

Mr. MULLANY: Quite so. I do not wish to see the system die out. However, this proposed appointment is unnecessary and useless. Do not let us run away with the idea that a man out prospecting, and putting in perhaps months in one area, is going to be advised by an inspector who comes along in a motor car and in a day or two goes away. The man prospecting knows, or should know, what he is doing. He cannot be advised in that way. So far as I can see, the only object of the proposed appointment is to try to check the men who are not carrying out their part of the contract. I have nothing more to say except to refer to the position of the mining industry, which is not in the condition it was some years ago.

The Minister for Mines: Relatively speaking.

Mr. MULLANY: I am not pessimistic. I believe that in those great auriferous areas there are possibilities of new finds. With the return of normal times, I believe the gold-fields will come back to something like the position attained in earlier years. It requires no stretch of imagination to picture what the prospects of the State would be if, in addition to the production from our agricultural and pastoral areas, the great mining industry could get back to the stage it was in 15 or 20 years ago. Then, indeed, Western Australia would come into its own as the leading State of the Commonwealth.

On motion by Mr. Money, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 10.41 p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 24th August, 1922.

	PAGE
Question: Soldier Settlement ... ..	371
Leave of absence ... ..	371
Bills: Light and Air, IR. ... ..	371
Nurses' Registration Act Amendment, IR. ...	371
Address-in-reply, Fifth day... ..	372

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

### QUESTION—SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Hon. J. A. GREIG (for Hon. H. Stewart) asked the Minister for Education: In connection with soldier settlement, what are the latest possible figures to date regarding (a) number of applicants for land? (b) number granted land qualification certificates? (c)

number of applications rejected? (d) number of applications deferred? (e) number of soldiers settled? (f) number to whom loans have been granted? (g) average expenditure per soldier settler?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied:

	A.I.F.	Munition and War Workers.	British ex-Ser-vice.	Total.
At 23rd August, 1922 ...	7,367	30	206	7,603
At 23rd August, 1922 ...	6,137	21	71	6,229
At 23rd August, 1922— Rejected or deferred ...	467	...	7	474
Pending qualification	763	9	128	900
At 23rd August, 1922— Loans approved ...	4,598	9	53	4,660
Group Settlement ...	37	...	74	161

152 properties have been abandoned, of which 81 have been re-occupied, 71 being on the Agricultural Bank's hands for re-settlement. The number (about 100) who have not yet taken possession pending completion of mortgages and for other reasons cannot be accurately ascertained; nor can the number of sleeping partners. (g) Lands Department expenditure to 31/7/22, £794,584; Agricultural Bank advances to 31/7/22, £3,883,429; total actual expenditure to 31/7/22, £4,678,013; average actual expenditure per head at 31/7/22, £1,012 (4,622 loans approved, 31/7/22). The Lands Department expenditure includes large expenditure on lands not yet settled (drainage, etc.), and Agricultural Bank approvals cover an additional £595,774 not yet drawn. Group settlement costs are not separated for soldiers.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Duffell leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. G. W. Miles on the ground of urgent private business.

On motion by Hon. J. Cornell leave of absence for six consecutive sittings granted to the Hon. J. W. Kirwan on the ground of urgent private business.

### BILLS (2)—FIRST READING.

1, Light and Air.

2, Nurses' Registration Act Amendment.

Introduced by the Minister for Education.

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Fifth Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East) [4.42]: I desire to offer a few remarks on the motion so ably moved by our new member, Mr. Macfarlane. Further, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, upon the position you occupy. Your accession to the Chair is an honour conferred upon the House. In view of the great number of years of honourable service which you have devoted to the State, it is only fitting and proper that you should have had the preference on this occasion. Your presence in the Chair, Mr. President, is an assurance to new members that they will have the guidance of a man of ripe experience in the history, the early development, and the trials and difficulties of the work which has to be carried out in this State, work with which you are so well acquainted. I know that you will give all new members, as indeed you have already given, much aid in the work lying before them in this Chamber. I join in the hearty appreciation which has been expressed at the return of so many of us from the recent election. In this respect I have to express my thanks to my own constituents. I recall that in the closing hours of the last session, when we were bidding each other goodbye, many of us shook in our shoes. Therefore it is a pleasure to note that so many members retain the confidence of their electors, and are with us again to carry on the work as they did in the past. I have to express my regret at the loss of those who were not enabled to come back amongst us. At the same time I extend a very hearty welcome to new members, who in the course of this debate have already shown themselves prepared to take an active and intense interest in the business of Parliament. It is clear that they will prove of immense value, bringing as they do, new ideas with them. I am gratified that not one of the new members returned at the last election has voiced such views as have been expressed by members whom we have seen enter this Chamber in previous years—views to the effect that this is to be made a party House, or that the purpose of new members in entering this Chamber was to secure its abolition. I am pleased to think the new members have a full appreciation of the advantages of retaining the Council, and I feel sure that as they grow older in Parliamentary experience they will be still more convinced of the usefulness of this Chamber. The outstanding feature of the Speech delivered by His Excellency was the reference to the Premier's mission to London. It is interesting to know that the Premier was only taking a forward step in carrying out a policy of which he has been an ardent advocate ever since he entered Parliament. In some of the old files of "Hansard" we discover that he held the same opinions of land development many years ago. We can commend him on his

