

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 13th August, 1925.

	PAGE
Leave of absence	258
Address-in-reply, seventh day	258
Lapsed Bills (2) restored	268

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. J. Ewing, leave of absence granted to Hon. J. M. Macfarlane (Metropolitan) for six consecutive sittings on the ground of urgent private business.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

Seventh Day.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. T. GLASHEEN (South-East) [4.35]: To begin with, I wish to express my thanks to those members who were gracious enough to preface their remarks on the Address-in-reply by extending to me such kind words of welcome and congratulation. I appreciate very much their attitude, and I clearly see that the intention of hon. members was to make me feel somewhat at home in these, to me, new surroundings. There is an old saying, that fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind. Of course at some time or other in the Parliamentary careers of hon. members they had to make entry here initially, and I have no doubt their feelings on that occasion were similar to mine at the present time; they felt somewhat embarrassed, somewhat shy, and if kind words of welcome and congratulation were extended to them, as they were to me, I am sure those words proved very helpful indeed. I sincerely thank hon. members for their great kindness. I was pleased at being assured by Mr. Kirwan that in this House a man's political soul is to some extent in his own keeping. Before I came here I was under the impression that party division was very marked in this Chamber; indeed, I believed that the several parties sat on their own particular benches and glared at one another, as parties do. Therefore I was particularly

pleased to find that, so far from that being true, we are all nicely and sociably mixed up, which I think a much better arrangement.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: As you go on you will find there is no party here at all.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Although assured by Mr. Kirwan that here one's political soul is to some extent in his own keeping, I am inclined to differ on the point as to where a man's political soul or his political body either, is held. I am inclined to think it is not here, but out in his province, where his political soul is kept and where it is regulated on party lines in spite of the fact that we may be here non-party. It will be most fitting on my part to sincerely endorse the expressions of regret at the death of my predecessor, Mr. Greig. I feel that in taking Mr. Greig's place I am partaking somewhat of a legacy. I called on Mrs. Greig a little time after her husband's death, when I thought her grief had had time to soften slightly, but I found her grief just as great as at the graveside. They were a Darby and Joan couple, they loved each other, and I am inclined to think Mrs. Greig will carry her grief to her own grave. When I say I look upon this seat in the nature of a legacy, what I mean is this: Mrs. Greig sincerely assured me that it was I, more than any other person, whom she wished to see take Mr. Greig's place here. She further assured me that had Mr. Greig ever had any reason to resign his seat he, too, would certainly have wished that I should fill the vacancy. I appreciated that very much indeed, and it fortified me to go out and fight the election. In your own remarks of condolence, Sir, you said you hoped that Mr. Greig's spirit was happy in the Great Beyond. I particularly endorse that sentiment. I think it is very much better that we should all believe there is a Great Beyond. If Mr. Greig's splendid spirit is not there, then, to be frank, I do not like my own chance of reaching that haven. I listened with very much satisfaction to His Excellency's speech. I was not privileged to take my place in the House prior to that address, and so I listened to it from behind the Bar of the House. I was particularly struck at His Excellency's clear enunciation. Where I sat, every word was distinctly audible to me, and I have heard others who occupied seats in the remote parts of the gallery say that every word was distinctly

heard by them. His Excellency appeals to me very much indeed. I first had the pleasure of meeting him at the opening of the Albany woollen mills, and I was privileged to be present at the civic reception tendered to him by the mayor and residents of Albany. There I listened to His Excellency while he delivered one of the most logical addresses I ever heard. That was not only my own opinion, but was the unanimous verdict of everybody who listened to that speech. I came away from that reception quite convinced that His Excellency was very far removed from what is sometimes termed a figurehead. Mr. Nicholson, touching upon the opening of Parliament, alleged want of respect to His Excellency, and to the King whom he represents, in the cutting out of the guard of honour. Mr. Nicholson had a good deal to say about sentiment and tradition. With what he said about sentiment I entirely agree, but I am not in accord with some of his remarks respecting tradition. Sentiment is an ever-fresh atmosphere that continually surrounds us. It is in our domestic life, in our public life and in our business life, and will be with us for all time. I am not so sure about tradition. I am of the mind that many things called tradition are as woefully out of date as Cobb & Co.'s coaches. I do not think any want of respect was shown to His Excellency in the cutting out of the guard of honour. I should be inclined to say that His Excellency is one who would not unduly insist upon guards of honour or any of the trappings of tradition. I think he would be more inclined to say, "Cut it out and save me the embarrassment of it all." The question of expense always creeps into these displays. The cost of a guard of honour may not be very great, but when all these things are insisted upon at various places, the aggregate expense is considerable. While we take Governments to task for reckless expenditure we sometimes insist upon that expenditure being incurred. When it comes to a lot of money to carry out those things, which do not appear to be of very much use, I cannot help commending the Labour Government for cutting them out if they are not really necessary. I do not look upon guards of honour as emblems of loyalty. I would rather believe that the expressions of loyalty shown by Western Australia and her soldiers during the war were all-sufficient. Mr. Potter had something to say the other night about the

