-

ently there are differences of opinion with another branch of the legislature.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot permit the hon. member to discuss the different ideas or principles of another Chamber. The hon. member must keep to the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: It seems to me that one would be in order in discussing the essential features of the Bill with a view to arriving at a conclusion whether our decision will be acceptable to another place. If it is merely a matter of saying yea or nay to the proposal to construct this line—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will realise that it is only necessary to offer suggestions in connection with the matter before the House. Because a subject is before the House, an hon. member should not think that he has the right to discuss all and sundry aspects of the proposition. This is a Bill to authorise a railway, and the hon. member can discuss the necessity or otherwise of the railway.

Mr. LAMBERT: Let us first review the necessity for the construction of the railway. That matter is linked up with the policy of the present Administration. The policy of the Government was sufficiently wide to include matters of land settlement, and one of their objects was to provide that land alongside our existing railways should be utilised to an extent ensuring that interest and sinking fund would be recouped before the State was launched upon an expensive scheme of agricultural railways. As an offshoot of the Government's policy, we had the question of closer settlement. A Bill was passed by this House authorising the Government to acquire privately-owned land upon equitable terms. However, others have differed from the Government as regards that portion of their policy.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid I must stop the hon. member. The hon. member must keep to the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: But in discussing the policy of the Government—

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a matter of the policy of the Government, but of a railway from Bridgetown to Jarnadup. The policy of the Government is not in question. I shall have to ask the hon. member to sit down, unless he keeps to the subject of the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: It seems to me that the matter of building this railway is part and parcel of the Government's developmental policy.

The Minister for Works: You have not read the Bill. The Bridgetown-Jarnadup railway has been built for years.

Mr. LAMBERT: Then the question is one of extending that railway, if the Minister desires me to be more correct than he himself sometimes is. An alternative to the proposed railway extension would be for the Government to acquire land alongside existing railways. Am I permitted to discuss the matter so far, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will tell the hon. member when he is out of order.

Mr. LAMBERT: I should have liked the Government to show political dignity and political backbone, qualities which are essential to the carrying out of a policy after it has been framed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not discuss the policy of the Government under this Bill. He can discuss the railway. I am afraid I shall have to take strong measures with the hon. member. I do not wish to do it.

Mr. LAMBERT: I shall make it unnecessary for you to adopt strong measures, Sir, because I shall conclude, seeing there is nothing much left for me to discuss. As a matter of developmental policy, the proposed railway extension would receive my endorsement. The unfortunate circumstances of a re-discussion of the matter make it particularly hard to debate the question, seeing that one has certain things in one's mind but is not allowed to mention them. In my opinion, the Government have failed to an extent which we never anticipated. They would have done well to pursue the development of agricultural lands alongside existing railways instead of incessantly calling upon Parliament to authorise developmental railways which must add to the burdens of the people without giving any corresponding advantage.

Mr. Teesdale: The others throw them all out.

Mr. LAMBERT: They would throw the hon. member out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAMBERT: I feel that in giving tentative support to this Bill I am doing so for reasons the discussion of which would hardly come within the scope of the measure. If a continuance of this policy of building railways is essential to the development of the State and the Government are balked in that policy, there is only one straightforward way in which they can preserve their dignity. Whether any other administration could get the necessary authority—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss that question. He must keep to the Bill. I do not wish to threaten him, but I shall not stand any more of it.

Mr. LAMBERT: My remarks were dealing with the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: They were not. The hon. member must deal with the Bill.

Mr. LAMBERT: I do not wish to discuss it any further, but I am afraid you, Sir—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must keep to the Bill and not discuss me or any body else.

Mr. LAMBERT: If tenders are called for the construction of this line, the Government should exercise the greatest caution. Without going into the merits or demerits of contract versus day labour, I think this House has a jealous regard for economy in railway construction. In the light of experience the Government can come to only one conclusion,

and I hope they will not be side-tracked by those who would politically handcuff them for a reason other than that of economy. I appreciate the leniency you have shown, Mr. Speaker, but you will realise the difficulty of discussing the question on its actual merits without referring to the undue and unfair action of another place.