consistency in always advocating that policy. Just as applicable to-day as they were 18 years ago are his views respecting the enormous liabilities of the State, the indebtedness per head and the necessity for introducing new settlers. It is disappointing that so many of the settlers introduced in past years have not remained with us, or, at all events, have only taken the places of others who have departed. Many of those whose passages were paid by the State have not hesitated to leave us. There must be something wrong when people are so ready to get out of the country. We should all concentrate on that one idea, because so frequently we see the advantages of the State held up to newcomers, notwithstanding which they find greater inducements elsewhere. When we consider the enormous expense the State has incurred in bringing settlers here from overseas, it is astonishing that we have not a greater number of settlers to-day. It is pleasing to note that on this occasion the Premier has succeeded in evading, on behalf of the State, the responsibility of paying the passages of new settlers. I have frequently marvelled that Great Britain, although so anxious to place her sons in her overseas Dominions, has not seen her way to paying the passages of those coming to Australia. It is no new idea, because in days gone by England paid the passages of large numbers of her people bound for America. Even now she is not paying the passages of those coming here; the Commonwealth Government have undertaken that responsibility, for which we should be duly thankful. It appears that instead of 75,000 actual settlers, as many of us understood, we are to have only 6,000. They will be expected to help us carry the enormous burden of maintaining large numbers of people in the towns and cities, people not engaged in primary industries. Not only in Western Australia, but in the Eastern States also, it is astonishing that there is so little to show for all the money expended in encouraging people to go on the land. In the older districts of Western Australia we do not find any great increase in the number of settlers; in fact, in some of those districts, there are no more to-day than there were 20 years ago. The same phenomenon is to be seen in the inland districts of New South Wales. In that State only one inland centre has increased its population during the last 10 years. The population of the whole State has increased very largely, but the increase seems to have drifted towards the towns and cities. I hope that of the 75,000 people who are to be brought out from England, a very much larger ratio will be placed on the land than has been the custom in previous years. In my opinion, the question is whether we are ready to receive all these newcomers, whether the department is prepared to give them a practical welcome, placing them on suitable land and keeping in touch with them for some time afterwards. I am sorely afraid things will

not go quite so smoothly as many seem to expect. I have heard of many instances of unsatisfactory dealing with the Lands Department. Nine months ago I applied for the freehold of land which had some years to run under conditional purchase conditions. Knowing that the department was short of cash, I decided to pay up the balance of the instalments due on that land, but up to the present I have not been able to get an inspection, although I have repeatedly asked the department for one, and have even gone so far as to place the business in the hands of my solicitor. I do not wish to make a personal matter of this, so I present it simply as definite evidence of something being wrong in the department. Possibly the department is under-staffed. I have a friend who has had even a more exasperating experience. He is a returned soldier. Before he went to the war he had 1,000 acres at Dalwallinu, 700 acres being cleared. He had resided on the property and farmed it, and during his absence at the Front his brothers worked his land, with the result that when he returned he had fully 3,000 bags of wheat to his credit in the pool. Like other soldiers, he was given an extension of five years, free of rent. He returned wounded, but eventually was able to go back to his farm. Last season he was actually engaged taking off his crop when he saw a number of motor cars in which some men were inspecting his farm. He learned from them that his land had been forfeited, and was to be sold within a fortnight. When he finished taking off his crop he came down to the city to see why he had not been apprised of the position. The officials, on going into the matter, discovered that his property had been gazetted for forfeiture without his having been communicated with in any way. I bring this matter before the House because whichever way I turn I come across people who are in similar difficulties.

The Minister for Education: Will you give me the name of the person?

[The Deputy President took the Chair.]