amount of blood he saw spilt at the war—too much of it—and he is an example of what the war has cost some people. In view of Western Australia's wonderful display during the war, and the thousands of her soldiers who took German poison gas for breakfast every morning in defence of King and country, I consider that this State has shown wonderful evidence of her allegiance to the Empire. Mr. Ewing said the bettered condition of the finances of the State and the bettered condition of the revenue were due in a great measure, if not entirely, to the policy laid down by Sir James Mitchell with respect to group settlement. Perhaps I am too new a member of this Chamber to begin differing from old members, but, as faint heart never won fair lady, and I must make a beginning somewhere, I might as well do so now as later on.

Hon. J. Duffell: That is the stuff.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not agree with Mr. Ewing in his contention that the better part of this improvement is due to Sir James Mitchell's group settlement policy. Up to date it appears that group settlement has been all expenditure and no return. How then can it be logically claimed that the bettered condition of the finances is due to that? My contention is that the improvement, the around-the-corner business, as it is called, is due to the fact that Providence has been kind to us. We have had good seasons. We have had rain where we needed it. We have had sunshine where we needed it, for a period of eight or nine years. Running concurrently with these things there have been high prices for wheat and wool. Therein lies the substance of our prosperity. These things have produced wealth in great abundance. It has permeated the whole community, and as a consequence there has been an improvement in the revenue. I admit, with Mr. Ewing, that the policy laid down by Sir James Mitchell in the settlement of the wheat belt has in a large measure led up to the prosperity we claim to have now, but I am at variance with him in his other contention. I do not say I know much about group settlement, and am not going to be dogmatic in my remarks concerning it, but I had some early training in group settlement of another kind. I refer to Australian born people, not to migrants from England. I wish to speak about

groups of people who have been rocked in the Australian cradle, have been born here. I was one of a family of 12. Our next-door neighbours, across the fence, farmers like ourselves, had a family of 16.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: I know of a man who went through the entire alphabet in giving names to his children.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: On the other side, across the other fence, was another family of 14. There were thus 42 between the three families.

Hon. A. Burvill: And there was no baby bonus.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: If there had been it would have run into a considerable amount for that group. Our early struggles were difficult. Nowadays people do not know what pioneering means. We had everything there to constitute group settlement. As growing boys we helped one another in every phase of our common industry. We herded our cattle together. We gathered our grain together, and we shored our sheep together. It was a kind of kindergarten amongst the children. We enjoyed it, and it was quite workable, but not in its final stages. As we grew up and assumed responsibility, and we became concerned about the financial aspect of things, instead of assisting one another in group endeavour, we became engaged in Jack Dempsey tactics, quarrelling with each other and blacking one another's eyes. Our parents began to get jealous of each other and we became jealous, and in the end we all retired unto ourselves, not speaking to each other, either the young people or their parents. This sort of thing is evident in many places. I am led to the conclusion that group settlement may be all right in the South-West or elsewhere until it is advanced a certain stage. Under the sustenance basis practically everything goes along smoothly, but when the settlers are thrown upon their own responsibilities I am very much afraid that group endeavour will cease to function. I cannot help thinking that Mr. Ewing was slightly out of order in his address concerning group settlement.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You will often find us out of order here.

Hon. J. Ewing: In what way was I out of order?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: He said that the report of the Commission on Group

Settlement was null and void, because the Government had expressed their intention of going on with the scheme.

Hon. J. Ewing: I do not think that is out of order.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is. I believe on the Address-in-reply a member has the privilege of talking about anything. He can talk about bugs, mice, politicians, or anything under the sun. I did not, however, know that a member was privileged to talk about nothing. That is what Mr. Ewing did in his speech. He said the report was of no value at all, and he immediately proceeded to give a half-hour's disquisition upon it. If it was of no value and was merely a waste paper basket business, there was no further necessity to discuss it. I do say, therefore, he was out of order in doing so.

Hon. J. R. Brown: It shows the uselessness of this Chamber. Members talk for half an hour and say nothing.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Perhaps I am doing that now.

Hon. J. Duffell: You are trying to raise your own screw at the present time.

Hon. J. R. Brown: Who is?

