

price for wheat will continue and that the favourable season with its bountiful rains and warmth encouraging the growth of crops and grass, will continue and result in a bountiful harvest for the State. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

On motion by Hon. W. T. Glasheen, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly.

*Tuesday, 30th July, 1929.*

	PAGE
Temporary Chairmen of Committees ... ..	19
Questions: Wheat, bulk handling ... ..	19
Cattle, exports to Java ... ..	19
Railways—1, Boyup Brook-Cranbrook; 2, Karlgardin ... ..	19-20
Land Titles Office ... ..	20
Technical Education Superintendent ... ..	20
"White City" ... ..	20
Sitting days and hours ... ..	20
Government business, precedence ... ..	20
Bill: Supply (No. 1), £1,900,000, all stages ... ..	20
Leave of absence ... ..	24
Address-in-reply, second day ... ..	24

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

### TEMPORARY CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I desire to inform the House that I have appointed the following as temporary Chairmen of Committees for the present session:—Mr. E. H. Angelo (Gascoyne), Mr. G. J. Lambert (Coolgardie) and Mr. A. H. Panton (Menzies).

### QUESTION—WHEAT, BULK HANDLING.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Have the committee appointed by the Government completed their inquiry into the question of bulk handling of grain in Western Australia? 2, When will the Government make the report available? 3, If the full report is not likely to

be ready in the near future, will the investigations so far as carried out be made available to those members of the House who are keenly interested in the question?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture replied: 1, No. 2, The investigations have not reached the stage when the information available will be interesting to members of the House.

### QUESTION—CATTLE, EXPORTS TO JAVA.

Mr. GRIFFITHS asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, In view of the cable from Weltevreden, Java, published in the "Daily News" of the 4th June, 1929, stating "Cattle for Java. Untrustworthy certificates. W.A. Imports banned. The Dutch East Indian Director for Agriculture has prohibited the importation of Australian cattle in consequence of lung disease, and Western Australian certificates have officially been denounced as untrustworthy," has any action been taken to prove or disprove this alarming and damaging statement about our Stock Department? 2, If no action has been taken, does he intend the statement to go unchallenged, and have no steps taken to remedy the position, should it be as the Dutch authorities have stated?

The PREMIER (for the Minister for Agriculture replied: 1, Yes. 2, Answered by No. 1.

### QUESTIONS (2)—RAILWAYS.

*Boyup Brook-Cranbrook.*

Mr. THOMSON asked the Premier: In view of the serious problem of unemployment confronting the State, and as it is imperative that transport facilities be provided in the interests of settlers to enable them properly to develop their holdings, is it possible for the Government to anticipate the Loan Estimates and immediately start the Boyup Brook-Cranbrook authorised railway, thus providing work for men and a long promised necessity for the settlers?

The PREMIER replied: Having regard to the number of works required, it is not possible to anticipate the Loan Estimates for any particular work. I have already arranged to receive a deputation with regard to this railway.

*Karlgarin.*

Mr. BROWN asked the Premier: 1, When do the Government intend to commence the construction of the railway to Karlgarin? 2, In the event of the railway not being completed in time for the 1929-30 harvest, will the Government establish a wheat dump at Karlgarin?

The PREMIER replied: 1, When sufficient progress has been made with the survey which is about to commence. 2, The matter will receive consideration.

**QUESTION—LAND TITLES OFFICE.**

Mr. MANN asked the Minister for Justice: Will he cause the vaults at the Titles Office and recent additions to them to be examined by a health officer with a view to ascertaining whether they are injurious to the health of persons employed in them?

The MINISTER FOR JUSTICE replied: No. The whole position as regards the Titles Office is well known to the Government and the provision of new premises is under serious consideration.

**QUESTION—TECHNICAL EDUCATION.***Appointment of Superintendent.*

Mr. STUBBS asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Were applications called in October last for the position of Superintendent of Technical Education? 2, Was any appointment made? 3, If not, what is the reason for the delay in making an appointment?

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

**QUESTION—“WHITE CITY.”**

Mr. DAVY asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Government to perpetuate “White City” by turning it into a parking area?

The PREMIER replied: The Government fail to understand how “White City” can be perpetuated if it is converted to a better use. In any case, the Government have no jurisdiction over its legitimate use, as the area is vested in the State Gardens Board.

**SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.**

On motion by the Premier, ordered: That the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.15 p.m., if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 onward.

**GOVERNMENT BUSINESS, PRECEDENCE.**

On motion by the Premier, ordered: That on Tuesdays and Thursdays Government business shall take precedence of all motions and Orders of the Day.

**BILL—SUPPLY (No. 1) £1,900,000.***Standing Orders Suspension.*

**THE PREMIER AND TREASURER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.48]: I move—

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as is necessary to enable resolutions from the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means to be reported and adopted on the same day on which they shall have passed those Committees, and also the passing of a Supply Bill through all its stages in one day, and to enable the business aforesaid to be entered upon and dealt with before the Address-in-reply is adopted.

Question put and passed.

*Message.*

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the purposes of the Bill.

*In Committee of Supply.*

The House having resolved into Committee of Supply, Mr. Panton in the Chair,

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder) [4.51]: I move—

That there be granted to His Majesty on account of the services of the year ending 30th June, 1930, a sum not exceeding £1,900,000.

This is the usual two months' Supply that is asked for at the opening of every session.

Hon. G. Taylor: And it is granted?

The PREMIER: I do not think it has yet been withheld. On more than one occasion we have had to come down again for

further Supply before the Estimates were submitted: but the Estimates are already drawn, and I am confident that they will be introduced before the end of August, which is the period covered by this Supply Bill. The Supply asked for is based upon the expenditure of last year and of previous years, and there is no alteration whatever. Of course, there is the amount that has been set aside under the Financial Agreement.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That amount is not in this.

The PREMIER: No, but I wish to say that the House will have an opportunity of deciding, when the Estimates are introduced, the purpose to which that money is to be appropriated.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I do not mean on the Estimates.

The PREMIER: I do not know of any other way.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You can find another way.

The PREMIER: It is immaterial whether the House decides on the Estimates or in any other manner. I am not much concerned as to that. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks there is any better way of discussing the matter, I shall be prepared to consider it. However, the first opportunity will be availed of.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have heard that before.

The PREMIER: It is so.

" Sir James Mitchell: I have heard that before, too.

The PREMIER: When the amount is appropriated in the Estimates—

Mr. Marshall: We heard such statements when we were sitting in Opposition.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: I have no doubt that I have made that statement before.

Hon. G. Taylor: Somebody else has made it, too.

The PREMIER: The first opportunity has been made available to members. However, there are certain limitations imposed in regard to finances, not in this House maybe, but in another place. At any rate, the fullest opportunity will be given to discuss the purpose to which that money shall be devoted, when the Budget is introduced.

**HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL** (Northam) [4.56]: I am glad to hear that the House will have an opportunity to discuss the item of £350,000. The people are, of

course, wildly enthusiastic about finance. So important is the subject that they revel in statements which contain figures. Indeed, it is the most important subject. It covers everything. I agree with the person who said that finance is government. Undoubtedly it is. If we are to have the opportunity to discuss what shall be done with the £350,000—and of course we shall have such an opportunity when the Budget comes along—

The Premier: It is two years now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Two years and a half. But there are other years ahead of us. The amount will not always be £350,000. The Premier, by the way, when inducing the House to vote for the Financial Agreement said the amount was £427,000. At any rate, this £350,000 is money that is taken back from sinking fund. It is largely interest earned upon the stocks held by the Sinking Fund Trustees, which stocks will be cancelled, so that we are taking money from past contributions and using it towards present-day revenue. Something has to be done with it, since we have decided that we shall no longer keep our compact with the British money lender, but substitute something else. I would like again to say to the Premier that to pay in 58 years is not the same thing as to pay now, or within the next year or two, as we should have had to pay from the sinking fund had we not entered upon the Financial Agreement.

The Premier: Yes, but there were about 19 millions for which no provision had been made in the way of sinking fund.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In the ordinary course we do not pay sinking fund for four years on borrowings, and so there would be 18 millions borrowed by the Premier during the last four years on which we would not be paying sinking fund under the old arrangement. Besides, there are certain other moneys that do not carry sinking fund. But the sinking fund had increased with the contributions plus the interest on the investments by something over £600,000 annually, year in and year out over many years. The earnings of the sinking fund were far more than the contributions towards it. That has stopped now. However, we have finished with it and it is no use going back over the thing, the Premier will be pleased to know.

Mr. Marshall: You put up a record deficit on that basis.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What basis?

Mr. Marshall: The basis of your argument.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is perfectly true, and I am much obliged to the hon. member; but the greatest deficit was covered by interest on sinking fund, and so really there was no deficit at all. I thank the hon. member for allowing me to make that explanation. In my time there were deficits inherited from those who went before. The Premier forgot to say that the deficits were reduced in my time from nearly £700,000 to just over £200,000. Now we are back to a deficit of £275,000. I am going to speak shortly on the Address-in-reply, and I shall then deal with finance a little. In the Governor's Speech the Premier said that the finances were perfectly satisfactory. Indeed, I think he said their condition was highly satisfactory.

The Premier: There is a surplus, having regard to this £350,000.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course, having regard to something received from the past.