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. Another man, who had completed his final payments, I think some 18 months ago, on a property which you, Sir, once held, has not yet had it inspected because there is a shortage of inspectors. If this is the position with the people I know, what must the position be generally throughout the State? If we do not put our house in order we shall not be able to receive the new settlers from the Old Land. It is not fair that these important matters should be bung up in this way. I want to sell land, but cannot give any transfers if the department will not deal with them. Something must be done before we can receive the new settlers from overseas. There appears to be nothing in the Speech indicating that the Government intend to consider the question of an agri-

cultural college for the instruction of our newcomers. If the Premier would launch an appeal to men in England to come here with their own capital, and could assure them that agricultural instruction was available for them, I am sure there would be no difficulty in getting them. Victoria has received many settlers with capital, and after learning something about the business they have become successful farmers. I do not think the Government have made any effort in this direction in this State. If we established something in the nature of an agricultural college, it would be an inducement to many farmers with money to come here and give their sons the advantage that would be afforded to them. There are practically no people coming here with money to invest in the land. When land is sold here the buyer is generally a local man. Very few people outside the State seem to have any faith in it. Others seem to be disinclined to invest their money here. It may be that we have frightened capital away by our legislation.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: That is since the advent of the Country Party.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: There must be something wrong, and we should find out what it is.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Change the Ministry.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The very fact of its being difficult for people to learn anything about agricultural pursuits is a great deterrent to their coming here. The Education Department spends a great deal of money in teaching children in the city all kinds of things. With the exception of the meagre attempt at Northam, and one or two other centres, in the way of teaching children agricultural subjects, and with the exception also of the taking over by the department of the Narrogin Farm School, nothing that is at all adequate for the situation is being done. However good these attempts may be, they are not likely to induce people to come here. We have not sufficient people in Western Australia with money for the development of our resources at their own expense. It is, of course, impossible for the State to find money with which to do more than just scratch the surface of the country. We want more capital here. It is a great strain upon the resources of the average taxpayer when he is called upon to foot the bill every time. I have no fault to find with the scheme of immigration, or with the financing of the scheme, but I contend that something more must be done to induce people to come here with their own capital. We should do more to teach young people to make a success of their agricultural calling, instead of leaving them to run the risk of making a failure. The Speech refers to another Closer Settlement Bill. That measure is in total disagreement with the ideas I have just expressed. We desire to establish the confidence of people in this country and to bring new settlers here. The Bill that was thrown out last session was tantamount to

class legislation, and was calculated rather to scare people away than to induce them to come here. The best means of encouraging outside capital to come here would be to do away with the land tax. It would constitute a good flaring advertisement and would attract many people.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: That is what De Garis said.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It would attract the attention of people, for they would be inclined to come here instead of going elsewhere with their money. They would say Western Australia was a good place to come to. The Government do not make a great deal out of the land tax, and would therefore not lose much if it was abolished. Instead, however, of reducing it or taking it away they are increasing it. The Government should do away with the State trading concerns. People in inland areas have great difficulty in getting their machines repaired. Many vehicles have to be sent to the State Implement Works, because there are no men left in the country districts to do the necessary blacksmithing work. It is more difficult to get such work done to-day than it was 20 years ago. All the old foundries have decided not to enlarge their establishments, or indeed to build them up, because of the competition with the State. They regard State trading as a danger.

Hon. J. M. Macfarlane: It is unfair competition.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Yes. The private individual has to pay rents, rates, taxes and interest. It is found to be difficult to get men to work, for apparently men prefer a Government job.

Hon. J. Cornell: Do you believe in selling the State Implement Works?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Not necessarily, but I do not think the State should run in competition with people who have been established in the older country districts, and who are being ruined because of this unfair competition. Some of these big concerns in the country districts are being carried on by the owners with practically their own labour. I realise that some of the men employed in those establishments are growing older and that they are not worth as much to-day as they were when they were young. Owing to the legislation in existence here, the apprentice system blocks a sufficient number of young men from learning a trade thoroughly. If we want to get a good team of horses shod in the country in these days, we do not know where we can get the work done.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: What has that to do with the State Implement Works? They do not shoe horses there.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I know some of these older established businesses in the country can hardly be kept going, and it is difficult to get necessary work attended to there. Formerly we could rely on having wagons built or repairs carried out. It is becoming increasingly difficult to get such works at-

tended to. There must be something wrong to account for such a state of affairs. I attribute it to the State entering upon these avenues and manufacturing machinery and so on. By doing this, the State is finding employment for those men who prefer to work for the State rather than remain in the country districts working for old established firms.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: Can you name any firm manufacturing implements in the country districts?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It is exceedingly expensive to get anything done in the country in these days. If I were to approach an old established firm, I would be informed that such high rates of pay have to be given to the old hands who are not capable of doing a full day's work, that the firm are not prepared to embark upon the purchase of machinery to deal with such works as I would ask them to carry out for me. They would also complain of the drift of the skilled workers to the State works, and they would also, in declining to manufacture vehicles for me, point to the unfair competition by the State.