Hon. J. Duffell: You are.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: No man who is rational would dare to say that group settlement should not continue. Sir James Mitchell informs me that over £2,000,000 has been expended up to date in this direction, and in view of this every member must agree that we must go on with the business and show whether it is right or wrong. We must not allow group settlement and all the expenditure entailed upon it to fall to the ground, or allow the holdings to go back to nature.

Hon. J. Ewing: I am thankful to say the Government do intend to proceed with it.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: According to what they wrote on the report of the Royal Commission the "West Australian" would like the public to believe that it recommended that group settlement should be allowed to go back to nature. Nothing I have read in the report indicates such a thing. The scheme has my heartiest support and I consider we should prove whether or not it is worth anything. The expenditure that has been incurred is too great for us to take any other point of view. I know something about one of the statements made in the minority report. Mr. Latham said one of the outstanding features to do with the success of

the scheme was the conservation of ensilage. I am heartily in accord with that remark. On my farm I built a silo with a storage capacity of 160 tons. It was put up last year. This was my first year's experience of it. I can say without reservation it has convinced me that I have increased my stock carrying capacity, particularly of sheep, by at least 50 per cent. I shall not be surprised if I find from experience that this can be increased, but I wish to be careful and will confine myself to the 50 per cent. I am doing practically everything on my farm that it is intended to do on the groups. I have stud cattle, pigs, sheep, and wheat. I have an irrigation plot served by dam water. I could, if I wished, grow vegetables all the year round, or rather if I were a Chinaman or a market gardener I could do so, and grow everything that can be grown in the South-West. I am told that in the South-West at a certain time of the year there is an abundance of feed which cannot be eaten. It is not practicable to buy stock to eat it off, but something should be done to conserve that abundance of feed. We come back to the old adage of the bees and the honey. If the bees do not work hard in the summer and store up honey, they will starve in the winter. That is applicable to the conservation of the abundance of feed in times of plenty, and making use of it so that it can be turned to profitable account at other times of the year. I believe that the cow will be the key to the position in the South-West. If that is so, we must have continuity of production and profit, and all the things that go in a sequence with them. There is feed in plenty at certain times. Let us put that feed into some concentrated form so that it can be used when it is badly needed. From that point of view alone the minority report commends itself to me. With regard to group settlement I go so far as to say that, in view of the great expenditure and the doubts that have been expressed about the ultimate success, or otherwise, of the scheme, it will be wise for us to be careful about expansion. I am not going to say that we should not expand slightly; it is my view that we should expand gradually. My opinion is that undue expansion at the present time would be unwise. We have a big policy laid down, having expended already two millions sterling, and if we demonstrate quietly and carefully that we can expand slowly, I would sound a note of warning in that direction. There was a dis-

ussion in this Chamber last night on the subject of the gold bonus, and Mr. Stewart's remarks rather impressed me. I am in harmony with the sentiments expressed by that hon. member. I think that the business of bonuses, or protection, is wrong from an economic point of view; I go so far as to say that when anybody gets a bonus, everybody might as well be treated likewise, because the whole thing goes round in a vicious circle. A bonus does not come from the clouds, nor from a hole in the ground; it comes from the public purse. The public must find it and, having these bonuses, we are no better off with them than we would be without them. A bonus necessitates expenditure and the hands of the Government become so forced that they are then up against the proposition of having to increase taxation on land or income, or something else. Taxation is imposed to bring in revenue to the extent of the amount of the bonus, and so, in the end, we are left in the position we were in before the bonus was granted. We have heard it said that group settlements must go out of commission, because they are not paying. If that be the case, why did not the sugar combine go out of commission when that was not paying? But what did Australia do for that combine? If Mr. Gregory's figures are correct—and they have not been contradicted—the Australian public presented the sugar combine with four millions of money. Therefore, if protection is necessary for the sugar combine on the assumption that the continuance of its operations means the employment of labour, payment of high wages and provision of good homes, why not extend the principle to the groups? What is good for the goose is certainly good for the gander.

Hon. J. Duffell: What do you think of the baby bonus?

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The baby bonus was granted as a means of increasing the population of Australia, but in my opinion it is an insult to every maternal instinct.

Hon. J. R. Brown: But 98 per cent. of the people collect it.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I do not say I do not collect it myself, but I do not believe in it. I would prefer to bring about a set of conditions that would raise the position of the mother and her infant above the necessity for it. Now I wish to refer to some matters affecting the wel-

fare of my Province. The most important question is that of the provision of railways. When I set out on my campaign to fight the recent election I had no idea that so many people required railways. I find that nearly every community needs two or three lines, while some individuals appear to require one or two to themselves. According to the Premier, it will be about three million years before all the people in this State who need railways can be provided for. But speaking seriously, I can say without hesitation that the South-East Province, and the districts leading away from the province, are absolutely starving for railways.