The Premier: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Mr. Bruce, in his speech to the conference, suggested that we had a surplus last year.

The Premier: He said it: he did not merely suggest it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, he said it; and of course it was not true, since it was arranged that the £350,000 was not to come off revenue. The Premier gave him to understand that it was so, and naturally he used the figures. We should vote this Supply. I do not know where the Premier is to get the money from. I suppose he will have to make use of the overdraft freely, because nothing has been borrowed, so far as I know, during the last three months. The Premier has told us that the State's credit in London is splendid. I do not know how he is aware of the fact, because he is not in a position to find out if his statement is accurate. We have not the right to go on the money market and test the State's credit. The Minister for Works told the people at Kulja the other day that the credit of the State was magnificent. It may be, but in these days I suppose it is almost a matter of indifference to the Premier, except that it is good to know that the State is regarded favourably. It is probably a matter of in-

difference to him because the State cannot go on the London market for a loan. All we can do is to borrow at the request of the Federal Government and offer the lenders Federal bonds in return. We have thrown away our right of freedom to go on the London money market.

The Premier: We can go to our bankers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Even so, our credit with them is no better than it was in former years.

The Premier: It is no worse.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is not, but it might well be!

The Premier: They know the position pretty well although they are a long way from us.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: When I was in London in 1922, I saw our bankers about the overdraft and made necessary arrangements of which the Premier has since been able to avail himself. The Premier has rightly pointed out that the availability of the overdraft has saved to the State large sums of money, and it would certainly be foolish to go on the money market for a loan seeing that it might cost the State 1 per cent. or perhaps  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. more than we have to pay on the overdraft.

The Premier: It is not so much now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What is the charge now?

The Premier: I think it is  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In my time they charged 3 per cent., and later 4 per cent. I thought it was still 4 per cent. At any rate, the arrangement has been decidedly advantageous, although I suppose the bank rate will increase again. The position at the 31st March was anything but satisfactory. The Loan Account showed an overdraft of £1,380,000, the Revenue Account an overdraft of £668,000, while the Advance to the Treasury was overdrawn to nearly the full £500,000 that we granted last year. On top of that we have the London overdraft, and mighty little money here.

The Premier: That has been a common occurrence for many years past. We have had that overdraft for a long time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That may be so. At the same time, I should imagine the overdraft in London must cause the Premier some concern because he has not now the freedom to go on the money market to borrow the money he requires. That must cause him a good deal of concern in these days when he cannot do as he desires and

has to have the money borrowed for him. When we have the figures for the financial year ended the 30th June last before us, we shall know what the position actually is and, if no money has been borrowed in the meantime, I imagine that the finances will be found to be in a deplorable condition. If our finances are as satisfactory as the Premier has suggested and our credit is all that he says it is, we should put works in hand to absorb the unemployed.

The Premier: Money is tight all over Australia.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have heard that statement before. I am afraid we may be reaping some of the trouble that is likely to be experienced by Western Australia because of the Financial Agreement. While I know that arrangement has some advantages, I am afraid we shall find out the disadvantages as well. With reference to the Soldier Settlement Scheme, we find that money rebated, amounting to £188,000, is held at credit in the Trust Account. I would like the Premier to tell us if that amount refers to rebates that we have received in connection with the money we advanced, up to £6,000,000. I presume it does. If that be so, is this the position to-day? There is the £188,000 and on top of that we have £796,000, the amount given to us by the Federal Government in 1925, and written off our indebtedness to them under the Soldier Settlement Scheme. If it is, we are in an extraordinarily favourable position compared with the other States of Australia, if we can accept what has appeared in the Press and what we have heard at various conferences.

The Minister for Railways: In Victoria it is reckoned that there will be a loss of about £10,000,000.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes.

The Premier: There is no doubt we are in a favourable position in connection with the Soldier Settlement Scheme, compared with the other States.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We have written off a lot of the money that has been advanced to soldier settlers and, taking into consideration the £188,000 and the £796,000 to which I have referred, we have about £1,000,000 still.

The Premier: The Commonwealth Government appointed a Royal Commission to go into the whole question of soldier settlement, and the Commission has been at work for over 12 months. Judge Pike was the Royal

Commissioner and he has gone to all the States, but no recommendation has been made to the Federal Government yet.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I know that. At any rate, it looks as though we shall have a considerable sum of money in hand on account of soldier settlement. I do not wish to delay the Committee at this stage. It is usual to ask for Supply, and I shall have an opportunity in a few minutes to deal further with the financial position. I know that the Premier realises that the people do not inquire too closely concerning financial matters. They do not take a keen interest in the question. Personally I was amused at the reasons he advanced recently in explanation of the deficit. Had I presented the same reasons during the five years I was in office, the Premier would have waxed eloquent in condemnation of what he would have designated my "excuses." Of course the Premier can find an excuse for anything and everything, but he knows now how difficult it is to explain away a deficit! It seems extraordinary that such a position should arise when we realise that the revenue we received was the highest in the history of the State, and in many other ways we have had more favourable contributions to our finances during the past few years than we had some years ago. I hope the Premier will explain the financial position regarding soldier settlement, because I would like to understand it before dealing with the finances on the Address-in-reply.

The Premier: I am afraid I am not in a position to give that information off-hand.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Has the Premier drawn on the amount of £796,000?

The Minister for Railways: Of course, you know the writing down that has been done.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That was being done when I was in office.

The Premier: It is being done every day of the week.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We know the arrangements that were made, and we had to give the soldier settlers something in return for the interest paid. I think 6½ per cent. went into a special fund and 6 per cent. went to the soldier settlers. That money was used to write down losses. Then on top of that we have the £796,000 given to us by the Federal Government. I hope the Premier will give the Committee the information I have suggested.

The Premier: I will let you know to-morrow.

**MR. THOMSON** (Katanning) [5.10]: I shall not offer any objection to Supply being granted, because I realise that such a course would be useless. It is not customary to refuse Supply, particularly seeing that the Government have a majority in the House.

Mr. Marshall: Leave the majority out of it! Don't you like it?

Mr. THOMSON: Of course I realise that if the Government did not have a majority, we would not be asked to grant Supply.

Mr. Marshall: We shall have a majority to beat you at any time.

Mr. THOMSON: I am afraid that the Government and other people as well are worried at times as to whether there is a majority available. With reference to the Supply Bill, however, I understand that much of the money has already been paid away or has to be expended, because the State is committed to the expenditure. We have now a larger number of unemployed than usual.

Mr. Marshall: You are sympathetic.

Mr. THOMSON: I am. I was wondering whether, in asking for such a large amount, the Government had made provision for putting in hand various projects to provide employment for those who are harassing the Government at the present time. It is true, from a financial point of view, that the present position appears to be quite satisfactory and the prospects of the State are certainly excellent. That, however, is not helpful to those who are looking for work and cannot get it. I shall be pleased if the Premier considers this an opportune time to tell us whether the Government have any such projects in mind so as to provide work for the unemployed. I have asked a question regarding the construction of a certain railway. I hope it may be possible for the Premier to anticipate the Loan Estimates. I know the Government can do that if they so desire, because they have the necessary majority behind them. I can pledge several votes on the Opposition side of the House that will be solidly behind the Government if they decide to construct that particular railway and so provide work for the unemployed.

The Premier: It would be of greater assistance to the Government if you would find the money.

Mr. THOMSON: We can pledge ourselves to assist the Premier to find it; as private members we are not in a position to initiate expenditure, which task must remain with the Government. We have hopes that something may be done in that direction. I have also indicated to the Minister for Railways means of absorbing the unemployed in another direction in the same district to which I refer. Very little money would be actually expended. Although some would have to be found for the time being, the outgoings would be recouped from sales. The Minister knows I am referring to the deviation through the Gnowangernup district. I can promise the Government my support, for I am quite sincere in the desire to see whether anything can be done to find work for those people needing it so badly. As one who knows from experience what it is to look for work and not be able to find it, I have a great deal of sympathy for those in that unfortunate position. And I have a great deal of sympathy also for the Government in the position in which they find themselves in having so many demands made upon them. It is only by starting these various works that the Government will be able to absorb the men who, unfortunately, are doing nothing just now. I offer no objection to the passing of the Supply Bill. It is essential that funds should be made available to carry on the affairs of the State. I do hope that even at this stage the Premier may feel disposed to indicate to us what the Government have in mind as ways and means of relieving the present unfortunate position regarding unemployment.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. P. Collier—Boulder—in reply) [5.16]: I think the position in regard to unemployment is fairly well understood. It is one over which no Government have control, at all events, not in the circumstances we find existing to-day in Australia. It is well known that there is at present and has been for some years past in some of the States an unprecedented depression. It is so in South Australia, where they have had three years of drought, with the result that many thousands of men have been displaced from their employment. So,

too, in Victoria and New South Wales and Queensland. The result has been that, quite naturally, men who have been able to pay their railway fares across have come to the Western State.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: No fewer than 125,000 of them have come to this State.

The PREMIER: They have come in still greater numbers during the past few years than ever before, back to the days of the mining boom. I have here figures showing that in the last December quarter alone the arrivals of males from the Eastern States numbered 3,645.

Mr. Latham: Many of them would go back after the Christmas holidays.