Hon. F. E. S. Willmott: Twenty-five years ago we used to send things to be repaired from the Gascoyne.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I can inform the House of an instance where a set of wheels was sent down from beyond the Gascoyne to Northam and, what with railage and freight and the cost of the work, by the time the set of wheels for the wagon was received back on the station, the cost had run into over £100. That is one aspect of the difficulties we are faced with when the State enters into this sort of competition. I could go further and remark upon my own experience in connection with State shipping. In carrying out that undertaking, I think the State is pursuing a forlorn hope. I am sorry indeed that the "Kangaroo" was not sold when the Government had an opportunity of disposing of her some time ago. A large sum of money was spent on alterations in connection with that vessel, and she is now engaged in an effort to open up what is referred to as a "new trade" with the Dutch East Indies. From my earliest days I remember the trade with Java and the Dutch East Indies being in full swing, so there is nothing new about that trade. The State was trading 30 or 40 years ago with Java and Singapore, and it is ridiculous to refer to it as a new trade.

Hon. A. J. H. Saw: It is said that they gave us wire grass.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Dr. Saw is mistaken if he refers to the Guildford bulb grass. I must absolve the Java people from sending it to us. If hon. members went to Lemnos they would find the whole island is covered with that grass, and I fancy that is where it came from. When I was in Java a little while ago I failed to find any evidence of the wire grass there. I found that Western Australia was trading in sheep, and if she continues to trade in the way she has started, we will be in exactly the same position as some indi-

viduals were years ago. The efforts of those people resulted in ruining the trade. Private individuals in the North some years ago endeavoured to work a smart point on the people in these islands who desired, in the opinion of those individuals, poor and rubbishy sheep. I can assure hon. members that the people in Java and Singapore require a first class article just as much as any person in Australia. Those people were terribly disappointed when they found that they were not receiving the article they had every right to expect. When one or two private traders in years gone by, and recently too, sent horses to those countries that were not what they were represented to be, the people cut out the trade, and rightly so. These people made arrangements to purchase good wethers and an individual contracted to ship them good wethers. Instead of doing that, a lot of ewes that were lambing were despatched to the islands, and again that trade was cut out.

Hon. F. A. Baglin: That does not sound too good for private enterprise.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Now we find the State is doing the same thing. The State Shipping Service should not treat the passengers in the way I found the service dealing with them when they arrived at Fremantle. At 8 o'clock in the morning men, women and children were tumbled off the vessel and shot ashore without a meal, just as the breakfast gong was sounding. That is atrocious treatment for the State to mete out to people who have come here to make this their home.

Hon. J. Nicholson: What was the reason for such an action?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The hon. member should ask the State Shipping Service for an explanation. Perhaps the reason was that they were studying the cost of the meals. Some 25 or 30 passengers saved the State the expense of a breakfast. I mention these things to show that we in Western Australia must put our own house in order if we are to make a success of these operations. Personally, I found that the arrangements for my tour were quite altered through a telegram sent from Fremantle to Singapore, which had the effect of varying the route to be taken by the vessel. Those instructions cut out some of the time we anticipated we would have ashore at Java. Subsequently a passenger who had had some experience told me that he had got a guarantee that the boat would stay for a definite time at the port he was mostly concerned with. The ship just managed to save the bacon for the State by squeezing in the stipulated time. I had no guarantee from the State Shipping Service as to what the definite movements of the ship would be. In future, however, I will adopt the same plan, for that gentleman was a Government official and knew what he might be up against, hence the precautions he took. I would advise everyone to get a written guarantee.