Hon. A. Burvill: That is the position at the south end, anyhow.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is the position all over the province.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Most of the railways required in your province will really be in the South Province.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: To begin with, away at Kalgarin some of the people are 45 miles from a railway. They require a line into Kondinin and both those districts need a railway across to Corrigin. Then going along to Brookton we find an old-standing and worthy agitation for a railway from Brookton to link up with Armadale. The Government lately decided to proceed with the construction of the Narrogin-Dwarda railway, which has been authorised since 1911. That is one satisfaction to the province, but there are other authorisations from Brookton to Westdale, a distance of 26 miles, and yet another authorisation out from Denmark. My contention is that we should not authorise the construction of railways, or pass Bills authorising the construction, unless we are prepared to immediately build those lines. I can only express the hope now that all those that have been authorised will be constructed immediately. When the building of a railway is agreed to by Parliament, the people in the district affected immediately become convinced that the work is to be put in hand without delay, and they set out on expenditure that they would not otherwise incur. It shows want of respect on the part of a Government to create a feeling of that description, and then fail to proceed with the authorised work.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They have all been guilty in that respect.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Perhaps they have; the hon. member knows more about it than I do. The question of the Brookton-Armadale line is an important one and appears to me to override the parochial, parish pump, vote-catching business entirely. I look upon that work not from the point of view of vested interests, but as a work of national importance. At the present time the districts beyond Kondinin and Naremben, and further out for a distance of 40 miles, are the Mecca of the wheat growing areas. I do not know what quantities of wheat will be produced there in the future, but I do know that immense quantities have been produced there in the past. All that wheat—I cannot give the tonnage—loops the loop twice before it reaches the port of shipment. Each loop is about 40 miles in length, and the farmer pays the piper. The wheat loops the loop around from Kondinin and Naremben to Narrogin, an excess distance of 40 miles as the crow flies. Then it goes to Brookton and again loops the loop from Spencer's Brook to Fremantle, another 40 miles. The question of wheat transport is boiled down to a question of efficiency. We are up against the black hordes of India and the cheap labour of Russia. We have to market our wheat in competition with those countries, and if we are compelled to do all this looping the loop business, and travel an unnecessary distance of nearly 100 miles, we shall be the sufferers. Therefore I am justified in claiming that this question overrides all parochial matters. If the Government are not prepared to build the line which will save nearly 100 miles in transport, they should be prepared to carry the produce at the shorter rate, that is to say, at a reduction which would be represented by the saving of that distance. The settler should not be obliged to pay for all that unnecessary transport. If the Government wish to be wasteful, then let them bear the cost. I read, I do not know whether with satisfaction or regret, the report of the proceedings of the deputation that waited upon the Premier in connection with the construction of the Brookton to Armadale line. That interview took place after five or six attempts had been made to gain access to the Premier's office. Finally the deputation

got there and so far as I was able to gather, there was no satisfactory result. The Premier led the people to believe that there was no possibility of getting that railway constructed for a long time. Then some numskull—he could not have been anything else—made the suggestion that the people might raise the money with which to build the railway if the State would pay the interest. I may say incidentally that I once floated a co-operative company. I never attended such an enthusiastic meeting as that which was called to consider the proposed formation of the company. Everybody declared that it was absolutely essential that there should be such a concern. Then when applications came in for shares, how many applicants do members think came to light? There was great enthusiasm at the meeting and much more oratory than there is in this Chamber, and when the concern was approaching statutory shape, the total amount we got was £12. Again, incidentally, I may mention that to-day that co-operative company has an annual turnover of £40,000. I mention that in a satirical way in connection with the proposal to raise money locally for the building of that railway. I believe it requires a quarter of a million pounds to construct the line, and if we set out to-morrow to canvass the people for it, I doubt whether we would get £250, apart, perhaps, from Mr. Hedges. The outlook is so hopeless that it can only be ridiculed from the viewpoint of the settler raising the money free of interest to build the line. The Premier must have had his tongue in his cheek at the time. Were I to say, as a farmer, that I had no money and therefore could not do anything, I would perhaps be living now, along with my wife and children, in a 6 x 8 tent. As far as actual money is concerned, I have not a shilling in the world. Neither has Henry Ford. But I have property, and whenever I had security I was not afraid to float a loan upon it. To-day I have a very fine and comfortable home. I use that as an analogy. We in this State have security. I do not know of any heritage in the world equal to it, and are we going to continue sending people out into the wilderness, such as those at Kalgarin, who were sent out there nine years ago and who, according to the Premier's reply the other day, will be there another nine years, which will about cut out their lives, before they get a railway. Is