Mr. HUGHES (East Perth) [4.34]: The Bill proposes to authorise a railway which must add considerably to the burden of taxation. Western Australia is honey-combed with railways and one wonders why steps are not taken to bring into use the land in close proximity to existing lines. Our railway system has evoked much complaint owing to the working expenses exceeding the revenue. One of the principal causes is that the settlers are so spread out that we have to grant them concession rates in order to give them farming requisites, and we do this irrespective of whether the man is a struggling or a prosperous settler. The result is that the railway revenue will not balance working expenses. Now it is proposed to build another expensive railway which will add considerably to working costs and necessitate the finding of a large sum of money annually, thus heavily increasing the burden of taxation placed upon the people in the metropolitan area. Before starting this railway the Government should spend a little money on developmental work in the metropolitan area to make the railway of service. If we lose the people from the metropolitan area, there will be no market for the produce resulting from the development of the South-West. We have more miles of railway per head of population than any other State of the Commonwealth, and the Government should do a little work in the metropolitan area. What would be the position if there were no consumers for the produce to be grown by these people?

Mr. Teesdale: There are too many now.

Mr. HUGHES: If something is not done to improve the metropolitan water supply, there will be no customers for the produce raised by the agriculturists along this line.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUGHES: To demonstrate the uselessness of this line, I take it I am in order in referring to the health of the consumers.

Mr. SPEAKER: But not to the water supply.

Mr. HUGHES: But it will be useless to build a line to develop agricultural production if at the same time the Government, by the water supply, poison their prospective consumers in East Perth and North Perth. The residents of those districts have daily to consume water which is quite red and thick—

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot allow the hon. member to discuss that under this Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: I regret I am not permitted to demonstrate that we shall have no consumers for the produce to be raised in the South-West unless a little expendi-

ture is diverted to East Perth and North Perth.

The Minister for Works: There is any amount of beautiful water along this railway.

Mr. HUGHES: Is there any chance of laying a water main and bringing some of it to North Perth?

The Minister for Works: No.

Mr. HUGHES: If the Minister had to drink the water now being supplied there, he would immediately start laying a pipe line to improve the supply. If the Government intend to embark upon the expenditure of a large sum of money, they should be able to prove that it will be of benefit to Western Australia, but of what benefit will the railway be if we have an establishment like the State Implement Works on which the agriculturists will depend for their machinery, closed up owing to the cussedness of the Government?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to be side-tracked in that way. The hon. member must keep to the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES: If it is not possible to show the uselessness of the railway, there is very little to be said. I shall not oppose the second reading, because the vital question is whether we shall submit to undue dictation by another place.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is the railway. Another place does not come into the question at all.

Mr. Munsie: We would not be considering the Bill but for the action of another place.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is unfortunate that the Bill does not allow an open discussion on everything in general to suit the wishes of hon. members. However, the debate must be conducted with due regard for the Standing Orders. I have allowed a tremendous amount of latitude, more than I intend to allow in future.

Mr. HUGHES: While in ordinary circumstances I would probably have voted against

the Bill, to do so on this occasion would be to vote in favour of another place. That, I cannot do. Although we are discussing a railway Bill, we are really considering the privileges of another place.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etc.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

Sitting suspended from 4.45 to 5.45 p.m.

BILLS (2)--RETURNED FROM COUNCIL.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received a message from the Council returning the following Bills without amendment:—

1. Albany-Denmark Railway Extension.
2. Bridgetown-Jarndup Railway Extension.

Hon. W. C. Angwin: A complete backdown by the Council.

Mr. McCallum: They deserve it.

The Premier: All's well that ends well.

ADJOURNMENT—CLOSE OF SESSION.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir James Mitchell—Northam) [5.44]: I move—

That the House at its rising adjourn until Thursday, 1st March.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.

Parliament was prorogued to 31st May, 1923, by Proclamation issued in the *Government Gazette* published on 23rd February, 1923.