Hon. J. Cornell: Would any Steamship Service give such a written guarantee?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not know, but we should be very careful before we start travelling. It is said that we desire to encourage tourist traffic. About £200,000 was spent on the "Kangaroo," and a portion of that was for providing accommodation to enable her to carry a large number of passengers. I understand that one object of that improvement was to encourage tourist traffic with the Dutch East Indies. I suggest that some consideration be shown for the convenience of passengers. Unless this is done, we will not get the support for the service that we might expect. I am against State trading concerns and against the State further embarking on any other such enterprises. I am opposed to the State dealing in the purchase of sheep and acting in competition against good and reputable firms who know the business better than the State itself. I think it well to mention these matters which have come under my personal observation and I know how the different departments are ready to meet anyone who cares to approach them. I am not definitely in opposition to anyone in direct control of these departments, but I do claim that we have much to put in order. We realise that some of the legislative enactments and the State operations are working to the detriment of those who are willing to invest their money on enterprises in Western Australia. Despite the reference in the Governor's Speech to private enterprise embarking upon secondary industries, I know that private enterprise is not going into them in the manner we would like to see. I would like to see proper encouragement given to such people to develop the resources of Western Australia. I support the motion and sincerely hope with His Excellency and others that legislation will be put through this session that will be of benefit to the State, that the condition of those who are embarking their all in Western Australia will be improved, and that we will find ways and means of getting over the many difficulties with which we are confronted at the present time.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.30]: In common with other members I extend a hearty welcome to the new comers in our midst. At the same time I wish to congratulate the President on his elevation to what he assures us has been the object of his legitimate ambition for many years. I am certain he will fill the Chair with the dignity and ability which has characterised his predecessors. Whilst expressing that sentiment, I also wish to pay a tribute to the last occupant of the presidential Chair, Mr. Walter Kingsmill. In my opinion Mr. Kingsmill was the ablest man we have ever had in the position of President of the Council. He is a man with an extremely well-informed mind, a close student, an able authority on constitutional matters, and an expert on all matters affecting the procedure of this House. I regard his loss to this Chamber as a very distinct one, and I trust that the future holds some equally fitting position in store

for him, perhaps in another sphere. I listened to the speeches of some members with considerable interest, and I am sorry that two members, to whose speeches I shall refer, are not in the Chamber. I think I may say that two of them were redolent of the Old Testament. I allude to what I might term the lamentations of Jeremiah brought up to date by Mr. Lovekin, and to the Book of Job in a revised version by Mr. Sanderson. I do not propose to traverse all the figures Mr. Lovekin gave us. I am certain they will be very ably dealt with by the Leader of the House when it comes to his turn to reply to the debate. He is very much more competent to deal with the matter than I am, and he also has at his fingers' ends the necessary statistics and has the means of getting assistance to collate those statistics, which I have not. As I listened to the speech of Mr. Lovekin, two fallacies struck me particularly. The first was a reference to the fact that 29,000 people came to these shores and that all with the exception of 27 quitted these shores. I interjected "Are you sure they were the same people?" and he replied "That is not relevant." I maintain it is perfectly relevant, because, if they were not the same people who went out as came in, then undoubtedly the State would have been very much worse off had they not come. So far as I can see the only point that the hon. member could have in making this allusion was that it was useless to encourage immigration because the people who came here went away again. In fact he said as much; he said the other States had no objection to this immigration policy of ours, because they knew they would subsequently get the people who came here. Consequently, I maintain it was relevant for him to prove that they were the same people who went away as came here, or that the people who came here displaced from their occupations a certain number of people already here so that they were compelled to leave the State. There is no information available on those points. The fact that so many people have left this State is undoubtedly a regrettable one, but it is due to inevitable causes. It is comparable, to my mind, with the drift from the country into the cities. The same causes are at work impelling people who live in small neighbourhoods to migrate to larger centres. The people who leave here go to the other States or to the Old Country. The movement has been going on for a very long time, and it is certainly not confined to the new settlers. It is within the experience of all of us that numerous people from our own circle have quitted Western Australia, old settlers or the descendants of old settlers. I can allude to many striking instances. The presidential Chair was filled years ago by a gentleman with a large family, and of that large family, not a single one at the present moment is living in this State. Take the ex-Chief Justice of Western Australia and some of his family, who have departed from these shores.