that giving them a fair spin? Let us show some vision. Float a loan of five or six millions and build the railways required. That is the colonising spirit. The parochial attitude of saying we have not the money is no good. We shall never have the money, but we have the security, and that is all we require.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It is the people who lend the money that should have the vision.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I think our credit is good. The Premier said he had a signed cheque to fill in himself for two millions, and if he wanted another million or two, well, he can fill it in for that, too. He also said that he had got the two millions of accommodation to tide over the interval pending the floating of a loan at a lower interest rate than he would have had to pay on a previous loan. So I can only conclude that the security of the State is great—great enough anyhow to float a loan and settle the State as it should be, instead of wasting generations of lives before the necessary work is half done. Regarding Albany, I hardly know what to say. Albany to-day would bring regret to any man who dodged around its outskirts. There is evidence of decay and lack of prosperity everywhere, and small wonder. His Excellency the Governor, in his remarks at the reception I mentioned, described Albany as a heavenly place—in fact, he said he knew of no place more so—the most beautiful health resort he had ever lived in. Albany, like the Brookton-Armadale district, is also starving for facilities that should feed wealth and prosperity into that harbour. Yet when we talk of building a line from Newdegate to Albany, we shall probably be parochial in the sense that we have been in the past. We will question its sanity and its wisdom, because it does not traverse settlement. I would not consider settlement along the route for a moment. I would consider the national aspect of a place like the Albany harbour. I am told, and I speak as a layman, that the whole of the British and American fleets could find room there for a night's lodging and none would be unduly crushed.

Hon. A. Burvill: Quite correct.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: If that is so, what a national asset it should be to us! I know something of the Sydney harbour. I have read about its scenic, its botanical, and its other kinds of beauty, but I say unhesitatingly that were the hills surrounding

Albany populated as Sydney is populated, the Sydney harbour could not hold a candle to Albany. We have the regrettable circumstance that travellers moving about the world call at Fremantle, but never see Albany. As a harbour, Fremantle is a stinking place compared with the sweetness at Albany.

Hon. G. Potter: That is on account of the amount of commerce it does.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Never mind the stink; Albany will stand the stink if you give her the trade.

Hon. G. Potter: If you deprive Albany of its beautiful sylvan glades, you will spoil it.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Population will add to its grandeur and further polish her sylvan glades. If at Albany we have one of the finest defence harbours in the world, if we have one of the finest health resorts, as the Governor said we have, why worry about a few settlers along the route of railway which will feed capital, production and wealth into such a place? Do not talk about patriotism. It is our bounden duty to do what we can to settle population in such a centre. It is one of the best tourist resorts we could conceive of, but while tourists in untold hundreds go to Fremantle, none of them sees Albany, and they go away without gaining any idea of our heritage there. It is our duty to see that the place is populated by some means and given the commerce that it should have. I advocate the immediate construction of the Newdigate-Albany line, if for no other consideration than the national one. As a line that would take group settlement produce into Albany, it is entirely justified. I have been told by the people of Albany—I do not know; I am too new at the game to know much—that they profess to see the trail of vested interest that drags produce from its natural outlet to Fremantle. If these underground workings are going on, I appeal to those responsible to take a State-wide view of the case. People often wag flags of patriotism, but too frequently it is the patriotism of the pocket, and I have not much time for patriotism of that description. Drop the flag-wagging for a while, drop vested interests and considerations of the pocket, and give these people their natural heritage and due. Give them everything the harbour entitles them to. I was pleased to see in the Speech the statement that the Bunbury harbour is to be

considerably improved. That may be an indication of some tendency to give the out-ports what is due to them. Years ago I worked on the goldfields; I belonged to the Boulder Miners' Union, and at that time I thought as much of Boulder Miners' Union as to-day I think of the farmers' union. I know something about the ideals of Labour, and I say, perhaps with some timidity, that I cannot for the life of me see any difference between the true ideals underlying Labour and the true ideals underlying the Country Party.

Hon. J. R. Brown: You will know when a division is taken.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is the trail of party politics that brings that about. The Labour man thought he was not getting his due. He thought he did not have as comfortable a home as he deserved, that his kiddies were not well fed and well educated; in short he thought he was not getting the worth of his day's work, and he set about forming a union so that he might get redress. What were the feelings that animated the farmers when their union was mooted? Were they not in the same position? Were they not claiming that they had not decent homes; that their kiddies were not well educated and well clothed, and that their wives never knew what it was to get a holiday. In fact some of the wives went 10 to 12 years without ever seeing the seacoast. We were making those claims and with every justification, too, and we immediately set about forming our union. But to-day we find greater antagonism between our Labour friends and the Country Party than exists between them and any other party.