The PREMIER: And during the March quarter of this year the male arrivals from the Eastern States totalled 5,110. So actually there were 1,500 more in the March quarter than in the December quarter.

Mr. J. H. Smith: You do not suggest they were all unemployed?

The PREMIER: No, but it is safe to say that 95 per cent. of them were men who came here in search of work. Of course a small percentage came looking for land or to engage in trade and commerce, but I am sure it is safe to say that 95 per cent. came in search of employment. Anyone who has been in the Eastern States recently and had opportunity to note the depression and the degree of unemployment, will know that a large number of those who could find their passage money, and even others who could not find it but stowed away on the train, have taken the opportunity to come West. Only last week I had wait upon me four men asking for railway passes to country districts. They had arrived only the preceding day from South Australia. They said they were sheep people and did not want to stay in the city. Their desire was to get into the country straight away. When asked how they got across from South Australia, they said with a smile, "We walked across."

Hon. G. Taylor: And you believed them?

The PREMIER: At all events they deserved to get out into the country districts. The fact is that men from the Eastern States have been coming here in large numbers. During 1928 the excess of arrivals over departures was 3,879. And they have been coming over in large numbers during the last couple of years. They will always do so when a State has the reputation of being comparatively prosperous; that is,

when any one State is experiencing better seasons or better conditions than the other States, population will go that way just as water will gravitate to its lowest level.

Mr. Stubbs: Can you tell us how many unemployed there are in the metropolitan area?

The PREMIER: I cannot say, but I know that according to the registrations the figures mentioned at last night's public meeting and published in this morning's newspaper are greatly exaggerated. Here is another aspect of the problem: In the four years 1925 to 1928, there was an excess of arrivals over departures of 7,500 male foreigners. They have been absorbed in this country during those four years. It is easy to understand the influence those men have had upon unemployment. They are largely, if not entirely, unskilled workers and unquestionably they have been getting preference of employment throughout the country districts. The member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) will know the large numbers of them that are spread through the timber areas of the South-West, and in fact all over the State. So in addition to the numbers of Australians we have received from the Eastern States, there are the 7,500 foreigners.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: But surely they are included in the general figures showing excess of arrivals over departures.

The PREMIER: No, those 7,500 foreigners represent the excess of arrivals of foreigners over departures.

Mr. Latham: But a percentage of them would be included in that 3,645 you quoted for the December quarter.

The PREMIER: No, I do not think any foreigners are coming in from the Eastern States. The quarterly figures I quoted dealt with the arrivals from the Eastern States, not with foreigners. These are figures I have got from the office.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: Well, they are wrong.

The PREMIER: The same officer prepared both sets of figures.

Hon. G. Taylor: For different purposes.

The PREMIER: He was not told for what purpose they were required; he was asked to get out the figures, and these are what he handed to me. However, I will look further into them. The Government are doing all the work it is possible for them to do.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: That is the trouble.

The PREMIER: The hon. member experienced times when money was tight and difficult. It is not peculiar to this State. The hon. member knows that the Federal Government have now to retrench all along the line, have to dismiss members of their Army, Navy and Air Forces, and reduce Federal works all over Australia. It is well known that the financial position throughout Australia at present is pretty difficult.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But the Premier said it was all right.

The PREMIER: I was referring to the financial position of this State. Still, the obtaining of loan moneys has been rather difficult.

Hon. Sir James Mitchell: You should not have given away your financial power.

The PREMIER: A large majority of the people of the State gave it away, decided to hand it over. However, that is the position: There is just as much work in hand to-day as it is possible for the Government to put in hand. But I do not think we would have these 1,200 or 1,500 people out of work if so many of our own people were not so unpatriotic as to employ foreigners.

Mr. Latham: A lot of foreigners also are out of work.

The PREMIER: But not the whole of the 7,500 that have come in during the past four years. No doubt a percentage of them are out of work, but we do not see so much of them as we see of our own people.

Mr. Latham: Quite a lot of them are gardening down here.

The PREMIER: No, those gardening have been in this country for a good many years. I saw in yesterday's newspaper that the branch of the Returned Soldiers' League was protesting against contractors working for the Perth Roads Board and employing all foreigners on a road-making job. So it is all over the country.

Mr. Lindsay: You must remember there is an Arbitration Court award governing these foreigners. They are not cheap to employ.

The PREMIER: It is easy to get around Arbitration Court awards when you find men unable to speak the language and without friends, and so ready to accept work at any price they can get.

Mr. Latham: Every one of those foreigners has friends here ready to protect him from the time of his arrival.

The PREMIER: As a matter of fact, it is the foreigner who has been here in this State for some years who frequently is responsible for exploiting in many directions his newly arrived countrymen. Of course it is highly unsatisfactory that we should have so many people out of work in this State, but it must be remembered that in this State we are a thousand times better off than are the people in any other State of the Commonwealth.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported and the report adopted.

#### *Committee of Ways and Means.*

The House having resolved into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Pantou in the Chair,

On motion by the Premier, resolved—

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the services of the year ending 30th June, 1930, a sum not exceeding £850,000 be granted from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, £720,000 from the General Loan Fund, £30,000 from the Government Property Sales Fund and £300,000 from the Public Accounts for the purposes of temporary advances to be made by the Treasurer.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

#### *Bill introduced, etc.*

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions, Bill introduced, passed through all stages and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. North, leave of absence for two consecutive weeks granted to the member for Murray-Wellington (Hon. W. J. George) on the ground of ill health.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

#### *Second Day.*

Debate resumed from 25th July.

HON. SIR JAMES MITCHELL (Northam [5.37]): I propose to address myself largely to the question of unemployment, already mentioned this evening by the Pre-



nier. I shall also deal with other matters, particularly with finance. There is the slightest possible reference to the fact that this is our Centenary year. The Speech says—

The occasion synchronises with the Centenary of the foundation of the State in 1829, and is therefore of particular significance.

That is the sole reference in the Speech to this year. We do need some legislation, that I hope will be introduced this session, to deal with questions arising out of the Centenary year. In Northam we propose to dedicate certain graves to the care of the local authority. In other places, such as Kohnscott, it is intended to dedicate certain historical features to the care of the local authority. This will require the resumption of land in order that the features referred to may be preserved upon it. We discussed this matter in the House last session. I hope legislation will be introduced and passed this session, so that everything may be put in order for the sake of the local authorities who will take charge of these things, and so that the necessary land resumptions may be effected. In two cases that I know of people have been buried on what are now roads. In each instance something will have to be done by legislative enactment. I am sorry this legislation is not referred to in the Speech, but I hope the Premier will have Bills prepared and give attention to the matter. A private member could not bring down such Bills because they would involve the resumption of land. I congratulate the member for Forrest (Miss Holman) upon her speech on the Opening Day. I am sure she could not have done any better than she did. I know that the ladies in the gallery who listened to her eloquence were delighted. I cannot, however, congratulate her upon the facts she put forward. We must, however, make allowances for the occasion and the position in which she found herself. When a person undertakes to propose a toast, that person must say nice things about the subject matter of the toast. When the hon. member undertook to move the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply, she felt obliged to say a number of nice things about the Government.

Miss Holman: I was able to tell the truth.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I dare say the hon. member thought she was stating facts, but before I sit down I shall knock

over some of those facts and dispel the idea that all is well in this fair land of ours. All is not well. There is nothing in the Speech to commend it. It is pitiful and colourless.

The Premier: There never has been a Speech any other way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is full of excuses for the Government. It contains a list of past happenings. It contains nothing for the future except a few amending Bills. It has been said that we ought to know as much about the future as about the past. I suppose, having regard to the short memories of people concerning political happenings, that the Premier took a risk and framed the Speech as he did.

The Premier: According to the gloomy Dean, there is not much of a future before the race.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He is not always as gloomy as his speeches. His worst writings would compare more than favourably with this Speech. When we were saying good-bye to Admiral Bedford, I remember he told us of an occasion when as a young man he walked along to Parliament House with the Governor, who carried a speech in his hand. The Governor said he was going to deliver that speech, but that he "did not believe a damn word of it." Admiral Bedford asked him why he was going to deliver it and his reply was "because I am a constitutional Governor." I am sure that His Excellency, Sir William Campion, must have felt very grateful that he could shelter behind the Constitution and the knowledge that he must carry out the wishes of his Ministers. I do not know that I need refer to many of the items mentioned in the Speech. There is, however, a reference to finance which I find hard to swallow. The Speech says—

The financial position continues to receive the most careful attention of my advisers. In all respects the finances of the State are in a satisfactory condition. It is gratifying to note that the credit of Western Australia is still regarded favourably in Australia and Great Britain.

Of course we always have stood well in financial circles in Great Britain. We could always get money there. There have been occasions when it has been difficult to get it transferred out here because of the unfavourable trade balance. During my last year it was impossible to transfer money. However, our credit was always

good, and we were always able to get what we needed. Unfortunately, we have now given away our right to go to the London market. It is no use boasting about credit which we cannot use, and that is what the Speech does. True, we have thrown in our lot with the rest of Australia, and it is good to have our credit as it is. Certainly our credit ought to be good, seeing that up to the passing of the Financial Agreement we had contributed to a sinking fund which increased considerably year by year. If we turn to the records of the past 19 years, we see that during some years the sinking fund contribution came to as much as one-third of the amount we borrowed. As we borrowed larger amounts, that proportion naturally could not be maintained. As regards the £350,000 which we are saving in interest on our securities that are to be cancelled, being now held by the sinking fund trustees, we should set the amount aside in reduction of taxation. The Federal Government now give us a special grant of £300,000 per annum, and from that we have reduced our income tax by one-third.