Some years ago a gentleman was elected to another place, the rising hope of the Liberals. He was supposed to be the Moses who was going to lead us out of the financial wilderness. I regret to say he did not do it. He has left these shores and I believe is seeking admission to the House of Commons. A son of the Archbishop is serving the Empire in Mesopotamia; two sons of a distinguished General are serving in the Indian Army. So it goes on. We must all know hundreds of people who have left these shores and migrated elsewhere. It is due to causes probably beyond our control. Perhaps the same restlessness that induced people to come here is inducing people to leave us and go elsewhere. It is one of the failings of Australian political thought not to recognise that Australia, equally with the rest of the globe, is a portion of the solar system. Some people seem to regard Australia as a water-tight compartment uninfluenced by causes having their origin in other parts of the world. It is not so. Whatever happens in other parts of the world has its reflex here, and in the same way, we in our small degree contribute towards events in other parts of the world. This, I take it, is one of the reasons why people are leaving here. I maintain that Mr. Lovekin must buttress up his argument if he desires to prove that it is useless to bring immigrants here because they go away again. If this is his contention, he must prove that the people who come in are the people who go out, and I fancy he will find that a difficult position to maintain. There is another even greater fallacy. The hon. gentleman alluded to the fact that the United Kingdom, in paying one-third of the interest on the £6,000,000 to be borrowed for five years, would pay £600,000. He worked that out at £8 per head on the 75,000 immigrants to be brought here. Then he went on to say that the trade of the United Kingdom with the Dominions amounted to £8 per head of population. I presume he meant the population of her Dominions, and that his saying "her" was a verbal error, for I find the export trade of the United Kingdom with Australia in 1919 amounted to about £7 per head of our population. Then he went on to draw an inference that inasmuch as the trade of the United Kingdom with Australia was equal to £8 per head and that was the amount calculated on 75,000 immigrants that the United Kingdom was paying to us as part of the interest on the £6,000,000, therefore the United Kingdom in one year would be recouping herself what she would be spending in five years. Can members imagine a greater fallacy. The £6,000,000 which the United Kingdom has to give us is profit to us and loss to the United Kingdom? He treats the £8 per head of trade as profit and treats as all gain to Great Britain the increased trade she may do with the 75,000 immigrants. This certainly is not profit; only a very small percentage is profit. The statement is entirely erroneous. I am certain the hon. member does not carry on his business on those

nes. When he sells a paper for 1½d. he does not regard that as all profit.

Hon. J. Nicholson: He charges 2d.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: There might be a small profit on it at 2d., but I doubt it. When we think of the increased cost necessary to print the reports of hon. members almost verbatim, wonder how he can make any profit at all. I am certain it does not make profitable reading. I am extremely sorry that Mr. Sanderon is not in his place, because I was very much pained at his defection; he is a colleague of mine. He referred to himself as an old Liberal. Ever since I have studied politics—long before I came into this House—I looked upon the hon. member as the stalwart of the Liberal Party, almost a die-hard.

Hon. T. Moore: That is what he said he was.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Unfortunately, he renounced his allegiance to the Liberal Party and said he had from that day joined the Country Party. I can only compare my feelings on hearing that statement with what I can conceive would have been the sentiments of a citizen of the first French Empire had he heard that the Old Guard had deserted Napoleon. I know the hon. member delights in the political tourney. As one of the poets has said—

He rode the melee, lord of the ringing lists.

and I can fancy that as he entered the list with his vizor down, prepared to break a lance with anyone, he cared not a jot who it was. He delighted to unhorse the champion of the Labour Party, to hurl back with jibe and scorn the champions of the Country Party, and, most of all, he delighted to direct the shaft of his trenchant criticism, of his mordant humour, at one of his own side. Henceforth we shall miss this trait, because he not only denounced his intention of joining the Country Party, but he also announced his adherence to the policy of the executive in directing the votes and speeches of hon. members.

Hon. J. Duffell: And invited us to do likewise.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: Can members conceive that he who has flayed all and sundry in his criticism henceforth is only to pipe to the tune called by the czar of the Country Party? Do we imagine that the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard his spots? I trow not. I am inclined to think the Country Party will find they have not got such a docile follower as the hon. member represented he was going to be. I fancy they will find him rather a thorn in the flesh—an "Enfant terrible." I feel shocked to think that one who has been my colleague and who is still the member for the Metropolitan-Suburban Province, should have deserted the flag and joined another party.

Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: The hon. member stated that he was an old Liberal, and I regarded him as such. In my boyhood I wept over the

fate of the Last of the Mohicans; in my youth I followed up the adventures of the Last of the Barons, and in my manhood I watched the career of the last of the Old Liberals. Alas, he is no more! Undoubtedly we have very serious business before us this session—the consideration of Sir James Mitchell's scheme of immigration. I am one who is in hearty accord with the broad outlines which underly that scheme. But occasionally I have a doubt as to whether due consideration has been given to the details of the scheme. I would like to know whether the scheme has been worked out by experts in land settlement, and by expert financial advisers, whether the Cabinet has gone fully into the matter, or whether it is merely an airy *ipso dixit* of the Premier. I am rather sorry to have to allude to this, but from my acquaintance with Sir James Mitchell, much as I respect him, I am by no means sure that details are his forte. I certainly hope that we are not going into this scheme without proper preparation. The whole thing depends upon proper preparation for receiving the settlers, proper arrangements being made for them to go on the land, and the education of these people in the calling they are to follow when they get on the land, and also on proper administration. Unless those three factors are fully carried out I am afraid that the scheme will turn out only a partial success, and instead of bringing, as we all hope, prosperity to the State, it will perhaps involve us in loss. I earnestly implore everybody to direct helpful criticism to the matter and particularly those gentlemen who have had considerable experience in land settlement. This is a matter of national importance, and it should be entirely outside party politics, as it involves the welfare or ruin of all of us. Therefore, criticism which is helpful, and which is directed towards promoting the true welfare of the scheme, should be offered. There are a few other matters to which I wish to refer, and one is in relation to the Perth Hospital. I am glad to see that at last the lately retired Colonial Secretary has admitted the principle, the adoption of which I have been urging for a long time past, the representation of the honorary staff on the board of management. He has conceded that, but I still maintain that the public are not getting the full benefit of the hospital, that there are still many things there that should be improved. Several new departments should be created. Probably there is not another hospital of the same size in any of the British speaking communities that has not a pathologist attached to its staff. The work of a pathologist in conjunction with the work of the surgeons and physicians is of the utmost importance. A pathologist does not only conduct *post mortems*, but a thousand and one other things in regard to the examination of living tissues and fluids of the body on which only a pathologist can give expert advice. The Perth Hospital does not possess a path-