Hon. J. R. Brown: That is questionable.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is a fact.

Hon. E. H. Gray: It is not our fault.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: It is your fault, and I shall show that it is. We travelled along nicely together up to a certain point, but the divergence came on the questions of protection and socialism. On the goldfields I was working underground and my mate was M. J. McCarthy. That man stood for more selection ballots and contested more vacant seats, I think, than any other man in the State, and every time he stood he failed signally. That was my mate on the machines in the Associated mines.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Later on he was tried to decide whether he should not be expelled from the union.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: McCarthy never did anything himself. He believed in explaining the principle of work to others. I was in the unfortunate position of being his mate. Instead of working, my mate brought me a book on socialism. I read Karl Marx's "Capital," Bellamy's "Looking Backward," Blatchford's "Britain for the British," "Merrie England," and almost every book on socialism ever written. I think I had the makings of one of the best socialists in the world. I felt that two little red flags were beginning to sprout in my pocket. The reading of these books created in my mind a desire for economic study. Further reading banished from my mentality every vestige of socialism. I have made a practice of buying the best works on economics that are obtainable. I think I may claim to have one of the best libraries in the wheat areas. For that I thank Mr. M. J. McCarthy. He, at least, sowed a desire in me for economic study. I read and re-read numerous works on economics, and the perusal of them utterly banished from my soul any idea of the possibility of socialism. Socialism would be an economic possibility were it not for human nature. Socialism is a beautiful dream, and every Christian ought to believe in it; but human nature has got in front of socialism, and we shall have to wait another million years for the realisation of that dream. Until human nature has been changed, it is no use bothering about socialism in one's own time. Farmers do not believe in socialism. As regards the allegation that farmers have experienced the benefit of socialism at the hands of the Government, the reply is that the farmers have to pay principal and interest in respect of anything they have received. Another line of division between the Country Party and the Labour Party is the principle of protection. Our Labour friends tell us, and with all sincerity, that they have a terrible set on monopolies and combines. I claim that the Labour Party, quite unconsciously, through economic ignorance, have fostered the greatest combine that Australia has ever suffered under—the sugar combine. We have a total embargo on the importation of sugar to-day, and whilst in New Zealand one can get a bag of sugar

for 16s., the same bag of sugar costs my wife about 29s. 6d. The difference represented by those figures, Mr. Gregory tells us, means four millions sterling to the people of the Commonwealth every year. The economic fallacies of the Labour Party, I say, have fostered the greatest combine ever known in Australia. Again, take the case of Hugh McKay. In a protected country like Australia, there are few people concerned in any particular manufacture, and there is no competition with the world; and the few manufacturers can all get round a table and by honourable agreements bottle up food-stuffs and other necessaries. Subject those people to the world's trade, and such a thing becomes impossible. I would advise any member visiting Melbourne to go and have a look at a certain paddock behind McKay's implement works, a paddock filled with implements broken up by Hugh McKay. One would then wonder whether McKay was manufacturing implements or deliberately breaking them up. On the other hand, Henry Ford in his book tells us that about his works there is not to be found a bit of waste; everything is utilised; the waste is not enough to fill a pipe; 'it is all efficiency. McKay is a millionaire whose success has been fostered by the Labour policy. Goodness only knows the amount of the bonus McKay draws from the consumers of his implements throughout the whole extent of Australia. The president of the Chamber of Mines, Mr. Hamilton, tells us that one man engaged in primary production furnishes the necessaries of life for nine others. If the policy of protection is reasonable, why not extend it to, say, group settlers, and all others engaged in primary industry? If protection is a reasonable policy for the sugar combine and Hugh McKay, it should be a reasonable policy all round. On that line of argument one would say, "Give protection to group settlers and to all other producers." I do not believe in protection. It leads nowhere. If we all got protection, none of us would be protected at the finish. Protection is one of the greatest economic ills that have ever afflicted Australia. I said something about reading matter, and that leads me to remark, further, that it is not many years back in our history when we believed that witches caused storms at sea and shipwrecks and conflagrations and all sorts of things. In the age I refer to, judges