The Premier: That grant has only another year to go.

Hon Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and what is to happen then? Either we shall be faced with ever-growing deficits, or the Premier must get Parliament to agree—a thing he cannot do—to an increase of the income tax to the old rate. The £350,000 should, I consider, be largely set aside in relief of taxation. The Speech contains a reference to some land scheme. It does not say which scheme, but I suppose the 3,500 farms are meant. When the Premier was in the East the report of the Migration Commission was issued, saying that they wanted all sorts of elaborate estimates of production before they would move further in the matter of the settlement of this land. They have inspected it time and again over the last two or three years. They have been coming once or twice a year—an expensive method of conducting the Commission. Everybody knows that if there is a sufficient rainfall, and if the land is good, and if there is sufficient land to justify the building of railways, there is no reason for delay in settling the area. I really thought I was helping the State Government in the criticisms I made on the Migration Commission's report.

The Premier: The Commission's last visit was due to the fact that the personnel had changed considerably.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I referred to the Commission's report, which came out when the Premier was in Canberra: and I thought I was helping the State Government. But our friend the Minister for Railways took up the cudgels on behalf of the Federal Government and said I was all wrong.

The Minister for Railways: No fear! You said there was no necessity for investigation.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The jolly thing has been investigated again and again. We have now been two or three years on it. I said that if the rainfall was good, the proposal should be gone on with. The Government could not have entered upon the discussion of the scheme with the Federal Government unless they knew that the rainfall was satisfactory. Records of rainfall have been kept in that country for years, in a manner: and we have always found that rainfall exceeds the records. At any rate, that is my contention. I set out to help the Government, and all I got from the Minister for Railways was an unsatisfactory reply. Is the rainfall right? I think it is. Is the land right, and is there enough of it? I do not know. But if the land is right, I believe it would be taken up without Government assistance. Many of the people who have come here from the East came to take up land; that is, the people to whom the Premier referred. For the most part those I have mentioned are splendid young fellows, farmers' sons from the East; and naturally they, not having been able to get land, have gone into jobs. Experienced as they are, they have succeeded in getting jobs in this country. I do not know just what the position is now with the Federal Government, but if they are going to help under the Migration Agreement, it is time they did help. What more can one get than the rainfall, the quality of the land, and the area of land? Nothing more is wanted. Whatever could be got beyond that would be merely speculative figures. I hope that if the Migration Commission will not assist, the land will be thrown open, when I should think that we could settle it in our old way. At any rate, the people who have come here from the East, and many of whom have some cash, will settle on it. There must, naturally, be railway communication. There would be no harm in waiting if waiting was going to be of any benefit, but why wait year after year? We have been talking about the 3,500 farms now for two or three years. I am aware that a great deal of the area in ques-

tion is settled, but it must be served by railways. If the Federal Government will not help us, let us help ourselves. The talk about the 3,500 farms brought a lot of people here—not out-of-works.

The Premier: It brought a lot of out-of-works too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes; but it has always been our good fortune that people have come here from the East. Hitherto we have always welcomed them. This is the first time in the history of Western Australia when we have heard it stated that it is inconvenient to have them. So far we have always said, "What better people can we get than our own Australian people?" How many members sitting in this House have come from the East!

Hon. G. Taylor: Wise men have always come from the East.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Having so many of those people, why make such a fuss about a few more? I do not think the race has deteriorated in Eastern Australia. They are just as fond of work there now as they were when various hon. members came over here. As regards wheat, when there is a good crop we are told that it is carried at a loss; and when the crop is not quite as good as we anticipated, we attribute the loss on our railways to the fact of not having the wheat to carry. We cannot have it both ways. It cannot be bad to carry wheat when we have got it, and also bad not to carry it when we have not got it.

The Minister for Railways: If the wheat production goes down, it means that there is considerably less money spent in other commodities; and all that is reflected in the railway returns.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course; and that is why we carry fertiliser and wheat so cheaply. That has been the system for years.

The Minister for Railways: It is increasing.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The wheat?

The Minister for Railways: No; fertiliser and wheat in comparison with other things.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Thank God that it is so.

The Minister for Railways: In comparison we do not thank God for it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I venture to say that the traffic into the country along the Eastern Goldfields railway was never greater than it has been for the last two or three years.

The Minister for Railways: No.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What I object to, and what the Minister also objects to, is the carrying of the higher-priced goods traffic by motor lorries.

The Minister for Railways: Do you know that last year we carried 20 million ton-miles more than previously and received £9,000 less revenue? The people in the country have not been buying the higher-priced goods because of the comparatively bad harvest.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But 34,000,000 bushels is not a bad harvest. The estimate, it is true, was not realised. The harvest was 2½ million bushels less than the record yield. Still, 34,000,000 bushels is not a bad crop. Such a crop as that is not a good excuse, though it represents excuse No. 1 in the Governor's Speech. I am glad the Government are able to see cause for gratification in the circumstance that the price of wheat is likely to be good. Unfortunately no one quite knows what the wheat market ever will be, because the world is such an enormous place and there is uncertainty as to the quantities grown in various countries. But the real trouble is uncertainty about the manipulations. The world must always have a large stock of wheat: otherwise we would be short of bread from time to time. Wheat prices are of the utmost importance to Western Australia, because we produce more wheat, in proportion to population, than does any other State. In our case the amount collected, per head of population, through the sale of wheat is nearly four times as great as it is per head of population throughout Australia. I have questioned the Premier about the soldier settlement scheme, and I hope we shall get a reply stating whether he holds that money or does not hold it. I am indeed sorry that the gold yield is still decreasing. With Wiluna going I hope we shall have an improved return.

The Minister for Mines: That place is all right.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes. I notice that the Premier said the railways lost £100,000, according to his estimate, through the waterside strike and the decrease in haulage. I do not know whether the Premier means £100,000 gross revenue, or £100,000 profit. It would take a great amount of earnings to produce £100,000 of profit, and I doubt whether he meant profit. I should like to know when we shall get the report of the engineer who came here

to report on the Fremantle Harbour. Have the Government got it?

The Minister for Works: No. The engineer promised it should be in our hands by July, but it has not arrived up to date.

The Premier: We have no word of it yet.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know whether the Minister for Works and the Minister for Railways saw a letter published in the Press after the one Minister had visited Esperance and the other had visited Bunbury. Perhaps they will tell us what they propose to do with the wheat grown on the 3,500 farms. One Minister said it was to be shipped from Esperance, and the other said it was to be shipped from Bunbury.

The Minister for Railways: Some of it will be shipped from Bunbury.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That was electioneering.

The Minister for Railways: No fear!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Albany was right out of it!

The Minister for Railways: Not at all.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At any rate, it would be well for Ministers to compare notes and at least say the same thing. It looked to me like vote-getting episodes!

The Minister for Railways: With no election for 12 months or more!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That reminds me that a little while ago there was a third statement bearing on the same subject. Perhaps hon. members remember that proposal. It looked as though a straight line had been run with a ruler from Fremantle to Esperance and if such a railway were constructed, it would take a lot of the wheat that normally would go to the other three ports. This is an interesting matter, and if the Ministers concerned have not seen the letter I have referred to, they should look it up and each should send a reply to the "West Australian."

Mr. Sampson: There has been no reply?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. At any rate, the people of Bunbury want the Minister for Railways to speak there. Perhaps a better plan would be for the Ministers concerned to change places. Then the member for Kanowna (Hon. T. Walker) and the member for Bunbury (Mr. Withers), could go to their respective ports and hear what the Ministers had to say.

The Minister for Health: They will be here next session to explain the position in their own way.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am told that the Minister will not be here next time.

The Minister for Health: Whoever told you that does not know much about it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister thinks that everyone else is a fool, apart from himself.

The Minister for Health: Not at all.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At any rate, the Minister for Health was not in this business.

The Minister for Health: I am glad of that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Just before the last election the Minister for Works made a promise to the Fremantle people and then he went to Esperance and made the promise to them. Then the Minister for Railways, who, as senior Minister, is Deputy Premier, made the promise to the Bunbury people.

The Minister for Railways: It is good to know that all the ports are to get their proportion of the wheat traffic.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: All that is very foolish, because those who are handling the wheat will send it forward in the cheapest way!

The Minister for Railways: I think if you look at the speeches you complain of, you will see that no promises were made.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The speeches were reported all right. The Minister must not deny what he says, and what appeared in the Press was true!

The Minister for Railways: It was purely conjecture; you know that no scheme has been announced yet.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister cannot qualify his statement now. We seem to have spent a particularly small proportion of the money we might have received from the Federal Government for the construction of main roads. Apparently last year £366,000 was spent from the Federal grant and from our own contributions. If that is so, I do not know why we have not made some effort to get works under way and so reduce the unemployment that exists at present. I notice from the Governor's Speech that there is a programme of road work drawn up that is estimated to cost £1,250,000. Does that represent work

to be done this year or does it merely mean that the engineers have drawn up a programme of work that they think should be carried out?