ologist to work in close co-operation with the staff, and until this necessary state of affairs is brought about, the hospital cannot be called a properly conducted institution. Other departments, also, to which I have already alluded, have not even-tuated—the electro-therapeutic and the orthopaedic. Neither is there yet an adequate X-ray plant. I daresay hon. members know that in Germany, on account of the improve-ments in X-ray plants, they have been able to cure many cases of cancer by means of what is known as deep therapy. This work has gone long beyond the experimental stage, and the results attained in Germany have been verified in other countries, and have proved of tremendous advantage. It is the bounden duty of the Government to see that such an X-ray apparatus is installed in the Perth hospital.

Hon. A. Lovekin: At the Children's Hos-pital there has been a 16-inch coil for years, which has never been used.

Hon. A. J. H. SAW: But it is only within the last few years that the new apparatus which has been so successfully used in Ger-many has been designed. A plant of this description is beyond the reach of even those who are specialising in X-ray work on account of the expense involved, and therefore it is the duty of the Government to instal a plant at the Perth Hospital so that those suffering from certain forms of cancer may have a chance of being cured. Then there is the question of miner's phthisis. I maintain that if it is possible to bring relief to those people who are suffering from the disease and pre-vent others from getting it, it is the duty of the mine owners to take the necessary precau-tions. I do not care whether it is going to re-duce the dividends, but I contend that if the disease can be minimised, every effort should be made to lessen the incidence of the dis-ease, even if it should involve closing down some of the lower grade mines, because I doubt whether it is an economic proposition to lose so much human life and to involve people in suffering, and for the State to have to bear the burden of their support. I know that Mr. Cornell and other gold-fields members are deeply interested in the question, and if they bring the matter for-ward, they can rely on getting my warmest support. Another matter to which I wish to refer is the question of the University. Our University has out-grown its clothes; we have not sufficient accommodation for the students at present enrolled. We are not able to maintain our present activities and to live within our means, and it is the duty of the Government to come to our assist-ance. Last session another place rejected the proposal to impose fees. Therefore, the Gov-ernment must see to it that the institution is properly maintained, and that can only be done by providing an increased grant. There are certain measures we would like to under-take in connection with the University, cer-tain new departures which at present are not

practicable, and unless we receive a larger sum of money than we are getting to-day, we cannot carry out what we have in view. We should have a degree in law and a diploma in commerce, and undoubtedly we should have a correspondence class to bring the university within reach of those outside the metro-politan area. At the present time we are housed in inadequate buildings which are overcrowded, and if we are to make pro-vision for the increase in the number of students which we expect next year, we shall have to provide further accommodation. That accommodation cannot be found on the exist-ing temporary site. I am going to plead to the Government to make us a sufficient grant from loan money to enable us to erect permanent buildings on our permanent site at Crawley. It seems to be a settled policy that we shall go to Craw-ley, and although I opposed that site in previous years, I have no further objection to offer to it. We must, however, erect new buildings. They need not be expensive. We hope to move the geology and biology de-partments to Crawley, and the expenditure involved in the erection of buildings, it is estimated, will be £15,000. For this sum of money those two departments can be ade-quately housed. It is useless tinkering with the matter by erecting further structures on any temporary site. I wish also to refer to the need which exists for the pro-vision of an agricultural college. It will be remembered that that was the first and most pressing matter urged by the Royal Com-mission on Education last year. It is a dis-grace to the Government and also to the Country Party who are behind the Govern-ment, that the agricultural college is not yet in being. Our State has already become a very important factor in the agricultural in-dustry of Australia, and we have not yet made provision for the proper education of those going on the land. I do not see how we can expect to make any considerable ad-vance in our yield per acre unless the farmers get more scientific education. It seems to me that Cabinet distrusts scientific educa-tion. I have reason to say that, otherwise I cannot see how a Govern-ment which is kept in power by the Country Party—Cabinet consists entirely of members of the Country Party or members representing country areas—can openly neg-lect to establish an agricultural college. When it is a proposal to advance £60,000 for meat works or abattoirs at Fremantle, the money is forthcoming in spite of the experience of Wyndham, and in spite of the fact that an agricultural college would be an infinitely better proposition. Regarding metropolitan needs I can assure hon. members that, having only lately contested an election, I know what they are. As a matter of fact I think it was because I did not join in the chorus which clamoured for trams here, trams there, and trams everywhere, that I was opposed. If the people are pre-pared to pay for the trams and we can