and other learned persons believed that witches caused storms and shipwrecks and fires and deaths. Since then, however, the schoolmaster has been abroad, and he has shown the fallacy of such beliefs. To-day, instead of blaming witches for storms and shipwrecks and other disasters, we get great astronomers to tell us how these disturbances arise and how the causes may be traced. Practically every art and science—astronomy, geology, biology, medicine—has its school of learning. If it is necessary to have a school of learning for, say, surgery, then I consider it is necessary to have schools established for the teaching of economics and political economy. I am not a bit afraid as regards being able to represent the South-East province in the matter of its local concerns, but I acknowledge that when I come into this Chamber I am particularly afraid of my ability to become a legislator. When I learnt to play chess at Boulder, I thought I knew all there was to be known about it after I had been playing a little while. Then I played on, and found, as I became more proficient, that I did not know much about chess. When I had played still further and become really good, in the ordinary sense of the term, at the game, I found I knew absolutely nothing about it. It was, perhaps, an instance of a little knowledge being a dangerous thing. However, I do not think a little knowledge is as dangerous as none at all. The point I wish to make is that my study of economics has led me to a conception of the appalling inability of the ordinary man to be a legislator except in the parish pump style. In the domain of surgery, a man has to spend ten years of his life learning before he is allowed to practise on humanity; possibly he spends ten years on practising on one organ before he is allowed to touch anatomy as a profession. But a carpenter or a bricklayer can come, practically off the street, into this Parliament and become a legislator under our so-called democracy, and this without having read a book, without having the slightest conception of the science of government. He can come in here and solemnly diagnose the social complaint and prescribe the remedy; and we expect to get good results. I am not surprised at the complications and the numerous disappointments resulting from government. What does surprise me is that those complications and disappointments are not still greater. I consider that children should be taught the elements of political

economy and economics, so that when they come to take the places of their fathers in the legislative halls they may know something about their subject. I was pleased to read some remarks in the Press about the great educational benefit it had been to Mr. Collier to visit England. I am quite in accord with those remarks. The little wee man in the street may say, "Collier is having a fine holiday. I wish I were he." This same man is saying that honour, dignity, and truthfulness are negligible in Parliament. This, of course, means that such desirable qualities are totally lacking in him. Yet the man in the street is trying to get into Parliament with the desire, I presume, to browse in his natural element. When I hear an observation of the kind, I conclude that the man who makes it has the characteristics which he ascribes to Parliament. Mr. Collier's visit to London, it seems to me, must be of great economic as well as educational value. The business of legislation is not confined to these Chambers, or to St. George's-terrace, or to the Esplanade. It stretches across the oceans and continents, and every man who sits in high office needs to follow the economic strings of finance and commerce across seas and lands occasionally. I believe that a man like Mr. Collier, or any other head of a Government, does well to go abroad as often as possible; I hold that money spent by a Premier in visiting other countries is money well spent. As Kipling says—

What do they know of England
Who only England know?

Those lines express an absolute truth, and we may echo, "What do they know of Australia who only Australia know?" I am not going to try to solve the problem I have stated, but I hope that some day we will start to educate ourselves in the business of scientific government just as we recognise that we have to educate ourselves in medicine, surgery, biology, astronomy, geology, or any other art or science. The matter of bonuses brings me back to constituencies. There seems to be about constituencies an atmosphere similar to that which hangs about bonuses and about protection. When we get something in the nature of a bonus for our constituents, we must recognise that the amount has to be taken from us in increased taxation. There is a selfishness about constituencies, and the less we do to induce any Government in power to spend public

money by way of purchasing the support of constituencies, the better. The spirit of selfishness with which constituencies are imbued induces them to seek what they want irrespective of the other fellow's claims. It comes round in a vicious circle, a circle which meets at the point where the Government, in order to cope with injudicious expenditure, must proceed to tax the people more heavily, thus taking away all the benefit that has been bestowed. We had an instance of that lately in the land tax. Again, we have an ever-increasing income tax. All bonuses and grants must come out of the State Treasury, and the Government must find something to replace the amount so expended. Something else is generally taxed and the result is that the constituencies are left largely in the same position as they were before. I would like to see a little less selfishness displayed, but still, as others are striving for benefits for their provinces, I intend to fight for my constituents and get everything I can for them, just as the other fellow does.

Hon. E. H. Gray: And quite right, too.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The migration question appeals to me as being a sort of funnel. If we were told the truth, we might be enlightened. From time to time announcements are made in the Press that so many migrants have arrived, but we do not hear much about those who have departed.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are good Australians.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: Thus it is a sort of circular funnel, migrants coming in at one end and perhaps a greater number going out at the other end. I suppose that will be so always, but my idea of the true migration policy is the little migrant that the Australian mother rocks in her Australian cradle. Earlier in my remarks I said something about 42 who comprised three families. I do not know why we do not hear of such families in these days.

Hon. J. Duffell: Because we know too much.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: The hon. member is now admitting something that, I presume, is applicable to himself. I do not know if the cause is physical.

Hon. E. H. Gray: People could not keep them in the towns.