The Minister for Works: We reckon upon completing that programme this year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL. Then it looks as though the Government have been saving up the money for expenditure during this year! If that is so, it is rather hard upon the unemployed who have been looking for work and have not been able to get it.

The Minister for Works: If the Commonwealth Government had left us alone, more money would have been spent last year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Commonwealth Government are carrying out the scheme under the terms of the agreement that the Minister for Works signed!

The Minister for Works: Nothing of the sort.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course they are. I have a copy of the agreement in my room, and the Minister agreed to it. We have unemployed people starving in different parts of the state, and yet we have not had sufficient energy to spend the money the Commonwealth Government have provided for us! Last year we spent £366,000 of Commonwealth and State money on roads, and this year it is proposed to spend £1,250,000. If that is the intention, let it be done quickly and let the unemployed men get to work. The Speech also includes reference to legislation that is to be introduced, and the rest of it refers to small happenings. We are to have a Rural Bank Bill, which I cannot discuss now. Some years ago it was to be a State bank; now it is to be a rural bank.

The Premier: It can be both rural and State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In addition to that measure, we are to have a few amending Bills, but apparently nothing else. There is no object in having Governors' Speeches presented to Parliament at the opening of a session unless they serve to inform the public regarding what may be expected by way of legislation. It seems to be that this year the Government merely prepared a speech for presentation to Parliament because one was necessary. The Speech includes a lot about what has

happened in the past, but nothing about the Government's failures.

The Minister for Health: We have not had any failures that we could refer to.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Only a few Bills are referred to and they, for the most part, are unimportant. There is nothing much in the Speech to comfort anyone interested in the progress of the State, except the indication that a lot of money for expenditure on the roads has been saved up. Most of our troubles are due to Ministers being unable to make up their minds, and so things drag on. It is due to the lack of promptness, energy and courage that Ministers are unable to make up their minds, and so work is not available for the unemployed. That is one of the greatest faults of the present Administration. Ministers could not even confer before starting off for Bunbury and Esperance! They could not make up their minds what to say, so they spoke as I have already indicated.

The Premier: I believe some negotiations are on foot now so that in a little while those sitting on the Opposition side of the House will be able to speak with one voice.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope they will be successful. The Premier cannot speak with his own voice.

The Premier: You have not shown much indication on your side of the House of speaking as with one voice.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: At least we will not speak, as the Premier does, with the voice of Mr. Mooney, or with the voice of Trades Hall. We on our side will not be dictated to by anyone.

The Premier: What about the voice of the Consultative Council?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We shall not be dictated to as the Premier has been dictated to by the Trades Hall.

The Premier: Not by the boss of the Consultative Council?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I will do in the future as I have done in the past.

The Premier: But what about the Consultative Council, that mysterious body that operates in the dark?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier has no right to object to organisation. What is he afraid of?

The Premier: What are those other people scared about?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I would be scared if I had to heed the voice of

Mooney, the Premier's boss, or of the Trades Hall.

The Premier: What about the Consultative Council boss, McGibbon?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Recently the Premier came to Northam with Mr. Mooney. Had the Premier been coming by himself, he would have rung me up to tell me he was going to Northam and that he would be pleased to see me. With Mr. Mooney in charge, he did no such thing. Mr. Mooney took him there and led him away.

The Minister for Health: You do not like the Labour organiser being there; it scares you!

The Premier: Mr. Mooney said he was a good friend of yours and would be pleased to see you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Premier cannot have it both ways! It is an extraordinary thing that Ministers have come into my electorate, but have not let me know of their intention. Had they let me know, I should have been glad to meet them.

The Premier: Did we not go to the premises where you first opened up business?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That was the bank, but the Premier went there to count votes in connection with the next elections.

Mr. Lambert: Are you taking "Coffee" for breakfast?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Wait until you take Corboy for yours? If the Premier will not be scared by the organising that is going on, I tell him quite frankly that I shall have no hand in organising a vote. I do not want anyone to promise to vote for me or for my party. We shall get the votes that we deserve and that is all we want.

Mr. Panton: You may not get too many of them.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the control of my party is not half as formidable as it seems, it should be remembered that the very fact that votes are organised actually limits the number of votes members are likely to get because not one-sixth of the electors are pledged supporters of a political party. It would be extraordinarily bad for the State if it were otherwise.

Member: We will get a good many voters from you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Not decently! The Government may stuff the rolls!

The Minister for Railways: You should not say that! You do not think it!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Where is the member for Greenough (Mr. Kennedy)?

The Minister for Railways: It is time you said something serious.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister should keep quiet.

The Minister for Railways: There has been too much that is not serious in your remarks, and there has been too much by way of innuendo.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I say distinctly that men were put on the rolls and were sacked immediately after the election.

The Minister for Railways: That is untrue.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I say that men were wrongly enrolled, and I say that definitely.

The Minister for Railways: A man can be definite and yet not be truthful.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That statement is both definite and truthful. Engineers were hurriedly brought up to my electorate, but they had to wait for the men.

The Minister for Health: That is not correct.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is.

The Minister for Health: If that is so, then we will make no mistake this time. We will have 400 or 500 men there early enough for the election.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: People who talk like that are a disgrace to democracy! They can boast of such things, and laugh at them!

The Minister for Health: What you suggest was never done and it is really amusing to hear you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I say it was done.

The Minister for Health: And I say it was not. My word is as good as yours or that of anyone else, and that stands for any part of the State too.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am glad to hear it; the Minister's friends will be pleased to know it too.

The Minister for Health: Will they?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL, Mr. Speaker, may I get away from this painful subject?

Mr. Sampson: You are upsetting the Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Dealing with the financial position, I intend to show to what extent the revenue has increased and how much more money the Premier has had each year. I will show those particulars from his own publications. If that money had been managed well, more would have come to the State.

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

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I propose now to deal a little with finance and with unemployment. The Premier has had a greatly increased revenue every year, and his loan expenditure during the last few years has been enormous. Before 1924 he was concerned about State borrowing, but now he is going on gaily with it each year. The average annual State Government revenue from all sources has been about £4,500,000. When the 33½ per cent. and the supertax were taken off the income taxation, that amount was lost to the Treasury but was made good by the Federal grant. Yet all the same, due to the fact that we increased the land tax considerably, our taxation, apart from the Federal contribution, has been £197,000 more than it was in my last year of office.

The Premier: Although we did increase the land tax, we gave away the amount in reduced railway freights.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It does not matter where the money went to, the Premier would throw the tax upon the farmers. As a matter of fact, the tax was previously ½d. in the pound, whereas it is now 1½d. It does not matter what the Government do with the money.

The Premier: But the Treasury did not benefit by it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then, of course, values are increasing. During the last five years valuations in the city and the towns have doubled, and about £6,000,000 has been added to the valuation of country land. So on top of the increased land taxation there has been the increasing values.

Mr. Lambert: Should not the country benefit by some of the unearned increment?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That is quite another question. Then we have had not only that £197,000 from taxation, but the Federal grant last year was £811,000, whereas it was only £585,000 in my last year

of office. So the Government have had £226,000 more from that source. If we take all the grants or advances from the Federal Government, there is the special grant of £300,000 and the £22,000 represented by increased interest on transferred properties. In the discussion we had in the Press a little while ago, the Premier told us that the Federal Government had paid part of our sinking fund, equal to £91,607. Then there is the waived interest on £796,000 of soldiers' money, equal to £50,000. So we get a total amount of £463,000. Then, if we care to use it, we have the road grant of £384,000. That makes a total of £847,000 from the Federal Government which was not enjoyed by any previous Government in this State. And on top of that we are using migration money represented by £5,000,000 at 1 per cent., thus saving us £212,500 per annum. Those items make the several advances to the Treasury during last year and this year £1,059,500, a nice cheque, a great deal of clear money.

The Premier: It is quite clear that you are aware the public do not follow finance, or you would not use those figures.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have taken them from the figures published by the Premier.

The Premier: And those figures are correct.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And it is correct to use them in the way I am using them. Will the Premier say it is not advantageous to have this £384,000 of road grant?

The Premier: It means a contribution from us of 15s. in the pound.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Which you have had merely to borrow.

The Premier: But you did not have to find it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There would have been no difficulty in finding it. Our credit in London was so good that we were told we had only to ask for money to get it. In my time it was frequently said, "See Lord Glendyne and get what you want." Even the present Government boasts from one end of the country to the other that they can get all the money they want, their credit is so good. That, of course, is quite right.

The Premier: We are not going to borrow ten millions or twenty millions, though.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, you want only  $4\frac{1}{2}$  millions per annum. Much of the advances I have quoted went into revenue. Where is it now? Then we have this year, and have had last year and for six months of the previous year, £350,000 per annum on which we are not paying London sinking fund. Of course, we have the right to use it, and we have used it.

The Premier: Is that so? It is not shown in the figures.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You have not a bean of it left. Every possible fund is overdrawn, as I have shown.