find the money, let them have the trams. But let us do it on a proper and orderly basis, so that we may know which tramways are most necessary, and build those first, instead of proceeding in a haphazard fashion. Then there are such questions as water supply and sewerage for the metropolitan area, and the algae in the river. I believe the Government have promised to get an expert from the Eastern States to deal with the algae, but he has not yet materialised. In spite of remarks made by a newcomer here, I believe the metropolitan area is looking forward to increased representation in Parliament. I shall protest with all my might against certain views expressed in this Chamber by members representing country districts. Mr. Hamersley was one instance, and Mr. Burvill seemed to think that the representation of the city should be decreased instead of increased—this while metropolitan members represent nearly half the population of the State. It is my opinion that the people of the metropolitan area will insist on increased representation. I protest against the view that the denizen of the city is not as good a citizen of the State as the man who happens to be a primary producer. We are always having it hurled at our heads that the city dweller is, in effect, a parasite on the primary producer. But the man in the city, the artisan, the clerk, the merchant, the professional man, has his place in the community just as much as the man on the land, and requires to be thought of too. We are just as important to the man on the land as he is to us. We supply him with his vehicles, his machinery and most of the things he uses on the farm. Let that fact sink into his mind. I advocate that the huge areas of land that we have here be brought under cultivation, but I protest against the continual disparagement of the man in the city. If it were not for us in the cities, the primary producer in a few generations would be back to the condition of the savage in Central Africa. He would be cultivating his own little plot of meales and going about with a few beads round his neck. Anyhow, we city people are equally necessary with the man on the land; and so long as I am here I shall protest against our not receiving due consideration. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-reply.

On motion by Hon. F. E. S. Willmott, debate adjourned.

*House adjourned at 6.4 p.m.*

## Legislative Assembly,

*Thursday, 24th August, 1922.*

Questions: Railway, Narrogin-Dwarda Extension	PAGE
Address-in-reply, Twelfth day, conclusion ...	379
	379

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

### QUESTION—RAILWAY, NARROGIN-DWARDA EXTENSION.

Mr. HARRISON asked the Premier: Is it his intention to place the file in connection with the Narrogin-Dwarda railway on the Table of the House, seeing that the member for Pingelly has given notice to move for a select committee to inquire into the advisability of the construction of that railway?

The PREMIER replied: Yes.

### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Twelfth day, conclusion.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

Mr. HICKMOTT (Pingelly) [4.34]: It was not my intention to speak on the Address-in-reply, but some of the statements made during the last few weeks call for a reply from those who know something about the employment of immigrants. With other members of the House, I agree that there is no question as to the advisability of getting more people to come to Western Australia. We are all agreed on that point. I do not know that I can go as far as many of the previous speakers in congratulating the Premier on his immigration scheme. Certainly, so far as the scheme applies to the securing of immigrants, it is good, and there is no doubt that the financial arrangements appear to be liberal. The handling of the immigrants after they arrive here is, however, a bit beyond the capacity of the existing organisation. It does not seem that there will be any difficulty in getting people to come to Western Australia; the greater difficulty will be to keep them once they come here. During the last eight or nine years we have received between 40,000 and 50,000 immigrants, but we have only retained about 9,000 of that number. It is questionable whether we can absorb the flow of immigrants arriving now from week to week. I am afraid they are coming much more quickly than we can absorb them. I hope, however, that I am wrong. I think the Premier has too much to do and I consider a better division of his work will have to be arranged. The Premier should have more help. He has many offices to administer and duties to perform. His time is fully occupied, without having to deal with this question of absorbing the immigrants as they come here. I think an advisory board might be appointed to manage