Hon. W. T. GLASHEEN: I am inclined to believe that the cause is social. On one occasion when Napoleon had returned to Paris after his victories in Italy, all the

notabilities of France were gathered in a great hall. One of the most prominent ladies of the time, Madame De Stael, was present. She coveted a compliment from Napoleon, for a compliment from that great personality was to be sought after indeed. She sought for it and she got it. She said, "Sire, whom do you conceive to be the greatest lady to-day in all France?" Napoleon's reply was characteristic of him. He said, "Madame, I conceive that the greatest lady in the whole of France to-day is the lady who has reared the largest family." Madame de Stael had none; she never forgave him. The French nation to-day is peculiarly strange, and there is some analogy between Napoleon's reply and the French nation to-day. The French are warlike; they are frightened of attack by Germany or some other nation. On the other hand, the French nation itself has invaded France and captured the country. When the death rate fights and overcomes the birth rate in a country, that nation has brought upon itself its own annihilation. The best and most practical scheme of encouraging migration that I know of, is that inaugurated with disappointing results by that idealist, Kingsley-Fairbridge. In his idealism he was, perhaps, too far advanced for us. It was Froude, I think, who said, "Give me a boy to a certain age and I care not who gets him afterwards." The meaning was of course that if he had the opportunity to mould the mind and character of the lad, the latter would, as a man, be adamant against any bad influence in the world. Kingsley Fairbridge aimed at getting boys from England from early childhood, before their associations had grown, before friendships had been formed and long before marriage. He aimed to train them on his farm and fit them out as citizens of Australia. That was a grand ideal. The pity of it was that he got no appreciable consideration from Governments. I believe that contributed largely to Kingsley Fairbridge's death—lack of support and disappointment with the reception of his scheme. I believe the ideal still lives and that it will be carried on. I do not believe it is the question of cost that influences the position. Given proper facilities, he would have turned out excellent citizens, and had he been encouraged from the beginning, the children would have long before this been turned out as practical citizens who would have been of advantage to the Commonwealth. I trust that even now there will be displayed some Government enthusiasm and that support will

be rendered to the work of this great Australian idealist. I realise that in my remarks on this occasion I am specially privileged as a new member. Hon. members have listened to me with considerate attention, and although there have been a few interjections, rather than be frightened of them I welcome them. It has been a pleasant experience to win a seat in Parliament, and I hope I shall emulate the spirit and character of the late Hon. J. A. Greig. If I fail in my desire to emulate them, I trust hon. members will be kind enough to appreciate that it will not be because I have not the desire, but because I am not able to.

On motion by Hon. J. R. Brown, debate adjourned.

LAPSED BILLS (2)—RESTORED.

Assembly's Message.

Messages from the Assembly received and read requesting the Council, in accordance with the Standing Orders relating to lapsed Bills, to resume consideration of the under-mentioned Bills:—

1. Main Roads.
2. Plant Diseases Act Amendment.

As to Second Readings.

On motions by the Colonial Secretary resolved: That the Bills having been read in this House a first time last session, the second readings be made Orders of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 13th August, 1925.

	PAGE
Question: Duty on kerosene and petrol ...	268
Bills: Land Tax and Income Tax Act Amendment, 1B. ...	268
Group Settlers' Advances, 1B. ...	268
Jury Act Amendment, 1B. ...	268
Real Property (Commonwealth Titles) ...	268
Electoral Act Amendment, 1B. ...	268
Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment, 1B. ...	268
Traffic Act Amendment, 1B. ...	268
Lapsed Bills, restoration ...	269
Address-in-reply, seventh day ...	269

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

QUESTION—DUTY ON KEROSENE AND PETROL.

Mr. THOMSON (without notice) asked the Premier: Is he aware of a proposal now before the Tariff Board suggesting a duty of 2d. per gallon on kerosene that in this State will amount to £19,595, and of a proposal to increase the duty on petrol from 1d. to 3d. per gallon that in this State will mean an additional contribution of £41,000? Has he, or will he, protest to the Federal Government against these suggestions?

The PREMIER replied: I read in the newspapers that these taxes were proposed, and immediately the announcement appeared, I telegraphed to the Federal Government strongly protesting against any such taxes being imposed.

BILLS (7)—FIRST READING.

- 1, Land Tax and Income Tax Act Amendment.
- 2, Group Settlers Advances.
Introduced by the Premier.
- 3, Jury Act Amendment.
- 4, Real Property (Commonwealth Titles).
- 5, Electoral Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Justice.
- 6, Industrial Arbitration Act Amendment.
- 7, Traffic Act Amendment.
Introduced by the Minister for Works.