The Premier: You have not shown anything of the kind.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Here is the Premier's own publication. If you want the thing, just get the "Gazette" of the 15th May, and here you are: General Loan Fund £1,382,214; Consolidated Revenue Fund £668,785; Treasury Bonds Redemption £4,056; Expenditure in Suspense £14,710; Advances £613,554. There is not a bean left, except the £209,000 which is at credit in banks here. It is all here. The Premier should not deceive the public, but should admit the facts. As I said before, the Premier and I had a little discussion in the papers about finance. We usually do from time to time. I met a friend of mine to-day. He remarked, "Here you are. You say one thing, and Mr. Collier says another. Whom is one to believe?" Then he seemed to think he ought to say he believed me, and so he said it. The public ought to realise that when we engage in such a discussion we do not manufacture figures. We take the figures from the public returns over the signature of the Premier. If the people would but take the "Gazette" and see the figures, they would know that we had taken our figures from the public returns.

The Premier: That £2,700,000 of your deficit as against my £400,000 I took from the public returns.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: You had two millions more than I had in my last year, and yet you increased the deficit.

The Premier: The hon. member had two millions more in his last year than in his first year.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: And I reduced the deficit by £440,000, whereas you increased it. The Premier knows full well that the Government with which he was previously connected started the deficit. Yet

during the discussion he merely published the deficit that occurred in my first year and said nothing about the legacy left me by my predecessors. That is not like him, nor is it worthy of him.

The Premier: But you were a member of the previous Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, for 11 months after the deficit started. I was a member of the Government in 1916-17 for 11 months. Let the Premier say the worst he can, by all means, but let him say it fairly.

The Premier: It is because your figures show so badly that you are so cross.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, it is not. I started with a deficit of nearly £700,000, reduced it to £220,000, and if I instead of the Premier had been in office I would have had it much lower to-day than it is. I once said we ought to charge interest on works under construction. The Premier said "No." That was in my last year, but he himself took it into account in the following year.

Mr. Latham: He tasted it and found it good.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To bring the deficit from £686,000 to £220,000 is something to be proud of. The Premier should endeavour to show that in my first years the finances were as bad as ever they have been and that I improved the position materially. What straightening out he himself did, he did by taking money that all other Governments had paid to the trustees in London. At any rate, the present Government are spending a good four millions more annually than did the previous Government. If half that sum were available it would keep 10,000 men going, and they in turn would keep thousands of other men at work. But let us see what other people, apart from the Government, have been doing. In five years the local authorities have borrowed £1,445,000, about one-half of all that they owe. In my five years they borrowed only £397,000. So to-day a million more of money borrowed by the local authorities goes in wages. Then the State Savings Bank deposits have increased by two millions, due to increased interest rates and to the fact that we now take only a limited amount. That, too, I suppose is up the spout. The ordinary banks' advances have increased by £5,420,000 during the past five years. That money has gone into circulation, employing people, just as has the



extra million borrowed by the local authorities. Yet despite all these amounts we have men unemployed at the present time. What will happen during the next five years, when these moneys are not available? The local authorities will not be able to go on borrowing as they have been doing, because they will not be able to pay for the money. Also it is unlikely that the ordinary banks will continue to advance as they have been doing during the past five years. The banking figures are most illuminating. In the period 1919-24 the deposits in the banks increased by £2,320,000 and reached a total of £13,122,000. The advances during that period totalled £11,656,000, or an increase of £1,240,000 during my five years, and then the State was providing for itself. Its deposits were nearly £1,000,000 more than the advances. But the position has altered. Since 1924 the deposits have increased by only £814,000, but the advances have increased by £5,420,000 as I have shown. It has been said that the banks have not been advancing money. Throughout the history of the State they have never advanced money so freely. If we add to that the increased production of wealth, which means about £9,000,000 a year—I know the member for East Perth (Mr. Kennally) does not agree with this—it is of very great consequence. At the meeting held in the Town Hall last night, the member for East Perth said that increased production was not a way out of the difficulty. We cannot get out of our troubles without money, and it is very much better to produce it than to borrow it, as wealth produced here goes very much further than money borrowed because it stays here.

Mr. Withers: You would not favour using borrowed money for unproductive works as was suggested by another speaker last night?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Of course not.

Mr. Withers: Someone suggested it, but not the member for East Perth.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The member for East Perth, on his argument last night, would say that the increased production of wealth amounting to about £9,000,000 a year is not an advantage. Of course it is an advantage; it is an enormous sum. That total, of course, includes manufactures which have increased by a considerable amount during the last few years. All those amounts have been available and have been used. I am merely dealing with increases and with the amounts now available to em-

ploy people that were not available five years ago. May I say, too, that the cost of production has some influence upon unemployment. The cost of production is made up largely of taxation, interest and wages. Wages, again, have increased as a result of the tariff. People cannot now live on the amount that was once sufficient for them. They are not as well off on the wages they are receiving to-day as they were on the wages of 1913. Of course the people have to live and they have to pay through the nose for everything they want. I do not know how the people on the basic wage manage to make both ends meet, especially if they do their duty in the world. At the Premiers' Conference the Prime Minister made a speech in which he dealt with the cost of production, but he did not say anything that was very comforting. I think he rather suggested that the Government would have to increase taxation.

The Premier: Not I.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I am referring to the Prime Minister, but he in turn was referring to Governments generally. Now that the Premier has been numbered with the others, he has to share with Queensland, New South Wales and the other places the decisions of that conference.

Mr. Withers: Queensland is out of date.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No, it is growing better. Let me quote figures showing the value of production, the amount of taxation and the percentage of taxation to production as follows:—

	Production.	Taxation.	Taxation % of Production.
1913 ..	£221,000,000	£23,000,000	10.4
1923-24 ..	£400,000,000	£71,000,000	17.8
1927-28 ..	£450,000,000	£88,000,000	19.6

That is an enormous percentage and the marvel is that the people can stand it. While production increased by £50,000,000, the taxation increased by £17,000,000 or 33 per cent. Taxation is growing worse all the time, and something certainly will have to be done to reduce it. If it be a fact that one-fifth of our production is paid to Governments by way of taxation, in addition to the taxation of local authorities, cannot we easily calculate what the taxation represents to the farmer in the production of a bushel of wheat? If it be one-fifth of the value of the wheat, and wheat is 5s. a bushel, it is easy to see that taxation must represent 1s. a bushel. I have not worked it out and I do not know whether that would be the

amount, but if taxation be one-fifth of the cost of producing wheat and other things, it must ls. per bushel with wheat at 5s., which is an impossible tax. As we in Western Australia produce so much more wheat per head than do the people of other countries, it can easily be seen that we are paying far too much by way of taxation. The figure, however, should be carefully calculated. For the present I am taking only average figures. However, the question should be viewed seriously. It would be unfair if the State should have to make the whole of the reduction of taxation, but the State will certainly have to make some reduction and the Commonwealth will have to make a great reduction. I believe it is possible to keep the factories of Australia going on a very much lower tariff than is at present imposed, and if the tariff were lowered the volume of trade would increase. On goods manufactured in the Eastern States and shipped to us we in this State pay at least £2,000,000 a year more than we would pay if it were not for the tariff. Naturally the manufacturers take full advantage of that. Fancy £2,000,000 a year for the privilege of buying goods manufactured in the Eastern States! Notwithstanding that, I am certain the farmer is not a free trader; he is willing to pay a fair thing. The present impost, however, is not a fair thing, and something will have to be done to alter it. The trouble will increase when the burden is felt to the full, as it must be felt when the reserves of the people become exhausted by the paying of heavy taxation. So far as I know, there was no proposal for relief suggested at the Premiers' Conference. It was hinted that there were avenues of taxation that had not yet been exploited. It does not matter a jot whence the taxes are derived, their imposition must do harm. We may tax luxuries in the shape of what a man smokes or drinks or the necktie he wears, but we cannot do it without inflicting a little harm on everybody. It seems to me that in considering the burden of taxation we might justly add the street collections in aid of institutions and other activities. The street collections are really a tax imposed upon the people. Altogether we are living in a fool's paradise. It is impossible to withdraw such large sums of money from useful work without doing lasting damage. The problem has to be tackled. People might

talk about a reduction of the tariff, but we here can do nothing unless the agriculturists—and the whole of the people of Western Australia would be with them—are determined that this high taxation shall not continue. Recently it seemed possible that the price of wheat had fallen and would remain down for a considerable time. If that had happened, then we should have had to pay a greater proportion of the 4s. than we should pay of the 5s. in order to meet our tax bill. Fortunately the rumours were false and foodstuffs now seem to be in demand. I believe foodstuffs will always be in demand and that the demand will gradually tighten and that producers will get even better prices. The world's land is not increasing in extent, and the productivity of the world's land has not increased, notwithstanding all that science is doing. If we turn to the figures we find that there has been no increase in productivity, although science has been engaged in endeavouring to stimulate production during the last 30 years. So it seems that the outlook for the wheatgrower is fairly bright. Whatever the price of wheat may be, however, we in this country have to grow wheat and wool and work our land because we are not a manufacturing country. Our timber industry is becoming less valuable each year, and unless the Wiluna goldfield does something for mining, our mineral production must continue to decline. I think we ought to take a pull and see if we cannot do with less taxation and fewer street collections. The unemployed have not been confined to the city, but are found throughout the agricultural districts. When they are walking about without food to eat, the settlers have to feed them and so it amounts to the same thing—additional taxation. We have certainly spent loan money freely, but we have had enormous sums at our command and even though we have a few more people in the State than before, there has been quite enough money to employ them, even if the Government had had to shoulder the whole responsibility for providing work for them. However, it is not for the Government to employ everyone. What we need is to inspire confidence in the future and encourage enterprise. I have shown that the want of money was not the cause of unemployment. Slow circulation of money, due to want of confidence in the Government, is a far more serious matter than the amount of

money available. When money becomes stagnant or not quite so active as it has been, it must be reflected in reduced trade, reduced employment, and reduced activity generally.

The Minister for Justice: There is no want of confidence in this State.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: But there is a want of confidence in the Government.

The Minister for Justice: No fear!

The Minister for Works: There may be a want of confidence in the Opposition.

Mr. Clydesdale: The people applaud the present Government.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I thank the hon. member for that interjection. A certain section of the people applaud the present Government, but it is the wrong section. It is not the section that gave the Government a majority. It is a very small section indeed that applaud the Government.

The Minister for Justice: All sections have confidence in the future.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Government cannot continue to sit in those seats for long. Men ask how long have they to remain in now?

Mr. Panton: Ten years.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Then the State has to suffer in the meantime. There are people who tell me they voted for Labour on the previous occasion, but never again. There is no doubt that the wrong people applaud the present Government. They are the people who want privilege, not the people who want preference. It is clear that special representation is a failure. The member for Canning and other members have been returned, but the people who supported them are not getting the best out of them because they are not filling seats on the Treasury Bench.

Mr. Clydesdale: Even their worst was better than some I know of.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I dare say. Special representation is a failure.

The Premier: Do you say members on the cross benches are special representatives?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They are the representatives of the country people.

The Premier: Why are we special representatives and those other members are not?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Because the Premier and his party are pledged to obey Caucus.

The Premier: To what?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: To socialism. The Premier had something to say about the Consultative Council. There is no caucus about that. No Government can successfully control affairs under any caucus system. Whilst that form of control exists we are bound to have trouble and unemployment. We have it in the words of John Bright:—"No one leading, no one yielding, and only chaos." That must be so as long as anyone is under caucus rule, and can tell the Premier and his Ministers what to do.

Mr. Clydesdale: But he will never do it when you tell him.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: John Bright was referring to the position of a political party in England. Whilst this goes on men are starving. The Premier is not able to do his best under this system, and will never be able to do it. The member for Forrest referred to Italians. Our own people ought to have such work as is available. Of course, some Italians have been here many years and are really British subjects. I am referring to those who have just come to the country.

Mr. Withers: They did not enter into the picture, according to the member for Forrest. She was not dealing with the old-established Southern Europeans.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I hope she was referring to the new arrivals, as I am doing. It is only inconvenient now to have them here, because we have no employment for them. Beyond that, no one objects to them. In my own district not many sleepers are now being cut, but many thousands were cut and stacked at Spencer's Brook, as members who attend the Northam races know.

Miss Holman: Sleepers are still being cut on private property at as low as 25s. a load.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Those sleepers were cut for the Government by their own contractor, and at prices at which white men could not make tucker. One man, an Australian, came from Bunbury and called to see me. Those sleepers were cut for the Government.

Miss Holman: No.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Fully 90 per cent. of them were cut by foreigners.

The Premier: No. That is another of your reckless statements.

Mr. J. H. Smith: It is not a reckless statement. I will prove it.

The Premier: You cannot prove it. You just talk, and leave it at that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The sleepers at Spencer's Brook were used for Government railways. They were cut on private property by a Government contractor who employed Italian labour.

The Premier: How long ago was that?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It must be a year or so ago since they were cut. The Railway Department will be able to tell the Premier. They were cut and stacked long before they were needed. Since then they have been moved out to new railways, probably to Wiluna. They must have run into a lot of money. When the Government had all that work done they should have seen to it that only our own people were allowed to do it.

The Premier: For the last two years it has been a condition of all Government contracts that only our own people should be employed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It cannot have been long ago, because the Government would not have cut sleepers two or three years ahead of requirements.

The Premier: We have had supplies for two years on hand for a good while.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Those sleepers were cut by Italians.

Mr. Panton: Was the contractor an Italian?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should say not. No doubt the sleepers were cut at a reduced price. The member for Forrest referred to the matter on Thursday.

Miss Holman: The Government have not taken any contract sleepers cut by foreigners for more than two years.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I fail to see how the hon. member can know about this case, because the sleepers were cut in the Toodyay electorate.

Mr. J. H. Smith: Not two years ago.

The Premier: That is not so.

Mr. J. H. Smith: All right.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I suggest that the Premier and the hon. member should settle the matter outside. I have shown what money the Government had, what advances were made, what the local authorities have done, and what the increased wealth production has been during the past five years; but there has been un-

employment all the time. I have a little to say about the men who are out of work. I do not know why in this free country a man should have to buy a Government job by taking out a union ticket. Why can he not be picked up wherever work exists without being sent to places where there are Government or union officials? People have been sent from Northam to Perth for employment. There were some men at Kulja. They had built the line there and apparently had done excellent work. Another job was coming along, and they waited six weeks for it. I saw some of them, and they told me they all had to go to Perth to look for a job. That was neither right nor reasonable. The men who had served the Government well on this railway work should have been given a chance to do similar work. There were men at Meekatharra to whom the same thing applied. Others were sent from Perth to do railway work there. I have a letter and a petition from Pemberton signed by 88 men who had been employed by the Public Works Department. The letter is addressed to the member for Nelson (Mr. J. H. Smith) asking him to do what he could to get work for them. In these three cases the men ought to have had work, but did not get it. I saw the other day that the marriage lines of men were being demanded before they could get work in Perth from the Labour Bureau. We do not see the worst of the business in the city. Many who go into the country looking for work have almost worn the boots off their feet. They are genuinely seeking for employment. Their clothes are shabby and often they have to sleep in the bush or in some shed. It is a pitiful business and we ought to try to cure it.

The Minister for Railways: If it were cured within a week, how long would the cure last.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It will be cured permanently when there is a change of Government.

The Minister for Railways: Within a fortnight 30,000 more men would come from the Eastern States.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There are 120,000 people here from the Eastern States. It is the first time the Government have said they do not want men from the East.

The Minister for Railways: We do not say we do not want them, but not now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The Minister looked as if he did not want them. The

cure for the whole thing is work. Everyone should work, Ministers, members, employers and all.

Mr. Clydesdale: You had a rough time when you were in office.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No.

Mr. Clydesdale: The position was worse then than it is now.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If everyone worked to his full capacity, there would be employment for these people. If everyone did his best and no one shirked, there would be enough work for everybody. Men must have work or be fed. They ought not to be allowed to beg as they are doing now. At the Town Hall last night a meeting dealt with the whole question. It is not necessary to have a meeting to inform the Government of what is happening. They have been told from time to time. The member for East Perth (Mr. Kenneally) does not agree with me. I think work is the only solution of the trouble, but it is no good working unless something is being produced. He said that more production would not throw off unemployment. I maintain that it would, for it would mean more money and much greater activity.

Mr. Sleeman: What did the reverend gentleman say?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: He was decidedly unkind. He suggested the Premier should practice some economy. I think he said that until we could cure this unemployment members should make a cut in their own salaries.

Mr. Sleeman: What did the other reverend gentleman say?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I know the one the hon. gentleman refers to. It was not a charitable thing to suggest.

Mr. Withers: Not in the circumstances.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: A great deal was said at the meeting, and I hope some good will come of it. In the same paper there is a statement by Mr. Gullett. He says that work and production will cure the whole thing, and that men must work. If the tariff is kept on the people who derive a benefit from it must do their best to supply their goods at a cheaper price than at present. Manufacturers should not take advantage of the tariff as they do. That ought to be made clear to all concerned. Everyone who enjoys the advantage of that protection must do more work for it, and must supply their goods under more favourable conditions. Probably some of

our legislation, though it may have been passed with every good intention, has had an effect upon the position. In connection with the sleeper business, the State Insurance Office charges a £20 per cent. premium. I believe the private companies charge £25 per cent. Not many sleepers will be sold while those rates exist. South Africa, which has been one of our largest customers, is now using steel sleepers, and if it goes on doing so we shall lose that trade. Our timber is very valuable, and it does not matter very much whether we sell it now or not, except that in our virgin forests the timber is fully matured, and will deteriorate by keeping. This premium is a big load to put upon the industry.

The Minister for Works: I am afraid from what I saw that the overseas market has already gone.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: No. If we load sleepers with a charge of 20 per cent. insurance, we cannot expect to sell them, for it means so much added to their cost.

The Minister for Works: It is not 20 per cent. added to the cost of the sleeper.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is 20 per cent. on to the wages.

The Minister for Works: You said it was added to the sleepers.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That adds to the cost of the sleeper in the same proportion.

Mr. J. H. Smith: About 9s. or 10s. per load.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, and the buyer has to pay it; or, if he will not pay it, we lose the sleeper trade.

The Minister for Works: The rate is largely due to the foreigners now in the industry.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: If the foreigners are responsible for this rise, they ought not to be insured, and in fact ought not to be in the industry. If the rise is due to the foreigners, the Minister ought to see to it that there are two rates of insurance—one for South Europeans and one for our own people.

The Minister for Works: If foreigners were not employed, there would be no necessity for putting up rates. The State mills are not costing any more for insurance, simply because they do not employ foreigners.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: There is the disadvantage of the State trading with the public. The other people, who were engaged in the industry before the State came on the scene, are entitled to the same protection. The Minister has employed foreigners, and I am sure the State mills are buying sleepers from them to-day. If the Minister for Works as Mr. McCallum took a contract to supply sleepers, he would be obliged to insure his men; and the cheapest rate would be that of £20 per cent. charged by the State Insurance Office.

Mr. Withers: That is a good advertisement for State insurance.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: As Mr. McCallum he would have to pay £20 per cent. insurance.

The Premier: No, because he would not employ foreigners, and therefore the rate would not be so high. The high rate is necessitated because of the foreigners in the industry.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is the common rate, and it would have to be paid by Mr. McCallum individually. The position is monstrously unfair to the people engaged in the industry previously.

The Minister for Works: The State mills have not found their rate increased, simply because they do not employ foreigners.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: In any case, the rate is £20 per cent. In fact, it almost seems as if no one knows what the State mills rate is. I do not, and the Minister does not. It is perfectly true that we had considerable profits from the State Sawmills, and that they were well managed during the reign of Mr. George; but we lost on other State concerns as much as we made from the State Sawmills, and even more.

The Premier: Whose fault was that, then? Was that George's fault?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I refer to the Wyndham Meat Works and other concerns. Just about the time the last Wilson Ministry came into office the gains on the State Shipping Service and on the State Sawmills approximately met the losses on the other State trading concerns. However, there is a very different tale to tell to-day regarding those ventures. But we are discussing means of finding employment. I bank on the words "Work by everybody," and I mean Ministers and everybody else. Without that, there can be no improvement in the position. There must be reduced taxa-

tion and economy in administration. We must get value for our money—not spending less money, but getting more for what we spend. There must be reduced cost of production and increased production of wealth. As wages can only be paid from wealth produced or money borrowed, everybody will recognise that it is much better to produce wealth—dig it out of the soil, or get it from the timber forests or mines—than borrow it, and repay it with interest. I set out to deal with the question of unemployment in the hope that something might be done. It has been suggested that a deputation wait upon the Premier.

Mr. Panton: I notice you are to be one of the deputationists.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, I will rock it in.

Mr. Clydesdale: Like people used to rock it in to you.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, every time, and particularly in regard to shop betting. I do not know whether I can be of any use to the Government. If I can be, I am at their disposal.

Mr. Withers: If you remain where you are, you will be of use to them.

The Premier: You have something to say that will be a great deal more useful than what was said last night.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Especially by Mr. Kenneally. The closing of White City might help employment a little, and I congratulate the Government on having closed the place.

Mr. Withers: You did not close it; you opened it.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I merely opened it. One sees the smallness of some members. I put a fence round the place and handed it over to the Silver Chain and the Ugly Men. Those who came to see me looked like respectable men. They were running their show on the land behind the Supreme Court long before I had anything to do with the matter. They had to be moved from that position because they made too much noise. We sent them to where White City is now. The gentlemen who came to see me on the subject looked highly respectable. They said they ran perfectly inoffensive gambling devices and used the money for legitimate purposes. They also said that no one got anything out of it, all of them being honorary workers, and that the whole affair was highly respectable. I

know very well that gambling will never be put down. I know that all down the ages churches have gambled at bazaars, for instance, through the medium of guessing the number of peas in a bottle. I have never pretended to think that moderate gambling is a sin. But when it comes to wholesale gambling, or such gambling as that at White City, it is quite another matter. The Minister for Justice comes in here. At Northam we had a White City—I think an hon. member of another place had something to do with the affair—in aid of the building of a local trades hall. The people concerned had bought a block of land on which to erect the hall. They ran this White City business and got £1,500 by it. Thereupon they sold the block of land, and that is the last we heard of the matter. Still, that is not the point. The point is that another man thought he too would have a gamble at Northam, and opened up his show, with the result that the police promptly prosecuted him and he was fined £20. One set of people are allowed to carry on this business and make £1,500, but this poor fellow had to get out minus £20. He went to Boulder, where I understand a White City is still flourishing. Efforts were made to stop him there too. However, the Fresh Air League had hired his gear, and they were determined that they would not be stopped so long as the other show went on.

Mr. Withers: The man who was fined at Northam is far away from Western Australia to-day.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Surely the country is not doing justice in prosecuting one man for running such an enterprise while other people are allowed to go free. I do not know where the funds taken by the other people went, but I do know that they were allowed to carry on against the law whilst the other fellow was prosecuted. That is not fair.

The Premier: The one was an adventurer out to make profits for himself. The others were helping a public concern.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Nothing of the kind. I should like an inquiry into White City, as to where the funds have gone.

The Premier: When you were in office, all forms of gambling were going on there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Hon. members opposite do wrong and then say,

“Oh, you did it.” What miserable critics they are who cannot stand by their own acts. They had five years of it. White City in our time was never the gambling hell it was under the Labour regime.

Mr. Clydesdale: The gambling there was five times as much in your time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: The hon. member should know, because he was one of the people allowed to operate there. The money that was accounted for in my time may have been more than the money accounted for since, but that is quite another matter.

The Premier: That is a poor old thing, that!

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: It is a poor old thing when the people cannot stand by what they do.

Mr. Panton: I am afraid you set some very bad examples in your time.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Maybe.

Mr. Panton: That is, from what I can hear.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I have never been allowed to forget any of my weaknesses. When I endeavoured to meet the wishes of hon. members who sit opposite, I acted mistakenly, because my doing them good turns has given them opportunities ever since to behave as they are behaving to-night. It is useless, of course, to expect remembrance of good turns. I heard a story of how Mr. Brown was told that Mr. Smith had said something against him. whereupon Mr. Brown replied, “Well, I am not conscious of ever having done Smith a good turn.” I have not much more to say, because there will be an opportunity to deal with all other matters, according to the Premier’s promise, by the end of August. I hope that by then we shall know something of what is to happen with the 3,500 farms scheme, whether the Federal Government are going to help or not. I hope by then we shall know what the Government propose to do regarding unemployment. By the way, I should like to learn from the Minister for Mines something about the concessions granted in the Kimberleys. I notice that concessions of as much as 5,000,000 acres have been granted there for mining purposes. That, of course, is unusual. It may be advisable to do it. There would be some explanation, I suppose, that the land was open to the public, that everybody had an equal opportunity to secure a per-

mit, and, I suppose, that the permits were merely from year to year.

The Minister for Mines: The permits are for one year only.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I should not think it would be much worth while to grant a permit for one year. The concessions are a long way from here, and work can be done only during certain seasons.

Mr. Thomson: I presume that if a man showed his bona fides, his concession would be renewed.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I would ask the Minister if other men can go there to search for precious minerals.

The Minister for Mines: The land has been there for a hundred years, and no one has gone there.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: We have had prospectors in the Kimberleys.

The Minister for Mines: Not where these men have been.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I refer to the Kimberleys.

The Minister for Mines: I am not locking up land in the Kimberleys.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: I do not know that the Minister could do so under the provisions of the law. We should have some more information about this matter. I hope the people who get these concessions will find something of value and that their efforts will lead to more work.

The Minister for Mines: I hope so; they will have to look for it, otherwise they will lose their concessions.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: They will not find much if they are merely to put four men on a concession.

The Minister for Mines: Who said that?

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: That was the statement that appeared in the Press.

The Minister for Mines: I did not see that.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: How many men will they be required to put on a concession? If the Minister tells us, we shall be informed on the subject. With reference to railways the construction of which has been authorised, I hope those lines will be built very soon. The Yarramony railway, in which the member for Avon (Mr. Griffiths) is so interested, has been promised for a long time. It was first promised by the Premier in 1911. Labour succeeded at that election and the line should have been built then.

The Premier: I do not think I promised it then.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: Yes, I remember the promise well, and the Premier has promised the same thing since. There are many other matters concerning which I desire information and which I shall have an opportunity to discuss within the next month. In the meantime I hope the Premier will furnish me with the information I sought this afternoon regarding soldier settlement finance. Let us face the question of unemployment which is the most serious that confronts us now. We must all do what we can to overcome it. It has been suggested that it is a non-party question, but that can hardly be so in that the result has been largely due to party management. On the other hand, we can all insist, as far as we are able to do so, upon all assistance being given to the Government to solve the problem, if they will only take our advice.

The Premier: There are six non-Labour Governments and they are all faced with the same trouble.

Hon. Sir JAMES MITCHELL: What have we to do with the Government in Queensland, for instance, where Labour was in office until quite recently? There have been Labour Governments in other States until recently, but what has that to do with us? We have our own duties to perform, and I object to the Premier associating himself with others in the question of the government of the State. Our duties are here, not elsewhere. We are not responsible for the government of Queensland. The Premier himself repudiated the Queensland Labour Government and said he should not be responsible for them. I have nothing further to add except to express the hope that our people will be found work or else fed.

On motion by Mr. Thomson, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 8.35 p.m.*